

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
121085/FO/2018	24th Aug 2018	13th Dec 2018	Crumpsall Ward

Proposal Proposal is to build a three-storey block comprising of 28 no. two bed affordable apartments with associated landscaping and car parking facilities.

Location Land To The Rear Of Crumpsall Constitutional Club , Linn Street, Manchester, M8 5SN

Applicant Mr Peter Bowen , Bowsall Developments Ltd, Bowsall House, 3 King Street, Salford,

Agent Mr Tom Kelly, Jennings Design Associates, The Warehouse, Saxon Street, Denton, M34 3DS

Site Description

The application site measures approximately 0.24 ha in size, is fairly uniform regular in shape and is located with a street frontage onto Linn Street in the Crumpsall ward of the City. The site is comprised of a former private bowling green that forms part of the wider Crumpsall Constitutional Club site. The Club itself is located on Landsdowne Road, however the club house does not form part of the application site and would remain as a separate entity.

The bowling green itself has not been used for some time and has fallen into disrepair. The site has become overgrown and is now a mixture of grass and self seeded shrubs and plants. The trees that were previously planted across the site have all been felled recently, but before the submission of this planning application.

The application site edge red can be seen below.



The site is bounded by a retaining wall along Linn Street and then a mixture of timber, concrete and railing fencing around the other three sides, mainly where the site meets the surrounding existing residential properties.

The application site fronts onto Linn Street but sits to the rear of properties on Crumpsall Road to the northern boundary and Landsdowne Road along the eastern boundary. The properties along Crumpsall Road are large three storey Victorian properties with substantial gardens to the front and rear. The properties fronting onto Landsdowne Road are again traditional family houses at two storeys but with additional accommodation within the roof space. Linn Street forms the southern boundary of the site with lower two storey terraced and semi-detached houses on the opposite side facing the site. Finally, the western boundary is with the small two storey elderly person flatted properties at Bankhirst Close and their rear gardens.

Proposed Development

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a three storey linear building to provide 28 no. two bedroom apartments. All of the apartments are the same size and layout at 61 sqm, with 8 units on the ground floor and 10 units on the first and second floors to make 28 in total. The building is linear in shape and is located along the centre of the site with landscaping and 4 no. car parking spaces to the front, the bin store and cycle store to the western side along the boundary, and a car park and small garden area to the rear.

The proposed development includes the provision of 28 no. car parking spaces located to the front and rear of the building and in an undercroft area under the western end of the building. Two of the spaces are larger accessible spaces including the provision of two electric vehicle charging points. Both the pedestrian and vehicle access points into the site are directly off Linn Street.

The proposed development includes the provision of a mixture of new boundary treatments around the site, including varying heights of metal railings, metal weldmesh fencing and timber fencing. The submitted plans show a 1.8m railing to the front boundary with a hedge behind.

Consultations

Local Residents

A number of objections have been received for this scheme including a Petition with 28 signatures.

Comments include:

- Excessive and irresponsible overdevelopment of the land. 28 flats on such a small piece of land is ludicrous.
- Large three storey building will block the direct natural sunlight and view from adjacent properties. 3 storey building directly facing our properties will invade privacy significantly.
- There is a Council ban on converting properties to HMO's as a result of dense population – this proposal surely goes against the needs of the neighbourhood and the Council's stance in this regard.

- This area is already over saturated and this would make a small street totally overcrowded.
- Considerable increase in noise from the amount of people and cars.
- Increased congestion due to the amount of cars
- Increased pressures from on street parking
- Increased problems with rubbish building up and resulting vermin problems
- Flats will bring about anti-social behaviour in the area
- This was a former haven for wildlife and numerous established trees until they were recently felled by the owners. Around 10/15 bats were regular visitors here until the trees were felled and this and bird habitation has now been significantly reduced.
- Japanese Knotweed on the site – needs to be properly removed before any building work commences.
- Whole project will be an eyesore.

Ward Councillors

The three Ward Councillors, Councillors Leese, Ali and Riasat, object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is to build 28 apartments.
2. The local area comprises terraced housing with narrow access roads and this is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
3. The development would be better suited to houses rather than apartments providing much needed family accommodation within this area.
4. Parking is already congested on Linn St and the other nearby streets and this development would make this worse. The existing residents will have further problems with the additional traffic. The development also impacts heavily on the rear of the properties on Crumpsall Lane
5. The application has not provided any affordable housing, nor made an offer for 20% contribution to offsite affordable housing. The site is located within a residential area where affordable housing is required and a necessity and this site could provide some. The amount of housing planned is too dense for the site and will be an over development of this site.
6. The development is on land which was formally used as bowling green. There has been no consideration given or being provided in lieu of these loss of amenities and green spaces whether by financial contributions or like for like.

To conclude, these proposals are an over development of a site, in a residential area which would be ideally suited to affordable housing, with a loss of sports facilities and green spaces. Therefore, this application should be considered for refusal

Neighbourhoods and Strategic Development

The North Neighbourhood Team do not support apartments in this location.

The development of high quality sustainable neighbourhoods where people want to live and meet the demanding of a growing City population in the most sustainable locations is a priority in this area. Affordable family homes is a priority to provide

options for active family and young households moving into the area, therefore the NNT would like to see good quality family homes on this site.

Sport England

The proposed development does not fall within either the statutory remit (Statutory Instrument 2015/595), or non-statutory remit (National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Par. 003 Ref. ID: 37-003-20140306), therefore Sport England has not provided a detailed response in this case, but would wish to give the following advice to aid the assessment of this application.

If the proposal involves the loss of any sports facility then full consideration should be given to whether the proposal meets Par. 97 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is in accordance with local policies to protect social infrastructure and any approved Playing Pitch Strategy or Built Sports Facility Strategy that the local authority has in place.

If the proposal involves the provision of additional housing, then it will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then new and/or improved sports facilities should be secured and delivered in accordance with any approved local policy for social infrastructure, and priorities set out in any Playing Pitch Strategy or Built Sports Facility Strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and PPG (Health and wellbeing section), consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing or assessing a proposal. Active Design provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity.

Highway Services

The site is considered to be suitably accessible by sustainable modes and is in close proximity to a range of public transport facilities. It is anticipated that the proposals are unlikely to generate a significant increase in the level of vehicular trips therefore they do not raise any network capacity concerns. On site parking is being provided for 28 vehicles (of which two are accessible bays), and two car charging points which is considered acceptable from a highway perspective. Secure storage is also being provided for 28 cycles which is also acceptable in highway terms. The internal road layout is 6m wide and the bays are suitably sized.

The waste management proposals are acceptable and secure pedestrian access is being provided from two points on Linn Street and is acceptable in highway terms. Whilst the proposed boundary treatments are acceptable, we would prefer a permeable solution in the immediate vicinity of the vehicle access to provide better inter-visibility between drivers and vulnerable road users.

The proposed vehicle access is acceptable in principle and it is anticipated that the existing road hump could be retained in its original position. It is recommended that prior to the commencement of the development a detailed construction management plan outlining working practices during development is submitted to and approved in writing.

Arboriculture

Having visited the site, it is noted that the majority of the trees on the site have been removed prior to the application being submitted. The landscape plan proposes planting extra heavy standards at 14-16cm of native species. As no species are proposed, it is suggested that T1 to T8 be *Quercus petraea*, T9 to T11 *Tilia cordata* and T12 and T13 *Betula pendula* be used.

This should be added as a planning condition if the development is approved.

Greater Manchester Police

No objections subject to the scheme complying with the submitted Crime Impact Statement.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

The information submitted with the application includes an ecology survey. Overall this found the site to have low ecological value. The building present on site was assessed as having low bat roosting potential. The survey considered that the trees on site could be used by nesting birds. All wild birds, their nests and eggs are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), therefore GMEU would recommend that a condition be attached to any permission stating that no removal of, or works to any trees shall take place during the main bird breeding season. As Japanese knotweed has been found on site, GMEU would recommend that a condition be attached to any permission relating to its appropriate removal. In relation to biodiversity enhancement, GMEU would expect any scheme to include measures to enhance biodiversity at the site.

Environmental Health

Comments have been provided in relation to air quality, construction management, and acoustic insulation of the residential accommodation, waste management and contaminated land. In relation to air quality, the submitted AQ assessment prepared by REC dated July 18 reference AQ105975 R1 has been assessed and the content is accepted. Mitigation measures have been recommended in order to control fugitive dust emissions during enabling and construction works which will need to be included within the contractors construction management plan and adhered to. Reference has been made to good practice guidelines with recommendations which should also be complied with. In relation to waste management, due to the number of apartments the waste proposals need to be updated and re-assessed based on the high rise development criteria in the City Council's GD04 waste guidance document, to confirm suitable space has been provided.

In relation to all of the above, the wording for relevant conditions to be included have been suggested.

Flood Risk Management Team

FRMT suggest the inclusion of conditions relating to the submission of a fully detailed surface water drainage scheme and details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme.

Policy Context

The Development Plan

The Development Plan consists of:

- The Manchester Core Strategy (2012); and
- Saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995)

The Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012 and is the key document in the Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development.

A number of UDP policies have been saved and accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents as directed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The NPPF requires application to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The relevant policies within the Core Strategy are as follows:

Policy SP1 'Spatial Principles'

One of the key spatial principles is the emphasis on the creation of neighbourhoods where people choose to live, providing high quality and diverse housing, in a distinct environment. It will be explored in more detail within the report below that this development is not providing high quality or diverse housing that is in need in this area of North Manchester and would not contribute to providing neighbourhoods of choice.

Policy DM1 'Development Management'

This policy states that all development should have regard to certain specific issues, the following which are relevant to this case:-

- Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail;

- Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area;
- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise;
- Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space;

As will be explored in more detail below, contrary to this policy the proposed development does not deliver an appropriate scale, massing or layout which has an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area and does not have regard to the character or context. The development would have an unacceptable impact on amenity from a noise, privacy and light perspective.

Policy EN10 'Safeguarding open space, sport and recreation facilities'

This policy states that the Council will seek to retain and improve existing open spaces, sport and recreation facilities to an appropriate standards. Proposals will be supported that:

- Improve the quantity and quality of accessible open space, sport and recreation in the local area;
- provide innovative solutions to improving the network of existing open spaces, increase accessibility to green corridors, and enhance biodiversity;
 - improve access to open space for disabled people.

Proposals on existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities will only be permitted where:

- Equivalent or better replacement open space, sport or recreation facilities will be provided in the local area; or
- The site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function and the City wide standards set out above are maintained, and it could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space, sport or recreation needs, and a proposed replacement will remedy a deficiency in another type of open space, sport or recreation facility in the local area; or
- The development will be ancillary to the open space, sport or recreation facility and complement the use or character.

There will be a clear conflict with the provisions of this policy on the basis that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is surplus to requirements or that it can be used for an alternative open space, sport or recreation use, to remedy a deficiency in that alternative open space, sport or recreation facility in the area.

Policy H1 'Overall Housing Provision'

This policy outlines the housing priorities for the City Council and discusses the priorities for certain areas of the City. It states that within the Inner Areas in North, East and Central Manchester densities will generally be around 40 units per hectare.

The type, size and tenure of the housing mix will be assessed on a site by site basis and be influenced by local housing need and economic viability. Outside the Inner Areas, the emphasis will be on increasing the availability of family housing therefore lower densities may be appropriate. The application site in Crumpsall is located within an area outside the 'Inner Areas' and therefore the emphasis should be on the provision of family housing at lower densities. The proposed development is in conflict with this policy, as it proposes the provision of a higher density apartment led scheme contrary to this guidance.

Policy H2 'Strategic Housing Location' and Policy H3 'North Manchester'

This strategic housing policy outlines that the key location for new residential development throughout the plan period will be within the area to the east and north of Manchester City Centre identified as a strategic location for new housing. Developers should take advantage of these opportunities by diversifying the housing offer within an area with particular emphasis on providing medium density (40-50 dwellings per hectare) family housing including affordable housing. More specifically to this site in Crumpsall, North Manchester, Policy H3 goes on to state that North Manchester will accommodate around 20% of new residential development required by the Core Strategy. Most relevant to this case, policy H3 states that priority will be given to family housing and other high value, high quality development where this can be sustained. The proposed development through the proposals for 28 no. apartments does not accord with these policies and does not deliver family housing as is required within this area of the City.

The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995)

The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995. However, it has now been largely replaced by the Manchester Core Strategy. There are some saved policies which are considered relevant and material and therefore have been given due weight in the consideration of this planning application. The relevant policies are as follows:

Policy DC26 'Development and Noise'

This policy states that the Council intends to use the development control process to reduce the impact of noise on people living and working in, or visiting, the City. In giving effect to this intention, the Council will consider the effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise. In relation to the siting of the main car parking area for the proposed development immediately along the rear boundary of the site with existing residential properties, this would generate an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance that is not currently experienced by the occupiers of the existing accommodation. Therefore, the proposals are contrary to this policy.

National and Other Material Considerations

Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (March 2017)

The City Council's Executive has endorsed the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance. As such, the document is now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications and weight should be given to this document in decision making. The purpose of the document is to outline the consideration, qualities and opportunities that will help to deliver high quality residential development as part of successful and sustainable neighbourhoods across Manchester. Above all the guidance seeks to ensure that Manchester can become a City of high quality residential neighbourhood and a place for everyone to live. The document outlines nine components that combine to deliver high quality residential development, and through safe, inviting neighbourhoods where people want to live. These nine components are as follows:

- Make it Manchester;
- Make it bring people together;
- Make it animate street and spaces;
- Make it easy to get around;
- Make it work with the landscape;
- Make it practical;
- Make it future proof;
- Make it a home; and
- Make it happen.

More specifically to this case, Page 23 states that the Manchester Residential Quality Guide articulates and is explicit about what is considered to be good design, expressed throughout with clear case studies, sketches and photographs. Key to this is appreciating that residential design is not simply about the individual property, it is about how new homes combine to create places, about how they relate with one another and contribute towards creating a new neighbourhood, or adding to an existing one.

Page 29 outlines that residential design should create new housing that responds to the existing urban fabric, building typologies and the city's distinctive style while also embracing modern materials and contemporary ideas. Page 30 discusses appropriate densities and states that in suburban neighbourhoods, infill development will follow the scale of existing development. Higher density developments will result in greater demands on space in terms of all the functions required to support the successful operation and management of that development. Where area based planning guidance does not exist, or where it is silent on density, then any proposals which increase the existing level of density within the neighbourhood should be fully justified to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. An assessment of density is often a careful balance; taking into account character and context, economic and regeneration opportunities together with the capacity of different parts of the city to be able to accommodate and support any increase.

In relation to scale and massing, Page 34 discusses the need for development to appreciate scale in that there is a need to demonstrate how proposed height and mass would fit within its context, appreciating the need to create a legible urban environment, provide a strong sense of enclosure and, where appropriate in schemes of sufficient scale, introduce landmarks. Developers and their design teams will be expected to demonstrate how the bulk, massing and scale of proposals have

been considered in terms of its impact on the neighbourhood, street and block and how it influenced the architecture and design of the building and/or space.

Finally in relation to the type of housing provided, Page 46 looks at 'Housing for All'. This part of the guidance outlines that the population of Manchester is constantly changing. Residential developments should deliver a range of housing types and tenures that anticipate and fulfil the needs of these different demographic groups. Different groups have specific needs; for younger families it might be the relationship to play space and play facilities; for the older generation it may be more restorative spaces with access to medical services. Residential development that targets a specific demographic group should be driven by a clear demonstrable need.

It will be explored in more detail below how it is considered that the proposed development does not comply with the above guidance in that this high density, apartment led, large scale development does not relate to or add to the existing neighbourhood, it does not respond to the existing urban fabric, it does not follow the scale of existing development in relation to density, the increase in the density over the existing area has not been fully justified and that the development does not take into account the existing character and context.

The scale and mass of the proposed large building does not appreciate the scale of the area with the height and bulk not fitting within the context of the area. Finally, the proposed development for 28 no. two bed apartments all at the same size (2 bed 3 person) does not deliver a range of housing types that fulfils a range of demographic groups.

The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (Adopted April 2007)

This document provides guidance to help develop and enhance Manchester. In particular, the SPD seeks appropriate design, quality of public realm, facilities for disabled people (in accordance with Design for Access 2), pedestrians and cyclists. It also promotes a safer environment through Secured by Design principles, appropriate waste management measures and environmental sustainability. Sections of relevance are:

Paragraph 2.3 – Each new development should have full regard to its context and the character of the area.

Paragraph 2.7 – The City Council wishes to encourage the most appropriate form of development to enliven neighbourhoods and sustain local facilities.

National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

The revised NPPF was adopted in July 2018. The document states that the 'purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The document clarifies that the 'objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (paragraph 7).

In order to achieve sustainable development, the NPPF states that the planning system has three overarching objectives – economic, social and environmental (paragraph 8).

Section 8 'Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities' states that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places (paragraph 91).

Paragraph 96 states that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.

Paragraph 97 goes to state that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

Section 12 'Achieving Well Designed Places' states that 'the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this' (paragraph 124).

Planning decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

The NPPF is clear that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.

Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the

quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used). (paragraph 130).

Issues

Principle of Development, Type and Density

Policies H1 and H3 seek to encourage family accommodation outside of main centres. However, Policy H1 states that the type, size and tenure of the housing mix will be assessed on a site by site basis and be influenced by local housing need and economic viability. Outside the Inner Areas, the emphasis will be on increasing the availability of single family housing therefore lower densities may be appropriate. Policy H3 goes on to outline that priority will be given to family housing and other high value, high quality development where this can be sustained.

The proposal seeks consent for 28 apartments in an area characterised by single family dwellinghouses. Whilst it is acknowledged that apartments do not exclude family use, in this instance the offer comprises of 28 no. two bed 3 person flats without a good amount of private outdoor amenity space that would be attractive to families. Therefore, it is considered that the requirement and response needed in this location is for a lower density more traditional single family dwellinghouse scheme.

All indications are that there is a demand in the north of the City, and in particular the Crumpsall ward, for family housing and that the development of a high density apartment scheme is therefore considered to be unacceptable in principle. The proposal includes the provision of 28 no. two bedroom apartments within one large block, which equates to 116 dwellings per hectare. Policy H1 states that outside of the inner areas of Manchester, densities of around 40 dwellings per hectare will be supported. This development far exceeds this threshold, which is reflected in the layout and type of accommodation proposed. The applicant has not made a case for high density development and it is therefore considered that the proposed development conflicts with Core Strategy policy H3. Matters of layout and character will be considered in further detail below.

This is a site located within a predominantly and characterised by medium to low density residential neighbourhood. Therefore, the need in this neighbourhood is for larger family houses with good quality private gardens that will significantly improve the general environment and aid in regeneration of the wider area.

Within the Planning Statement submitted with the application, it is explained that the applicant was made aware during pre-application discussions with the Council that whilst they are supportive of the principle of residential development on this site, apartments in this location are not supported as a matter of policy. The applicant acknowledges that this preference is the starting point and have stated that they have explored the potential for family housing on the site. This has been shown through the inclusion of a draft layout along with the submission of an associated viability appraisal. The layout shown within the Planning Statement is for 8 no. family

dwellings and it is stated that the viability statement indicates that the scheme would stand to lose £320,000 based on a suburban scheme for family housing.

The applicant has since submitted a viability assessment to accompany the application to show that a scheme for family houses on this site would not be viable. The viability assessment has been considered by the City Council and the following brief summary comments can be made. The Council considers that the market value given for the proposed family houses is low compared to other local developments, the professional fees listed are high and the abnormal costs associated with the development are also high for a family housing scheme.

It should also be pointed out that no approach was made by the applicant to discuss and negotiate an alternative family housing scheme for this site. Therefore, it is not considered that the evidence submitted provides a strong enough justification for allowing an apartment led development on this site, which should be prioritised for the provision of family houses.

Character

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy refers to need to ensure development takes account of the character of the surrounding area and the impact of development in terms of its appearance. Policy SP1 looks to ensure development contributes positively to creating neighbourhoods of choice, with emphasis on creating well designed places that enhance or create character.

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD also advocates that consideration should be given to the scale of new developments and ensure that they are informed by their context. Where buildings are of a different scale to their surroundings, they should be of the highest quality and be of landmark status.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Section 12 'Achieving Well Designed Places' outlines the Governments expectations in respect of new developments. Paragraph 127 states that local plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. In particular, planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- Establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- Respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF specifically refers to the design of new development and states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to

take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Finally the Residential Quality Guidance states that design is not simply about the individual property, it is about how new homes combine to create places, about how they relate with one another and contribute towards creating a new neighbourhood, or adding to an existing one. It goes on to state that residential design should create new housing that responds to the existing urban fabric, follows the scale of existing development in relation to density and takes full account of the character and context of the surrounding area.

From an assessment of the context of the area surrounding the application site, it can be seen that the area is dominated by two storey terraced and semi-detached properties, some modern and some older in age, and some of which have dormers on the front elevation to provide additional accommodation within the roof space. There are some taller Victorian style properties fronting onto Crumpsall Lane, and these are set in substantial grounds with well sized front and rear gardens.

It is considered that the introduction of this single, large and bulky three storey building into the area would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area, as it would be significantly larger in mass than the existing terraced and semi-detached properties within this area. The provision of one large block across the whole of the site is considered to be a development of a scale and architectural massing that is inappropriate to the area. When added to the siting of the building, close to the site boundaries, this further emphasises the excessive scale of the building and the imposing presence that it would have in the street scene directly opposite low level terraced housing.

The resulting density of the development at 116 dwellings per hectare does not follow the grain of development in the local area. The shape of the site lends itself to a more similar form of development to the surrounding properties and area through the provision of good sized family dwellings. The proposal is therefore considered to overdevelopment of the site and out of character with the surrounding area.

Policy DM1 states that all development should have regard to appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail. It is considered that such a large building would represent overdevelopment of the site and would be out of character with surrounding properties, which are generally two storey family houses.

The overall density of the development is at 116 dwellings per hectare, which in comparison to the surrounding residential area is very high in number and scale. The level of built form, surface car parking and associated facilities such as bin storage and cycle storage against the level of amenity/landscaped areas, provides a very high density that is clearly not in keeping with the layout and density of the vicinity. It is felt that the application does not secure an appropriate scale and massing to development in relation to the surrounding area.

This can be seen in the site layout below:



The overdevelopment of the site has also resulted in large areas of car parking and unattractive bin storage and cycle storage areas to be located immediately adjacent to the boundaries of the site with existing residential properties to the detriment of the amenity currently enjoyed by the occupants of these properties. This will be explored in more detail below.

It is acknowledged that the proposed development does meet the Residential Quality Guidance requirements for the provision of private outdoor amenity space. As outlined within the Design and Access Statement, the Design Quality guide states that for 2 bedroom apartments, private external amenity space is to be provided by balconies of 7sqm. The proposed development includes the provision of a 7sqm balcony for every apartment with the addition of external garden space at approx 400sqm. Therefore, a total external amenity space of 525.5 sqm is provided, which does meet the requirements outlined within the Quality Guidance. However, notwithstanding this, it is considered that the provision of a balcony and a very small rear garden immediately adjacent to a car park, is not likely to be attractive to families in this suburban context and would be considered to be lacking in good quality and safe amenity space for children to play in.

Also, this does not outweigh the detrimental harm that would be caused by the overdevelopment of this site as outlined above and the development would be seriously detrimental to the character, context and visual amenity of the neighbourhood and surrounding area, and would not result in the positive and successful regeneration of the area.

In relation to the design of the building, it comprises a very simple traditional approach with the use of red bricks and a single ply roof. There are balconies to the front and rear however generally the design is very simple with very little architectural interest. There is a glass link towards the western end of the block over the vehicular access to the rear car park, however generally it is wholly brick with just window and patio door inserts. Although the proposals are not high quality in terms of architectural interest, the traditional approach is in keeping with the surrounding residents properties and is not considered to be inappropriate within this context.

However, this does not outweigh the overall scale and mass of the building being out of context with the character of the area.

The elevations of the building can be seen below:



South Elevation



North Elevation



West Elevation



East Elevation

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development is an inappropriate form of development which represents overdevelopment of the site and which does not take into account the context of the site, on which it is proposed, and is an inappropriate form of development that is not informed by its surroundings, having a poor relationship with adjoining residential properties. The proposed development is therefore considered to be unacceptable in principle.

The City Council aspires to create modern, attractive neighbourhoods based on good design principles. In this case, whilst it is acknowledged that the site is no longer in use and is overgrown, the proposed development does not respond to the character of the area sufficiently to warrant a recommendation of approval.

Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 explains that all development should have regard to appropriate siting, layout, scale, form and the potential effects on amenity, including privacy, light and noise. It has been acknowledged that the principle of a residential development on

this site, which is surrounded by existing residential properties, is considered to be acceptable.

However, good planning ensures that we get the right development, in the right place and at the right time. It is considered that the proposal that is the subject of this planning application has a high density at 28 units so would constitute a significant increase in activity through comings and goings, has a poor relationship to the existing residential properties in this area and is significant in scale and mass to the detriment of amenity.

As outlined above, the proposed development has a very high density at 28 units which equates to 116 dwellings per hectare. This is a very high density for a suburban site that is surrounded by family housing. It is considered that the proposal would introduce significant additional comings and goings compared to the existing site, leading to an over-intensive development of the site, which would have the potential to cause disturbance to adjoining residents that would be unduly harmful, due to the increased level of activity at the site.

The existing properties along Linn Street and surrounding streets are predominantly two storey in height, with a small number of three storey properties or properties with additional accommodation within the roof space. The new proposals are for one large three storey block that stretches across the whole site with little relief or break. This constitutes a large mass immediately adjacent to these existing dwellings and their garden spaces.

It is acknowledged that due to the distances between the proposed windows and balconies on the front and rear elevations and the existing properties, their windows and their gardens, there would not be a significant reduction in the privacy currently experienced by the existing occupants. There are windows on the side elevations that are in much closer proximity to the boundaries, however a condition could be included to ensure these windows are opaquely glazed as they only serve the corridors on the first and second floors.

However, the distance between the eastern elevation of the new building and the existing gardens is only 7.65m and the distance between the western elevation of the new building and the existing gardens is only 9m. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development would have an unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing impact to the detriment of visual and residential amenity, due to the proximity of the new building to the existing houses. This relationship is especially harmful given the depth of the three storey building across many properties and the size of the existing gardens and proximity of the windows of the properties at Bankhirst Close.

This development proposal has not adequately considered the impact on the existing residential properties in the area and does not integrate into the existing community in an acceptable way. The relationship of the building to the surrounding existing properties can be seen below:



In addition to this, the main car park area has been sited along the rear boundary of the site and the bin store and cycle store have been sited along the side boundary of the site, all immediately adjacent to the boundaries with the adjoining residential properties. These are not screened by any substantial landscaping and would be visible from the existing gardens and rear property windows. These elements would also cause a noise disturbance from the comings and goings, slamming of car doors, disposal of rubbish and the movement of bins and bicycles at any time during the day and night. As this is residential accommodation, this disturbance could be any time 24 hours a day.

Policy DC26 states that the Council intends to use the development control process to reduce the impact of noise on people living and working in, or visiting, the City. In giving effect to this intention, the Council will consider the effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise. In relation to the siting of the main car parking area for the proposed development immediately along the rear boundary of the site with existing residential properties, this would generate an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance that is not currently experienced by the occupiers of the existing accommodation. The car park would be located in a position adjacent to the rear gardens of the properties fronting Lansdowne Road and it is within these gardens that occupiers should expect a degree of peace and quiet. Therefore, the proposals are contrary to this policy.

The site is surrounded by residential properties and, given the points above, it is considered that the development would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of surrounding residents, due to its height, scale, and close location to the site boundaries, which would result in problems of overlooking, and loss of outlook from adjoining properties and their garden areas.

In addition the creation of 28 apartments would lead to a significant intensification in general activity at the site, compared to the previous use, with the resulting increase in noise, all of which would have a detrimental impact upon the amenities of surrounding residents, contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and saved policy DC26 of the UDP.

Loss Of Bowling Green

Paragraph 97 of the NPPF together with policy EN10 of the Core Strategy states that existing open spaces should not be built upon unless a specific criteria can satisfied, namely that:

Equivalent or better replacement open space, sport or recreation facilities will be provided in the local area;

or

*The site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function and the City wide standards are maintained, and
o it could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space, sport or recreation needs, and
o a proposed replacement will remedy a deficiency in another type of open space, sport or recreation facility in the local area;*

or

The development will be ancillary to the open space, sport or recreation facility and complement use or character.

The applicant has sought to demonstrate that the proposal is in compliance with this policy through its supporting planning statement on the basis that:

- The site is surplus to requirements through a letter from the Constitutional Club;
- The site does not fulfil a function as open space having limited public accessibility and therefore does not serve the local community;
- There would not be any appreciable loss of accessible open space and therefore does not need to be replaced;
- It is not necessary to consider the need for alternative provision.

This approach to promoting and conserving open space for access by local communities is reiterated within policy SP1 'Spatial Principles' of the Core Strategy states that 'the City's network of open spaces will provide all residents with access to recreation opportunities'. This policy also outlines a number of core development principles that all development in the City should adhere to. This includes making a positive contribution to health, safety and wellbeing of residents together with the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment (consistent with paragraph 97 of the NPPF).

It is noted that the 2009 City Wide Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study prepared by the City Council does not include the application site. It should be noted that simply because the site was not considered as part of the open study, it does not mean that the tests of the NPPF and policy EN10 do not apply. The starting point for any assessment of a planning application is the Development Plan and therefore, the Core Strategy and NPPF are given more weight in this case. The application site is a former Bowling Green and a recreational space and therefore its loss requires careful consideration against this policy and the NPPF.

The applicant contends that because there is limited public access to the site it has no value as open space despite the saved policy. They go on to state that as a consequence of this, it does not currently make any provision to the supply of open space.

The assessment prepared by the applicant that the open space contribution of the application site is limited has been considered in detail. However, it is considered that this assessment has failed to demonstrate that the application site is surplus to requirements. The evidence provided for this is simply a letter from the Constitutional Club that outlines why the bowling green was closed to use in 2012. It does not provide an up to date detailed assessment of the need for Bowling as a recreational sport within the Crumpsall ward, nor does it provide an assessment of other bowling green facilities within the Crumpsall area or surrounding wards. In addition, and as required by policy EN10, no consideration has been given as to whether the application site could fulfil another open space, sport or recreation requirement that would remedy a deficiency in another type of provision.

Paragraph 96 of the NPPF makes it clear that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation is important to the health and wellbeing of communities. Accordingly, policy EN10 is consistent with the provisions of paragraph 97 in that it requires equivalent or better replacement open space, sport or recreation facilities to be provided in the local area or that the site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function and the City wide standards are maintained including that it could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space, sport or recreation needs or remedy a deficiency in another type of open space, sport or recreation facility in the local area. As the applicant has not proposed any mitigation for the loss of this recreational facility or for replacement provision in the area, the proposals are considered to be contrary to the Development Plan.

Affordable Housing

Policy H8 sets out how developments should respond to the 20% contribution of affordable housing across the City. Using 20% as a starting point, developers should look to provide new houses that will be for social or affordable rent with a focus on affordable home ownership options. Any requirement or not for affordable housing will be based upon an assessment of a particular local need, a requirement to diversify the existing housing mix and the delivery of regeneration objectives.

The application has been accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement, which outlines that the development is to provide 28 no. new 2 bedrooomed flats for shared ownership. The properties would be purchased for an initial 35% equity share with a registered provider managing the property under a shared ownership lease to ensure that the properties will not be sublet.

The report concludes by stating that the scheme meets local housing needs, it contributes to nos. of new units detailed in the Local Plan, will alleviate pressure to develop on non-brownfield sites, will meet the current drive for low cost home-ownership and provides good prospects for this site coming forward for an affordable-led housing scheme. As outlined above, the Council believes that this site should be brought forward for affordable family housing rather than apartments and

that this is more appropriate in terms of meeting local housing needs. Any delivery of affordable housing provision would be expected to be secured through a S106 agreement and this could be progressed with the applicant if an appropriate scheme came forward for family housing.

Notwithstanding the above, if the current application before Members was to be supported, it would require an appropriate S106 agreement to ensure the delivery of affordable housing provision within the development.

Landscaping and boundary treatment

The application has been submitted with a detailed Landscape proposals plan that shows the provision of soft landscaping around the site. This includes the planting of 12 new trees, with 8 of those being along the front boundary with Linn Street and 5 within the rear garden area. The scheme also proposes the planting of a 600mm high hedge along the front boundary with Linn Street and around the rear garden and car parking area. Proposed lawn areas and ornamental shrub planting is then provided to the front and rear of the building. The planting of new trees is proposed to mitigate the loss of the existing trees previously felled on the site before the planning application was submitted.

The scheme includes the provision of 1.8m high railings along the front boundary with Linn Street, a 2.1m high close boarded timber fence to the north and eastern boundaries of the site and a 2.1m high green weld mesh fence to the western boundary. Within the site, it is also proposed to install 1.2m high railings and 1.8m high railings to separate areas for the garden and the parking and bin/cycle stores. The proposals to use railings and timber fencing within this residential context is considered to be acceptable. However, it should be noted that the front boundary should include a more robust treatment with a dwarf wall and piers to accompany the railings, to provide a better relationship between the development and the street and a proper plinth is required to stop litter from being transferred between the street and the site. Furthermore, the proposals to erect an industrial style weld mesh fence along the western boundary with existing residential properties is considered to be unacceptable.

Therefore, subject to certain amendments to the front and side boundary treatments, it is generally considered that the development secures good quality landscaping and boundary treatments to create a good quality setting for the site.

Highways/car parking

Policy T1 and T2 of the Core Strategy seeks to encourage modal shifts away from the car and locate new development that is accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. Policy DM1 goes on to state that traffic generation and road safety must be considered as part of new developments. In relation to parking provision, 28 car parking spaces have been provided for 28 flats and 100% provision is acceptable in this location. This is comprised of 26 car parking spaces with 2 larger accessible spaces. Two of the spaces would also include electric vehicle charging points. In addition to this, ample secure cycle storage has been provided with a secure cycle store to the side of the site to provide parking for 20 bicycles.

Concerns have been raised by both local residents and Local Councillors about the existing parking problems on Linn Street and nearby streets from on street parking. This is due to the nature of the properties being terraced with no off-street in-curtilage parking, which means residents have to park on the street. As the proposed development does provide 100% off street car parking and ample secure cycle parking, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a substantial increase in on-street parking to exacerbate the existing problems.

Highway Services have assessed the proposals and have confirmed that the site is considered to be suitably accessible by sustainable modes and that the proposals are unlikely to generate a significant increase in the level of vehicular trips in relation to network capacity concerns. The internal road layout and proposed car parking spaces are suitably sized and the proposed vehicle and secure pedestrian access points off Linn Street are considered to be acceptable.

Overall, it is considered that the development will have a minimal impact on the local highway network transport and there will be adequate car and cycle provision to serve the needs of the development.

Designing out crime

The planning application has been accompanied by a Crime Impact Statement completed by Design for Security at Greater Manchester Police, and compliance with the security measures outlined within this report has been recommended. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to achieve a good level of security in line with policy DM1.

Ground Conditions, Drainage and Waste

The application was submitted with a Phase 2 Geo-Environmental and Geotechnical Assessment, a Drainage Strategy and a Waste Management Strategy. Despite the submission of these reports, it is recommended that if planning permission was approved, appropriately worded conditions should be included in relation to all of these matters requesting further information. A contaminated land condition is recommended to request the submission of a remediation strategy and a verification report submitted on completion of the development to verify that all the agreed remediation has been carried out. Two drainage conditions have been recommended in relation to the submission of a fully detailed drainage strategy for the site and details relating to the implantation, maintenance and management of the sustainable urban drainage scheme.

Finally, the application is accompanied by a Waste Management Strategy and a large bin store is shown to the side of the new building. However, Environmental Health have confirmed that the calculations produced have not been completed to the correct standards. It has been confirmed that the waste strategy needs to be updated and re-assessed based on the high rise development criteria in the City Council's waste guidance, due to the number of apartments being proposed. This is necessary to ensure that the space being shown for the bin store is adequate for this number of apartments. However, as with the contaminated land and drainage

issues raised above, it is considered that the waste management arrangements could be dealt with through an appropriately worded condition.

Ecology

The planning application has been accompanied by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey due to the vacant and overgrown nature of the site and the removal of vegetation and some trees. This is a key requirement of policies EN15 and DM1 which seeks to ensure that applicants identify, enhance and restore impacts from developments on local habitats. The assessment has confirmed that the existing site has a low ecological value and that there are no constraints associated with redevelopment of the site. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit concurs with the findings of the report. Conditions have been suggested in relation to the felling of trees outside the bird nesting season, the appropriate removal of the Japanese Knotweed at the site along with the submission of a biodiversity enhancement scheme.

Inclusive Access

The Design and Access Statement outlines that the proposed development has been designed to be fully inclusive in terms of access. There is level access to the ground floor entrance to the building and 2 accessible car parking spaces are provided. However, there is no lift being provided within the building and therefore, only the 8 units on the ground floor could be accessed by ambulant disabled people.

The proposals will create an inclusive environment by ensuring that disabled people will use the same entrances as other users of the building, there is level access to the main entrance and the rear garden without the need of supervision or assistance. Therefore, the external areas and ground floor are accessible to all, however two thirds of the proposed accommodation are not accessible which is not considered to be acceptable.

Conclusion

To conclude, the indications are that the demand in the north of the City is for the provision of family housing, and that the proposed development for a high density apartment scheme is unacceptable in principle. The applicant has not made a case for high density development and the accommodation does not follow the principles of traditional family dwellinghouses suitable for supporting families and sustainable communities. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to policies SP1, H1 and H3 of the Core Strategy.

The proposed development is considered to be an inappropriate form of development which represents overdevelopment of the site and does not take into account the context of the site and is not informed by its surroundings, having a poor relationship with adjoining residential properties. The impact of this high density, overdeveloped site would be seriously detrimental to the character, context and visual amenity of the neighbourhood and surrounding area, and would not result in the positive and successful regeneration of the area. It is considered that the development would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of surrounding residents, due to its height,

scale, and close location to the site boundaries, which would result in problems of overlooking and loss of outlook from adjoining properties and their garden areas. In addition the creation of 28 apartments would lead to a significant intensification in general activity at the site, compared to the previous use, with the resulting increase in noise, all of which would have a detrimental impact upon the amenities of surrounding residents, contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and saved policy DC26 of the UDP.

Finally, Paragraph 96 of the NPPF makes it clear that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation is important to the health and wellbeing of communities. Accordingly, policy EN10 is consistent with the provisions of paragraph 97 in that it requires that equivalent or better replacement open space, sport or recreation facilities will be provided in the local area or that the site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function. It is also consistent with the NPPF in that the policy requires City wide standards to be maintained and further that the site could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space, sport or recreation needs and a proposed replacement would remedy a deficiency in another type of open space, sport or recreation facility in the local area. As the applicant has not proposed any mitigation for the loss of this recreational facility or for replacement provision in the area, the proposals are considered to be contrary to the Development Plan.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations – This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the refusal of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of refusal and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation REFUSE

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. Pre-application advice was sought by the applicant prior to the submission of this application, and it was advised at this stage that the provision of family houses was

the most appropriate form of development for this site, in an area with a need for family housing and that the scale and mass of the development was not considered to be in keeping with the character of the area. Despite this advice, the application was submitted in the same form. Therefore, in this instance a solution that was acceptable to both the Local Planning Authority and the applicant could not be reached, as the nature of the proposal was considered to be unacceptable.

Reason for recommendation

1) The proposed development in the form of the provision of apartments does not meet the requirement to deliver medium density family housing within this area of North Manchester where housing demand and need assessments show a high proportion of small houses and apartments and a need for larger family houses. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that there is the demand for the type of accommodation proposed and consequently the provision of apartments would be contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy Policies H2 and H3.

2) Having regard to the pattern of development found in the area and the scale and architectural massing of properties in the area, the proposal represents an over development of the site to the detriment of the character of the area. The proposed development, by reason of its high density, urban design, built form, poor layout, and a lack of meaningful and integrated open space, has an inappropriate form of design that has not been informed by the character and context of the surrounding area, has an inappropriate relationship to neighbouring buildings and structures and will result in a detrimental impact upon the street scene, visual amenity, character and the successful regeneration of the neighbourhood and area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1 and guidance contained within the Guide to Development Supplementary Planning Document and National Planning Policy Framework.

3) The proposed development by reason of its excessive height and massing will have an overbearing impact on the adjacent and nearby residential properties to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of those properties. The proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding residential accommodation by way of the buildings height, mass and location, in close proximity to existing residential properties, and the resulting impacts in terms of overshadowing of the garden areas of those properties, and would result in an over-intensive use of the site. Due to these reasons it is therefore considered that the proposal has an unduly harmful impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and that the development would thereby be detrimental to the character of the area contrary to saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) The application, by reason of the location of car parking spaces to the rear of the site and the large bin storage and cycle storage areas to the western side of the site immediately adjacent to boundaries with existing residential properties and their gardens, would introduce visually obtrusive features along with a source of noise and disturbance from the comings and goings of vehicles and refuse bins along the shared boundary with neighbouring occupiers, to the detriment of the residential

amenity of those occupiers. This would be contrary to policies SP1, DM1 and T2 of the Manchester Core Strategy, the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Guide and Planning Document and the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (2016).

5) The proposal to create a residential development will result in the loss and harm to an existing sport and recreation function. This would diminish the recreational value of the site which would therefore be unduly harmful to the recreational, health and wellbeing needs of the local community. Sufficient evidence has not been provided that the site is surplus to requirements and there has been no consideration of alternative uses of the site that would fulfil an open space, sport or recreational function nor is there any proposal to mitigate the loss through the provision of replacement facilities elsewhere in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP1 and EN10 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 121085/FO/2018 held by planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are held by the Planning Division.

The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:

City Wide Housing Support Team (HMOs)
Environmental Health
Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)
MCC Flood Risk Management
Greater Manchester Police
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Sport England

A map showing the neighbours notified of the application is attached at the end of the report.

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Relevant Contact Officer :	Jeni Regan
Telephone number :	0161 234 4164
Email :	j.regan@manchester.gov.uk



 Application site boundary  Neighbour notification
© Crown copyright and database rights 2018. Ordnance Survey 100019568