Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
087900/FO/2008/S1	18th Nov 2008	23rd July 2009	Chorlton Ward

Proposal	Retention of a three storey building comprising (A1 retail) and (A3 restaurant) uses on ground floor with seven self contained flats above
Location	72/74 Manchester Road, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 9PQ,
Applicant	Arrows International Limited , 160/164 Wellington Road, Withington, Manchester, M20 3FU
Agent	Lambert Smith Hampton, 79 Mosley Street, Manchester, M2 3LQ

Background

Following the site visit prior to the meeting of 12th February 2009 Members deferred consideration of this application to enable officers to hold discussions with the developer in relation to Members' concerns raised about the scale and massing of the building and the possible stepping down of the building on Manchester Road, together with issues relating to refuse storage and parking. Members were also concerned that a significant development had progressed in the manner it had, namely the demolition of the original buildings rather than the extension and elevational alterations approved, in addition to work having continued despite a request for this to cease until various issues had been addressed. The building is now substantially complete.

No changes to the proposal which address the height of the building have been negotiated and further significant concerns about contamination have arisen and as a result reasons for refusal are set out below.

Since 12th February 2009 officers have become concerned about unauthorised development carried out by the applicant to the alleyway for which no retrospective consent is being sought and this matter will be taken forward separately.

Issues

Scale and Massing – Members expressed concern about the height of the building at the corner of Brantingham Road and Manchester Road where a decorative parapet rises approximately one metre above the height of the building and also where the building abuts 76 Manchester Road. One suggestion was that for the length of one flat, approximately 6 metres, it may be preferable for the building to be reduced in height by 0.9 metres to match the ridge height of 76 Manchester Road. It was felt that this could reduce the disparity in height between the buildings and improve what is seen as an uncomfortable relationship between the pitched roof of 76/78 Manchester Road and the flat roof of the development.

The applicant has declined to modify the building, stating that it is the adjoining dilapidated Victorian properties that are out of place when considering the main design characteristics of the District Centre within which the site lies. They also submitted a drawing indicating how the adjoining site could be developed in a similar manner. However, how the adjoining site could be developed is not a material

consideration in the determination of this application since the land is not in the ownership of the applicant and is not the subject of an application for planning permission.

An earlier claim by the applicant that the building could not be altered for structural reasons in the manner suggested above has not, to date, been substantiated.

The issue of the relationship between the application site and its immediate neighbour is recognised. To a degree the current roof treatment brings some articulation at roof higher level, although it is accepted the relationship is not an easy one sat as the development is against the lower, traditional pitch roof of the neighbouring property. Reducing the height of the main building could further increase the articulation and therefore interest of the roof level, whilst also improving the relationship of the different roof styles of these adjoining properties. As the site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed building issues, this is a subjective matter which is finely balanced and which for this reason may not in itself be easy to sustain as a refusal of planning permission.

Refuse Storage – Members expressed concern over the distance residents of the flats would have to carry their refuse and also sought clarification that the commercial and residential refuse storage areas would be separate.

The distance needed to carry refuse is covered by Part H of the Building Regulations. The developer employed an Approved Building Inspector, rather than the City Council, who has approved the scheme despite the distance exceeding the maximum. It is understood this is, however, a suggested maximum and is not mandatory. In this instance the applicant has stated that a management company would be responsible for putting the refuse storage containers out for collection; this is something that could be conditioned if planning permission was to be forthcoming. The applicant has also confirmed that there are two separate refuse storage areas and that these can accommodate the required number of refuse containers, again it is possible to cover this by condition.

Parking – As mentioned in the main body of the original report this is a sustainable location within a district shopping centre. Not providing dedicated off-street parking is in line with usual practice in similar locations and also Government guidance. The Head of Engineering Services has suggested that it would be appropriate to impose a condition requiring the approval of a servicing strategy for the commercial units, but has raised no issues regarding the absence of off-street parking.

Other Issues – Further site visits have revealed that there are several areas where the development does not accord with the submitted drawings. These are:-

-The access ramp has not been provided to the front entrance and the design of the recently installed steps could make its provision at a later date more difficult. Whilst a ramp may still be physically possible, it is not clear whether it could be installed with an appropriate gradient and this is being looked at further.

-One of the doors has been omitted from the rear elevation. From the position of the other doors it would appear to be the rear entrance to one of the commercial units. The applicant claims that this was omitted for security reasons and will be added later. Visually, the omission of this door is not considered to be significant, the question it raises is about potential operational impact. As the applicant claims this would be added later, if planning permission was to be granted this could be subject to condition.

-The flue at the rear of the property has not been enclosed in the shroud shown on the drawings. The applicant has indicated that this is work still to be carried out. Without the shroud the flue has an adverse visual impact and therefore, if planning permission was to be granted this would need to be subject of a condition.

Revised plans have been submitted which address other issues including the use of galvanised Juliet balconies rather than glass and showing the location of rainwater goods on the outside of the building.

Contaminated Land – Historical records held by the Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services indicates the possible presence of significant levels of contamination. Ordinarily if contamination is suspected then a developer would be asked to provide a desk top study up front in order to make an informed decision as to the suitability of the site for the development proposed and to ascertain what if any remediation is required. Accordingly when it became known that the site may be contaminated the applicant was asked to produce a desktop study to indicate if there is likely to be a problem. The applicant has declined to do so unless required by condition. However, Circular 10/95 suggests that Local Planning Authorities should only impose conditions that are capable of being complied with. As this is a retrospective application it is not possible to say whether the site can be adequately surveyed and remediated with the current building in place and it is not considered appropriate to grant permission subject to the standard condition relating to contaminated land

Government Policy on developing contaminated sites is contained in Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control.

Annex 2 to PPS23 on the role of the owner- developer states 'Where development is proposed, the developer is responsible for ensuring that development is safe and suitable for use for the purpose for which it is intended'. The developer is thus responsible for determining whether land is suitable for a particular development or can be made so by remedial action. In particular, the developer should carry out an adequate investigation to inform a risk assessment to determine:

-whether the land in question is already affected by contamination through source
-whether the development proposed will create new linkages,
- what action is needed to break those linkages and avoid new ones.

A potential developer will need to satisfy the local authority that unacceptable risk from contamination will be successfully addressed through remediation without undue environmental impact during and following the development.

According to PPS23, the refusal on the part of the developer to carry out a desk top study until after planning permission has been granted into contamination could form the basis of a refusal of planning permission. The Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Contaminated Land) suggested that significant levels of contamination may exist and that an appropriate condition should be attached to any approval (see below). However, the Council is not in position to know at the moment (and without the submission of any survey) what the investigations will reveal and whether demolition of the building is one of the remedial works needed to deal with the contamination issues of the site. Therefore, this application should not be determined without a desk top study being submitted by the developers which shows that no significant levels of contamination exist on the site and that demolition of part or whole of the development is not necessary for the remediation of the site. If such a study is submitted, it may prove possible to deal with the contamination issues with the insertion of an appropriate condition requiring a Remediation Strategy to be submitted and approved by the Council; it would follow that the development would then have to be carried out in accordance with this Strategy. Without a desk top study permission ought to be refused.

Acoustic Report – The applicant has refused to submit an acoustic report for the development. Given the fact that the proposed development includes residential units above two commercial units it is considered that an acoustic report is necessary. This is something that can be dealt with by an appropriate condition if permission was to be granted.

Section 106 – The applicant has indicated his continued willingness to enter into an agreement under s.106 for improvements to the footpaths adjacent to the development, but is unwilling to extend this to incorporate environmental improvements in the wider area.

Conclusion

The Head of Planning's recommendation is to approve this retrospective planning application subject to a s.106 agreement being completed, however, this is also now subject to a desk top study on contamination risks being submitted and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority in writing which reveals no significant levels of contamination and/or a Remediation Strategy that confirms that demolition of part or the whole of the development is not necessary in the interests of remediation. In view of the applicant's response to Members concerns outlined in the preceding sections the following reasons could form the basis of a refusal of planning permission:

1. The building by reason of its scale, architectural massing and relationship to nos. 76 and 78 Manchester Road forms an over-dominant and intrusive feature in the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. The development is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies S2.5, H2.2 and H2.7 of the Unitary Development Plan of the City of Manchester and the Guide to Development In Manchester which is a Supplementary Planning Document.

2. The development which is the subject of this application is located approximately 110m from a landfill site and is adjacent to a number of former industrial uses which

could have given rise to contamination. In line with the guidance contained in PPS23, the applicant was asked to provide a contamination survey prior to determination of the application in order to ascertain the presence or otherwise of contaminants including landfill gas and address any potential risks to future users of the development. The applicant has declined to carry out the survey prior to the determination of the application and the City Council has therefore been unable to determine whether the development has been carried out in a manner which protects future users of the development from contamination and/or landfill gas contrary to the provisions of Annex 2 of the PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control and the Council's Planning Guidance in Relation to Ground Contamination

Description

This application was deferred for a site visit when it was considered at the Planning and Highways Committee meeting of 15th January 2009. It relates to a partially constructed building occupying a site of 0.025 hectares at the junction of Manchester Road and Brantingham Road. The site was previously occupied by a pair of terraced properties comprising commercial uses on the ground floor with residential above. Two planning permissions were granted for the alteration and extension of the premises to form additional living accommodation. However, rather than the approved works the buildings were demolished and a new building erected on site. The framework of the proposed building and the inner leaf has been constructed and the building is awaiting its outer skin. This new building is 0.9 metres taller than the extended premises would have been with the new building also incorporating elevational differences and a ramp at the front of the property. This application seeks to remedy what is currently an unauthorised development.

The site is located within Chorlton District shopping centre. Of the original terrace there are two, two storey properties remaining, beyond which is a petrol filling station currently being redeveloped. To the South across Brantingham Road is the former Open University Building, a 1960's style three storey office block. Adjoining the site to the rear and with a frontage to Brantingham Road is a former petrol filling station used as a hand car wash and for car sales. Facing the site across Manchester Road are three storey properties comprising commercial grounds floors with either storage or residential above.

Permission is now sought for the erection of a three-storey contemporary styled building occupying the whole of the site. It would comprise two commercial units on the ground floor, one of which would be an A3 restaurant, and seven flats on the two floors above, one of which is a duplex. There would be a small roof terrace at first floor level for one of the flats. Two other first floor flats would have a balcony overlooking Manchester Road whilst all the remaining flats would have Juliet balconies. There would be an enclosed refuse store for use by both commercial and residential properties at the rear of the building. No parking is proposed for the flats and servicing of the commercial units will be on-street.

Whilst the ground floor of the development would be fully accessible, there is no lift to the flats. However, the development is fitted with an ambulant staircase and all of the flats are accessible in terms of room sizes. As part of the development the applicant has offered to upgrade the public footpaths in front of the building.

Consultations

Local residents/businesses - Two letters have been received objecting to the development on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development will increase demand for on-street parking in an area that is already extremely congested. In particular residents on Kepple Road will suffer as people compete for the limited number of on-street parking spaces.

2. The developer has carried out works to the adjoining property without the consent of the owner.

3. The rear access to the adjoining property has been blocked off.

4. The developer has consistently failed to respond to attempts to contact them and address the grievances of local businesses.

5. The development overlooks adjoining property and causes a loss of privacy.

6. The building takes away light.

7. The development adversely affects the adjacent business by obstructing the signs.

Ward Members - Councillors Sheila Newman and Val Stevens have made the following comments:

They consider that the application for a three-storey building, comprising retail and restaurant on the ground floor with flats above to be an overdevelopment of the site. The building is at least a metre higher than was originally intended and creates a massing effect on Manchester Road that is not in keeping with the area or nearby buildings such as the library and nearby shops.

They further feel that it would be much preferable to have the restaurant and retail outlet on the ground floor with flats on one storey above.

Councillor Paul Ankers -Has a number of concerns about this development. It is much too large for Chorlton. It is visible from a number of directions and dominates the landscape. He is surprised a similar application was previously approved two years ago.

The report suggests that the building is similar to the Open University building opposite. This development is larger. The benefit of a retrospective planning application is that you can see the finished project and judge. Members of the Committee were invited to view the site as part of a field trip organised by the Communities & Neighbourhood Scrutiny Committee last year. It was clear at that stage that it was too large for its location. He would be unhappy with the roof terrace if it overlooks any neighbouring properties. Although he has not stood on the roof terrace, he suspects it would even have views over Buckingham Rd, some 100 yards away.

He wholeheartedly agrees with point one of the consultation summary. There seems to be little or no provision for parking and it will increase on street parking. MCC and local Councillors are working to reduce parking provision near the Brantingham Rd/Albany Rd junction due to safety issues there despite parking having reached critical mass effectively in the area.

If the application is approved, he would ask that the section 106 conditions referred to in the report are extended to ensure there are pavement renewals either side of Manchester Road and that provisions are made for appropriate jetting or culverting of drains in the vicinity to prepare the road for the increased drainage issues associated with a large development. The site is proving a huge disamenity at present and appropriate measures of support for the surrounding community are necessary.

Greater Manchester Police Architectural Liaison Unit - Support the proposal which has been the subject of pre-application discussions. The proposed development can achieve secured by Design.

Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Contaminated Land Section) - Historical information indicates the possible presence of significant levels of contamination. It is therefore suggested an appropriate condition is attached to any approval.

Highway Services - The applicant must develop a vehicular servicing strategy for the restaurant element of this proposal. The applicant may have to fund traffic regulation order amendments.

Issues

Unitary Development Plan - The relevant policies within the plan are:

H2.2 which seeks to protect the amenity of local residents from the adverse impact of development,

H2.7 and S2.5 requires new developments to be of a high standard of design,

DC10 sets down the criteria to be considered in determining applications for food and drink uses

Regional Spatial Strategy - The RSS was adopted as part of the Development Plan for the City of Manchester in September 2008. The relevant policies are:

DP1 Which sets down the Spatial principles that underpin the RSS

DP2 Which seeks to promote sustainable communities

DP4 Which looks to make the best use of existing resources and infrastructure

DP7 Require new developments to promote environmental quality

Principle - The principle of a mixed development comprising commercial units with residential accommodation above is acceptable in a district shopping centre.

Disabled Access - The ground floor units are provided with access ramps, The flats are all fully accessible in terms of their room sizes, however, there is no lift, only an ambulant stair, thus the flats would not be accessible to wheelchair users.

Crime and Disorder - The proposed development can achieve Secured By Design accreditation and an appropriate condition is proposed should permission be granted. The introduction of flats overlooking Manchester Road and Brantingham Road will introduce natural surveillance of these streets.

Design - This is a prominent corner site within a major district centre which requires a high quality design solution. The proposed elevations achieve this with striking frontages to both Manchester Road and Brantingham Road.

Scale and Mass - The frontages on both sides of Manchester Road contain three storey buildings varying in age from Victorian/Edwardian to the 1960's. The remnants of the two-storey terrace are an exception in terms of height. It is therefore considered appropriate to position a three storey building on this prominent site.

Comparison with earlier schemes - The originally approved scheme was 300mm lower than the remnants of the terrace, although the corner feature was higher. The building the subject of this application would be 900mm higher that the adjoining building. Whilst 1.2 metres is a significant increase in height over that previously approved, the proposed development is intended to hold the corner and can accommodate the height without detriment to the street scene.

Ground floor uses - The site is located within a major district shopping centre and therefore a retail use (class A1) and a restaurant (class A3) are appropriate uses, which will add to the viability and vitality of the centre.

Car parking - This is a sustainable location with good public transport links and easy access to facilities. Not to provide parking in such circumstances is in line with the City Council's normal approach as well as Government guidance.

Servicing - Most of the commercial uses within the centre are serviced on-street. The site itself is too small to provide off-street facilities and reduction in the footprint of the building would undermine the development. However, in response to the comments of the Head of Highway Services, should planning permission be granted it is proposed to impose a condition requiring the submission and approval of a servicing strategy.

Residential amenity - The only residential property affected by the proposal adjoins to the north. The development has been pulled away from the adjoining property at first and second floor levels to keep any impact within acceptable limits.

Loss of daylight - The development has been designed to minimise any loss of daylight in respect of the adjoining residential accommodation.

Refuse storage - provision is made within the development for the storage of the large euro bins for both residents and commercial operators.

Sustainability - The development is in an extremely sustainable location with good public transport links and a comprehensive range of services and facilities available within walking distance. The building itself uses locally sources materials and is designed to minimise its carbon footprint.

S106 agreement - The applicant has agreed to undertake works to improve the public footpaths, including street trees, resurfacing the footpaths and street furniture adjacent to the development. This would need to take the form of a section 106 agreement.

Conclusion - This application has been brought about by the failure of the developer to adhere to his original planning permissions for the development of the site. This in turn has lead to a great deal of unnecessary delay in completing the development and inconvenience for local residents and businesses from the construction works. Whilst this application is for a new build development rather than the alterations and extensions originally approved. In reality the only significant change is to the height. Other minor changes to the fenestration have served to improve the appearance of the building. It is believed that as this is a prominent corner site, the additional height can be successfully accommodated and that overall the development represents a significant improvement to the street scene for this part of the district shopping centre.

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 Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning 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. He believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation MINDED TO APPROVE

Subject to a S.106 agreement for works to the public realm in the vicinity of the building and subject to:

a) a desk top study that shows the risks of contamination and whether or not further investigation is necessary in accordance with PPS23 and the Council's

Planning Guidance in Relation to Ground Contamination. The desk top study shall be prepared by a suitably qualified person whose competence to carry out the Desk Study has been approved in writing by the City Council as Local planning Authority (an 'Expert') and

b) if required by the City Council a scheme for the investigation of the site and identification of remediation measures (the Site Investigation Scheme). The Site Investigation Scheme shall be prepared by an Expert. The Expert shall prepare a report outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Site Investigation Report and/or Remediation Strategy). The Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

If following the submission of a site investigation survey, remediation measures are identified the Head of Planning shall be authorised to either impose relevant conditions or withhold permission until satisfied that the site has been adequately remediated.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposal is considered to accord with the City Councils Unitary Development Plan and in particular policy H2.2 which seeks to protect the amenity of local residents from the adverse impact of development, policy H2.7 and policy S2.5 which require new developments to be of a high standard of design and policy DC10 which sets down the criteria to be considered in determining applications for food and drink uses, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

Conditions and/or Reasons

1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority: 201.28.3 P10, P11, P12, P21 rev C, P22 rev A, P23 rev C, P24, P25 and P101

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policy H2.2, H2.7, S2.5, DC10 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

2) The development hereby consented shall not be used ot occupied until it has achieved a post-construction Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of at least three star sustainability rating under the code for sustainable homes for those elements of the development which are residential in nature. A post construction review certificate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before any of the buildings hereby approved are first occupied.

Reason - In order to minimise the environmental impact of the development pursuant to policies E1.5 and E1.6 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies ER13 and DP3 of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) and the principles contained within The Guide to Development in Manchester 2 SPD and Planning Policy Statement 1.

3) The fume extraction system detailed in the document Residential Development, 72/74 Manchester Road, Chorlton shall be implemented before the development hereby is used or occupied and the scheme shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturers specifications.

Reason

To protect the amenity of nearby residential accommodation from the adverse affects of fumes and odours pursuant to policies H2.2 and DC10 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

4) The ground floor commercial units shall not be open outside the following hours, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority:-

Sunday to Thursday 8.00am to 11.30 pm and Friday and Saturday 8.00am to midnight

Reason - In interests of residential amenity in order to reduce noise and general disturbance in accordance with Policies H2.2 and DC26 and the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5) Before the development hereby consented is used or occupied, the premises shall be acoustically insulated and treated to limit the break out of noise in accordance with a noise study of the premises and a scheme of acoustic treatment that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the building and occupiers of nearby properties, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

6) Before first occupation of the development the building, together with any externally mounted ancillary equipment, shall be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the equipment.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

7) There shall be no storage of refuse by either residents or the operators of the commercial units outside of the designated area in accordance with the approved drawing.

Reason -

To ensure that there is no storage of refuse on-street pursuant to policies H2.2 and DC10 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

8) a) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied or used until a scheme for the removal and storage of waste (A Waste Removal Scheme) has been submitted to the Council as LPA and approved in writing. The scheme shall provide for the establishment of a management company with obligations to remove domestic waste from the residential units to a waste storage area for domestic waste only. The scheme shall ensure that there are adequate receptacles for the storage and recycling of domestic waste. The waste removal scheme shall be adhered to at all time when the development hereby consented or any element of it is in use or occupation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council as LPA.

b) No waste shall be left on any highway or any land adjacent to the development hereby consented except in a receptacle approved by the Council as part of the Waste Removal Scheme at such time and for such periods as provided for in the approved Waste Removal Scheme

c) No domestic waste shall be left in any common parts of the development hereby consented for more than 24hours except in a designated storage area, in accordance with the approved Waste Removal Scheme

Reason – In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to Policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

9) The development hereby consented shall not be used or occupied until details of the measures to be incorporated into the development (or phase thereof) to demonstrate how secure by design accreditation will be achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with these approved details. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied or used until the Council as local planning authority has acknowledged in writing that it has received written confirmation of a secure by design accreditation.

Reason - To reduce the risk of crime pursuant to Policy E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan of the City of Manchester and to reflect the guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement "Delivering Sustainable Development".

10) The development hereby consented shall not be used or occupied before the access ramp is constructed in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason – In the interests of disabled access pursuant to Guide to the Development in Manchester (SPD).

11) Before the development hereby consented is used or occupied the Door omitted from the rear elevation shall be constructed in accordance with the approved drawing.

Reason – In the interest of residential amenity, pursuant to Policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

12) Before the development hereby consented is used or occupied the flue at the rear of the property shall be enclosed in the shroud and be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residential accommodation in accordance with policy H2.2 and to ensure that the appearance of the building is acceptable.

13) Before the commercial units forming part of the development hereby approved are first occupied a vehicular servicing strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council. All servicing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme unless agreed in writing with the City Council.

Reason - To ensure that the servicing of commercial units is carried out in a manner that does not interfere with the safe use of the highway by other users pursuant to policy S2.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

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: 087900/FO/2008/S1 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:

Engineering Services
Environmental Health
Environment & Operations (Highway Authority)
Greater Manchester Police
Steve Hobson, Crime Reduction Officer
Chorlton Civic Society
John Leech MP
65 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
63 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Barbakan Delicatessen Ltd, 67-71, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
67a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
69a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
71a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
71b, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
78 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PQ
77-79, Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BN
Chorlton Service Station, 84 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PT
Manchester Social Services, 102 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9SZ
53-55, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Flat 2, 59a-61a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Flat 1, 59a-61a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Flat 4, 59a-61a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
63a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW

65b, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Flat 3, 59a-61a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
65a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Marble Arch World Beers Ltd, 57 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Manchester Appliances Ltd, 59-61, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
76 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PQ
Princess Of Hearts Indian Restaurant, 72 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PQ
72a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PQ
David Arran, Albany Service Station, Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BG
Chorlton Cars, 330 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
50 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PH
Community Mental Health, Chorlton House, 70 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9UN
59 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BP
Flat 1, 76 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BW
72 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BW
70 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BW
Flat 1, 68 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BW
Flat 2, 68 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BW
Flat 3, 68 Keppel Road, Manchester, M21 0BW
345 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
Flat 1, 343 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
Flat 4, 343 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
Flat 2, 343 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
Flat 5, 343 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
Flat 3, 343 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
Flat 1, 73 Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BH
Flat 6, 73 Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BH
Flat 4, 73 Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BH
Flat 2, 73 Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BH
Flat 3, 73 Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BH
Flat 5, 73 Albany Road, Manchester, M21 0BH
341 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ
A Style Hairdressers, 43 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
45a, Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Kays Newsagents, 45 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
K Style Hairdressers, 47 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Bella House Take Away, 49 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW
Noble, 51 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PW

Representations were received from the following third parties:

76 Manchester Road, Manchester, M21 9PQ
Chorlton Cars, 330 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0BJ

Relevant Contact Officer : Dave Morris
Telephone number : 0161 234 4539
Email : d.morris@manchester.gov.uk