

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142415/FO/2025
Date registered valid: 13 March 2025
Proposal: Erection of five bed two storey detached dwellinghouse (Class C3)
Address: Land-Off Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 4TB
Ward(s): Moston Ward

Applicant: Mr Ged Boylan
Agent (if any): Warren Walker, Dimension Architecture
Case officer: Ellie Knowles
Tel: 0161 219 6633
Email: ellie.knowles@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 30 June 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Dwellings

Date of site visit: 30 April 2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 3 April 2025 Expired: 26 April 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 3 April 2025 Expired: 26 April 2025

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The site is vacant land in a residential area with a range of surrounding dwelling designs and forms. Properties fronting the nearby streets of Hawthorn Road, Parkfield Road North, Eastwood Road, Eastwood Avenue and Edith Cliff Walk back onto the central space accessed off Eastwood Road, which the site forms part of. One exception to this is a pair of semi-detached dwellings adjacent to the site, which front the access road. The site currently lends an element of openness among the surrounding dwellings, providing visual relief among the built form and contributing positively to the immediate character. Trees are present within the site.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The immediate area is predominantly residential in character and comprises of a combination of two and three storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses. Opposite the site is less homogenous in scale and typology and has been built at a higher density to include a mix of two and three bed flats.

Description of development

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey detached dwellinghouse (Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment.

The proposed development includes an off-road parking space to the frontage of the property, main garden area to the side (NE), new planting, bin storage areas and boundary treatment.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Eight letters of representation were received from four local residents raising the following concerns:

- Substandard access to site (poor existing conditions)

- Nosie will disrupt area
- Pedestrian/road safety concerns
- Parking congestion anticipated
- Environmental degradation – trees present on site / biodiversity loss
- Loss of privacy & overlooking
- Overshadowing impact on adjacent properties
- Over-dominant addition in constrained space
- Existing site in unkempt state

Consultee responses

Highway Services –

TRIP GENERATION AND JUNCTION CAPACITY:

- Given that the proposed development is resultant in one residential dwelling, the number of vehicular trips associated with site is expected to be minimal. It is therefore accepted that the adjacent highway network can facilitate such additional demands with no highway safety or capacity concerns.

SITE ACCESSIBILITY:

- The site is well accessed by sustainable modes.
- Regular bus services run along Moston Lane East.

ACCESS:

- Vehicle and pedestrian access to the development is proposed from the already established access point on Eastwood Road (between properties 57 and 59). The width of the access carriageway should be confirmed by the applicant.
- The submission states that the access road is maintained by the owner of (the adjacent) Rose Cottage, however, Land Registry information appears to indicate that MCC are in ownership of this land. The applicant should confirm that they have a formal written agreement to guarantee rights of access over any land which falls outside of the applicant's ownership.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been a former access operational in this location, a visibility splay should be provided by the applicant to demonstrate constraints in sight lines. This should be made in accordance with Manual For Streets guidelines respective of the speed restriction on Eastwood Road.
- Given the width of the access road, two vehicles are unable to pass. Priority should be given to vehicles accessing the site to prevent queuing vehicles on Eastwood Road. It is unclear how this would be ensured/managed.
- The applicant should provide verification that the necessary vehicle manoeuvres can be undertaken at the entry/exit point and along the site access road through the provision of vehicle swept path information.

PARKING:

- A driveway and Plans suggest this can accommodate 2no. cars. Whilst this level of provision is considered acceptable for the scale of development, further clarification is sought regarding driveway dimensions to ensure these align with MCC design standards.
- A garage is also noted to provide an additional in curtilage car parking space.

EV CHARGING:

- It is required, in line with MCC Residential Guidelines, that the provision of an Electrical Vehicle charging point (minimum 7kW) is made available.

CYCLE PARKING:

- In line with MCC Residential Guidelines, secure and sheltered cycle parking provision should be made within the curtilage of the site.

BOUNDARY TREATMENTS:

- Boundary treatment will be required to separate that site from the adjacent pedestrian connection which routes through to Hawthorn Road. Highways request that all fencing / railings in the vicinity of the driveway access are visually permeable from a distance of 600mm upwards to ensure adequate visual permeability for child pedestrians.

REFUSE AND SERVICING:

- A bin store can be accommodated within the garage or adjacent to the property.
- Details of the proposed presentation area for servicing should be provided.
- This should be in accordance with GD04 guidelines and bin presentation areas must ensure vehicle and pedestrian routes are not restricted.

Environmental Health – No objections subject to conditions.

Greater Manchester Police – The local area is a bit of a strange mix of housing types, back land development, access roads, and landscaping, which can generate issues, but if the house is built to Secured by Design standards, limited concerns are considered.

United Utilities Water PLC – No objections subject to surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme condition.

Relevant Planning History

At the application site –

140340/FO/2024 – Erection of part single, part two storey dwellinghouse (Class C3). Withdrawn 07.11.2024.

134605/FO/2022 – Erection of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellinghouses (Class C3) with accommodation in the roofspace with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment. Refused 05.07.2023 (*On grounds of overdevelopment & amenity*). – **Appeal Dismissed.**

129905/FO/2021 – Erection of a pair of semi-detached properties with associated car parking, landscaping and boundary treatment. Refused 11.06.2021 (*On grounds of Visual amenity & character*). - **Appeal Withdrawn.**

127469/FO/2020 – Erection of a pair of two storey dwellinghouses with associated car parking, boundary treatment and other associated works. Withdrawn 21.01.2021.

074365/OO/2004/N1 – Outline Planning Application with siting to be considered, all other matters reserved, for the erection of one dwelling house and garage. Refused 29.03.2005 (*On grounds of overlooking, amenity space & layout*).

History of negotiations

No negotiations were entered into with the agent, given that the proposal was considered unacceptable in principle, even in the event of significant revisions. The agent was offered the

opportunity to withdraw the scheme, however no correspondence was received following this, as such the application was determined accordingly on the basis of the submitted plans.

Local Planning Policies

Places for Everyone (2022-2039) – Places for Everyone is a long-term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth. It has been published by the GMCA on behalf of the nine districts and took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

The PfE Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The PfE Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012-2027) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11 July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan. Parts of the policies have been superseded by the Places for Everyone Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant **Places for Everyone** policies for this application are as follows:

JP-S1 – Sustainable Development
JP-H1 – Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
JP-H3 – Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-G1 – Landscape Character
JP-G7 – Trees and Woodland
JP-G8 – A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

The relevant **Core Strategy** policies for this application are as follows:

DM 1 – Development Management
SP 1 – Spatial Principles (partially superseded by PfE)
H 1 – Overall Housing Provision (partially superseded by PfE)
H 2 – Strategic Housing Provision
H 3 – North Manchester
EN 1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
EN 9 – Green Infrastructure
EN 14 – Flood Risk (partially superseded by PfE)
EN 15 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (partially superseded by PfE)
EN 16 – Air Quality (partially superseded by PfE)
EN 17 – Water Quality
EN 18 – Contaminated Land and Ground Stability
EN 19 – Waste

The relevant saved **UDP** policies for this application are:

DC6 – Housing on “back land” sites

DC7 – New Housing Development
DC26 – Development and Noise

The relevant supplementary planning guidance documents for this application are:

- The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD
- Manual for Streets (2007)

A relevant material consideration is also:

- Manchester Residential Quality Guidance March 2017 (Manchester's Emerging Space Standards)

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF (December 2024) sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt. Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors. The Local Planning Authority consider the following sections relevant to this proposal.

- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4 – Decision-making
- Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Section 11 – Making effective use of land
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Paragraph 135 (f) states that developments “*create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.*”

Issues

Principle of development:

The principle of the proposal is not considered acceptable. Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In the case of this application, the principle of the proposed development is not considered acceptable and is in conflict with development plan policy and associated guidance.

It is believed that the proposed height, scale, siting and massing of the dwellinghouse would be out of character with the immediate context, to the detriment of visual and residential amenity. The proposal would result in a cramped form of development, which would also be out of character with the pattern of development in the local area. It is further considered that the height and scale of the proposed dwellinghouse sited in close proximity to the side and rear boundaries and the positioning of rear windows, would result in a development that would be overbearing, overshadowing and intrusive to neighbouring residential occupiers, contrary to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, The Guide to Development in Manchester (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Impact on visual and residential amenity:

Policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy, as well as the Guide to Development (SPD) underline the importance attached to protecting the character and appearance of an area and the need to adhere to the Council's design principles.

Paragraph 2.13 of the Council's 'Guide to Development in Manchester' states that: 'The scale, position and external appearance of new buildings should respect their setting and relationship with adjacent buildings, enhance the street-scene and consider their impact upon the roofline and skyline. Buildings should recognise the common building line created by the front face of adjacent buildings'. The NPPF advocates further, the need for good design, as previously outlined.

In this case, it is considered that the proposal would be a sizeable addition of built form that would reduce the openness provided by the site and result in a sense of overdevelopment in the immediate vicinity.

The properties that back onto the site on Parkfield Road North, Eastwood Avenue, Hawthorn Road and Edith Cliff Walk, are uniform in terms of scale, eaves and ridge height. However, the proposed detached dwelling house positioned tightly within the western corner of the application site, creates a cramped arrangement resulting in a poor relationship with the surrounding properties. The resultant development would disrupt the architectural rhythm and appear at odds with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, and would be considered to have a harmful impact upon visual amenity, eroding the character and appearance of the area.

By virtue of the height, scale, and massing of the development in relation to the close proximity of the neighbouring boundaries, due west (Rose Cottage) and north west (no.s 30 & 32 Hawthorn Road), the development would appear to be over dominant and visually obtrusive in terms of its appearance, for the occupiers of the surrounding properties, which is unduly harmful to residential amenity.

The orientation of the proposal coupled with the proposed scale and siting of the dwellinghouse in the NW corner of the site raises significant amenity concerns, in terms of overdominance and overshadowing, in relation to the adjacent semi-detached neighbouring property, Rose Cottage, due west. Given that the proposed dwellinghouse would project circa 5.4m forward of the existing front building line of this neighbour, reducing outlook and casting significant morning overshadowing over the principal elevation of this neighbouring property.

In addition, significant harm would be caused, due to the positioning of the rear windows of the development, in particular, the rear first floor bedroom windows, which would allow overlooking into the rear gardens of the surrounding properties, in particular the rear gardens belonging to the properties on Hawthorn Road, leading to loss of privacy. Even acknowledging the separation distance between the proposal and these properties, it remains that this proposal would result in an undue element of both actual and perceived overlooking that would negatively impact the occupiers' enjoyment of these private amenity spaces.

The proposed development is considered to harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to overbearing appearance, overshadowing and loss of privacy.

The development therefore conflicts with policies SP1, H1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy. These require, among other things, that development makes a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of residents, having regard to the effects on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Policy and relevant guidance seek to harness design that would improve the character and appearance of an area. It is believed that the proposed development would fail to achieve this objective and is not therefore considered acceptable.

BNG/Trees:

The submitted application form states the application meets the de minimis exemption and therefore has not been accompanied by a BNG metric. The LPA contests that this site (400m2) would not be exempt from BNG, given the scale and 'rewilded' nature of the site, which features trees and heavy bramble/shrub cover.



The application site includes trees within the boundary which have not been illustrated in the proposal, as such, concern remains regarding potential loss of these and biodiversity impacts.

Impact on Highway and Pedestrian Safety:

Concern has been raised through representations, regarding parking capacity, accessibility and pedestrian safety.

The proposal has been reviewed by MCC Highway Services, who accept that adjacent highway network can facilitate such additional demands in principle. Given that the proposed development is resultant in one residential dwelling, the number of vehicular trips associated with site is expected to be minimal.

Notwithstanding this, highways note outstanding information should be confirmed by the applicant, relating to the existing access carriageway width, rights of access, visibility splays, traffic management, vehicle swept path information, driveway dimensions, EV charging, secure cycle parking, visually permeable fencing/gates in driveway vicinity and refuse presentation area details.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

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 a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority 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 Director 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 recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of 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

Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application, but these concerns cannot be overcome by the submission of a revised proposal. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and is therefore refused.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

- 1) The erection of a two storey detached property by virtue of its siting, scale and appearance together with the relationship with surrounding properties and boundaries would result in a cramped form of development which would be out of character with the pattern of development in the local area. The proposed property would also appear overly dominant and oppressive within the plot and would give rise to overshadowing due west upon Rose Cottage and overlooking resulting in a loss of privacy to surrounding properties. The development would therefore have an unduly harmful impact on visual and residential amenity and fails to make a positive contribution to the local area which is contrary to policies SP1, EN1, H1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) and the advice given in the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
Greater Manchester Police
United Utilities Water PLC

MOSS COTTAGE, HAWTHORN ROAD, NEW MOSTON, MANCHESTER, M40 3RJ

51 Parkfield Rd North, Manchester, M40 3TB
26 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
18 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
34 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
53 Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 3TE
53 Parkfield Road North, Manchester, M40 3TB
49 Parkfield Road North, Manchester, M40 3TB
30 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
24 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
59 Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 3TE
8 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
12 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
6 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
11 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
5 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
Rose Cottage, Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RJ
57 Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 3TE
55 Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 3TE
36 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
14 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
6 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
4 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
Moss Cottage, Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RJ
16 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
14 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
10 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
8 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
4 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
2 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
9 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
7 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
32 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
3 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
1 Edith Cliff Walk, Manchester, M40 3TH
38 Hawthorn Road, Manchester, M40 3RH
63 Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 3TE
61 Eastwood Road, Manchester, M40 3TE
59 Parkfield Road North, Manchester, M40 3TB
57 Parkfield Road North, Manchester, M40 3TB
55 Parkfield Road North, Manchester, M40 3TB
51 Parkfield Road North, Manchester, M40 3TB
16 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
12 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
10 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
2 Eastwood Avenue, Manchester, M40 3TJ
30 Hawthorn Road, New Moston, Manchester, M40 3rh

20 Whitecar Avenue, Manchester, M403GW
32 Hawthorn Road, New Moston, Manchester, M40 3RH

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Historic Landfill Site 50m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA