

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141619/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 28 November 2024

Proposal: Erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and installation of rear roof dormer following hip to gable roof conversion, and associated elevational alterations

Address: 17 Haversham Road, Manchester, M8 4JB

Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Mr Barnett

Agent (if any): Mr Eli Radnor, Radnor Architecture Ltd

Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 6 February 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 5 September 2024 (140629/FH/2024)

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 15 January 2025 Expired: 22 January 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 17 Haversham Road within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The application site relates to a semi-detached, red brick, two storey dwellinghouse with hipped roof, sited on the southern side of Haversham Road. Amenity space to the front of the property consists of an off street driveway and area of soft landscaping bounded by high timber fence panels. Amenity space to the rear is accessible via a paved area leading to a grassed garden with the property benefitting from a single storey extension with a large roof light (see planning reference: 119429/PDE/2018).

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature.

Description of development

The scheme to be assessed is the revised scheme received by the LPA on 24 January 2025.

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and installation of rear roof dormer following hip to gable roof conversion and associated elevational alterations.

The part single storey side extension would have a staggered set in from the shared boundary with no.15 Haversham Road, of up to 1 metre at the widest point. This element of the proposal would have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.6 x Length: 7.8 x Width: 2 metres, at the largest point. The part two storey side extension would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 2 metres and have approximate dimensions of Height: 7 x Length: 5.8 x Width: 2 metres, at the largest point.

The rear extension would run alongside the existing rear extension at the site and attach the existing rear extension to the proposed side extension. At first floor level, the rear extension would partially sit on the existing rear extension and extend up to the shared boundary with no.15 Haversham Road. The first floor rear extension would be set 3.4 metres from the boundary with the adjoining neighbour, and have a projection of 4 metres beyond the existing rear building line of the property.

The rear roof dormer proposed would sit within the roof space of the host property, following the hip to gable roof conversion. The proposal would have an approximate cubic volume of 24 cubic metres.

The associated elevational alterations would involve the insertion of a new front door.

Further, the proposal would involve the insertion of two windows within the front elevation, two roof lights within the front roof plane, and four windows within the rear elevation.

Materials to be used have been listed as:

Walls - Facing brickwork to match existing

Dormer walls - Red hanging tiles to match existing

Dormer and ground floor flat roof - Single ply membrane finish

Pitched roof - Tiles to match existing

Windows - White uPVC to match existing

Front door - Grey uPVC with side light.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The current application is a re-submission of the withdrawn application of 140629/FH/2024.

However, the re-submitted scheme gave rise to concern during the course of the application. The proposed side extension had a roof form which was considered unacceptable and contrary to Policy DC1.4, due to its height and being utilised to host a rear roof dormer. The proposal sought consent for the extension of the existing rear extension at ground floor level, however this would have resulted in a bulky form to the adjoining neighbour. The proposed roof dormer was amended to ensure compliance with policy DC1.2 and not be considered to create an overly large structure. Further information was supplied for the proposed materials and the description of development was amended to better reflect the proposed development.

One neighbour raised concern to loss of light caused as a result of development to windows and consideration was given to ways to mitigate any adverse harm. A revised scheme was received which shows a set in of the side extension off the shared boundary to create distance between the proposal and shared boundary.

Further information on the proposed materials were provided for review.

Planning History

140629/FH/2024-Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, with associated elevational alterations.
Withdrawn 11 October 2024.

119429/PDE/2018-Notification for a proposed larger home extension involving a single storey extension measuring 4 metres in length, 3 metres in height and 3 metres to eaves level.
Conditional Extension- 25 April 2018.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and three objections were received. Concerns raised included:

- Impact to neighbour's quality of life during the construction period and issues relating to noise, disturbance and dust, exaggerated by personal circumstances of the neighbouring property.
- Concern any development to the side of the host property would give rise to loss of light and ventilation implications due to the positioning of windows within the neighbour's property.
- The proximity of the development to neighbouring properties could adversely affect the structural integrity of neighbouring properties.
- The proposal would give rise to a terracing effect and adversely impact the streetscene.
- The proposal would also impact the value of neighbouring properties.
- The 'playroom' raises concern as neighbours state the existing property is used as a childminders. The neighbour requests the extension should be used for non-business purposes only.

During the first re-notification period, three further objections were received.
The same issues as above were discussed.

- Additional concern is raised that the expansion of dwellinghouse would result in the expansion of a childminder's business, with additional comings and goings and traffic and parking implications.
- One neighbour raised grievances in how a similar extension was refused at their own property.
- Concern was raised that the proposal would obstruct light and would be considered to create overdevelopment at the site, given it would be much larger than surrounding residential extensions.
- The proposed front roof lights within the front roof plane of the host property could give rise to adverse privacy implications to neighbouring properties.
- Allowing the extension would create a precedent for similar development in the area and associated adverse implications.

During the second re-notification period, two further comments were received (duplicate of one comment). The following comments were made:

- Amendments to the scheme to attempt to overcome neighbour concerns do not go far enough to overcome issues raised. The neighbour suggested sight of a plan showing the proposal in comparison to the neighbour's window.
- Refusal to any first floor side extension to the applicant site given a similar proposal was refused at a neighbouring property.
- The same concerns raised within the initial neighbour notification and first re-notification were re-iterated.

Issues

POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- ii. Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are Policy DM1 (Development Management), Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) and Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.

d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

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

The following policies are relevant:
i.JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted development application is for the erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and installation of rear roof dormer following hip to gable roof conversion and associated elevational alterations. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and adapt homes rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single family dwelling house, it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

Potential impact to no.15:

The proposal, specifically, the part single, part two storey side extension would be sited close to the common boundary with no.15 Haversham Road. The neighbouring property benefits from an existing single storey side extension (see planning ref: 093297/FH/2010/N1). Concerns were raised during the notification process that the extension would result in loss of light to the neighbour's window, which relates to a bedroom window. Consideration was given to re-designing the scheme to pull the proposal away from the window at the point closest to the boundary, and a revised scheme received 24 January 2025 set in the built form at both ground and first floor level by up to 1 metre. Although the neighbour raised concern that it was unclear whether this was at the same positioning as the neighbour's window, measurements confirm that the set in reflects the point where the additional distance is required. Whilst it is noted that the neighbouring window may result in some level of loss of light, the revision is considered acceptable to help mitigate harm, and the level of light as existing is limited given the proximity to the neighbour's gable wall and the small window with top opening nature, which is obscure glazed. Further, the neighbour's extension is set away slightly from the boundary, and the distance to the boundary would be retained.

Further, it is to be noted that a condition was placed on the approval of the neighbour's (no.15) extension 093297/FH/2010/N1 stating that *'the frosted window on the side elevation of the single storey side extension must be replaced with a non-openable window within 1 month of the date of this consent. Evidence of this work being carried out must be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority within 6 weeks of the date of this consent'*. There is no record of such CDN application and the window is still a top opening window when the site visit for 17 Haversham Road was conducted. This condition was placed on any approval granted, as stated within the Officer Report of 093297/FH/2010/N1 *'to allow no.17 to have a side extension up to the boundary if they so desired in the future'*. Given the breach of condition and given single storey side extensions can be built up to the boundary using Permitted Development rights, the revised scheme is considered sufficient as a mitigation measure.

The neighbour also benefits from two additional windows at first floor level facing the applicant site within the host property. However, given the existing small window openings and given the

set back from the property, no significant implications would occur to loss of light to these windows.

Due to no.15's existing extension to the side and rear, the neighbour would not feel much of the bulk of the proposal. Although the part two storey extension would be sited against the common boundary with no.15, the proposal would not come past the rear building line of the applicant's existing rear extension and so only slightly extend beyond the neighbours. Therefore, the neighbour is not considered to be impacted by an overbearing feature or loss of light. The rear building line of the neighbour's and applicant's site would be retained. During the neighbour notification concern was raised that a similar extension has been refused which comprised of a two storey rear extension against the boundary. However, given no.15's extension has now been erected, this results in a different site context for the applicant site.

A window within the proposed first floor rear extension and two dormer windows would be erected within the proposal. However, this is not considered to give rise to adverse privacy implications for no.15 given the same view into no.15's gardens can be achieved from the existing first floor windows of the applicant site. A condition would be placed on any approval granted restricting the further insertion of windows and doors beyond those approved by this consent.

Potential impact to no.19:

No.19 Haversham Road is the adjoining neighbour to the applicant site and as existing feels the 4 metre rear extension against the boundary as approved under 119429/PDE/2018. As a result of the proposal, a 4 metre rear extension would be erected, sited 3.4 metres from the adjoining property. Given the set in from the neighbouring property and given the roof form would be hipped to minimise impact to the adjoining neighbour, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of not creating an overbearing feature. The dormer due to its nature would not create an overbearing feature. The windows to be inserted in the proposal would not give rise to adverse privacy implications in comparison to the existing circumstances.

Impact to the rear:

The proposal would result in one additional window from the 4 metre first floor extension and two windows within the rear dormer, looking in the direction of Plymtree Close. However, due to the remaining distance to properties to the south of Plymtree Close, there are no adverse implications to be expected to properties to the rear.

Impact to the front:

The streetscene of Haversham Road would be impacted by the hip to gable roof conversion, part single, part two storey side extension and change in the front door. Although the extension would involve built form up to the shared boundary with the non-adjoining neighbour, the side extension would have a set back of 2 metres at first floor level, in addition to a lower roof level and set in from the common boundary. Therefore, the form of the development is considered to create a subservient feature at the site and reduce the bulkiness, pursuant to Policy DC1.4 of the UDP. The hip to gable conversion whilst it would alter the existing roof form, can be achieved through the route of Permitted Development and therefore is not considered to create an incongruous feature to the detriment of residential amenity. The associated elevational alteration of the change of the front door is not considered to give rise to any adverse implications given this is a design preference.

One neighbour raised concerns that the proposed rooflights within the front roof plane of the property would give rise to overlooking. However, due to the angle of such roof lights and given the existing level of overlooking from the first floor front windows of the applicant site, any overlooking from such roof lights would be insignificant.

Other residential amenity matters:

During the course of the application, the 'playroom' as shown in the proposed plans raised concern as neighbours state the existing property is used as a childminders. One neighbour requests the extension should be used for non-business purposes only. Additional concern is raised that the expansion of dwellinghouse would result in the expansion of a childminder's business, with additional comings and goings and traffic and parking implications. To overcome such concerns, a condition would be placed on any approval granted restricting the use class to C3a only.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon residential or visual amenity, and any harm has been mitigated within the revised drawings received. The condition restricting the further insertion of windows or doors would ensure no adverse privacy implications could occur as a result of the proposal. The set in from the boundary with no.15 is considered to mitigate harm to the neighbouring property. A further condition would restrict the use class of the property. In short, proposal is therefore considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1.

Other Concerns raised during the Neighbour Notification

Additional matters that cannot be considered within the planning remit were brought forwards during the neighbour notification process. This includes the impact to neighbour's quality of life during the construction period and issues relating to noise, disturbance and dust, exaggerated by personal circumstances of the neighbouring property. Further, the proximity of the development to neighbouring properties could adversely affect the structural integrity of neighbouring properties was raised as a further concern. Concern was raised that the side extension could give the impression of a terrace and result in a depleting value of the properties. Given these points considered outside the remit of the planning, they cannot be considered as material consideration.

Design and Appearance

Part single, part two storey side extension:

DC1.4 of the UDP requires the creation of domestic extensions which are subservient to the main house, do not cause a terracing effect and must provide a 1.53 metre gap to the shared boundary. In order to avoid the terracing effect and to ensure that subservience to the original dwellinghouse is achieved. In this instance, it is not possible to leave a 1.53 metre gap from the extension to the boundary and create a viable side extension. As such, the proposal shows a setback of 2 metres from the primary elevation at first floor level, has a lowered roof than that of the host property, and has a staggered set in from the boundary of the non-adjoining neighbour. As such, the proposal is considered pursuant to Policy DC1.4 of the UDP. This ensures that the proposal does not create a terracing effect.

Part single, part two storey rear extension:

The ground and first floor rear extension would align with the existing 4 metre rear extension at the site, as approved through the route of PDE. Given the proposal at neither level would come past this point, the development is considered to be sympathetic to the existing form of development in the immediate area. At first floor level, the extension has been set in from the common boundary with the adjoining neighbour by 3.4 metres, ensuring the proposal is not considered overbearing nor create any adverse loss of light implications. Therefore, the proposal is considered sympathetic to the neighbouring properties and surrounding type of development, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Installation of rear roof dormer following hip to gable roof conversion:

The proposed dormer would have an approximate cubic volume of 24 cubic metres, which could be achieved through permitted development. Further, the hip to gable conversion could be achieved through PD rights. Whilst a hipped roof is common along Haversham Road, given PD rights there are examples of gable roofs in the immediate area including no.24. Given this PD fall back and given neither structure are considered overly large or bulky, the proposal is considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Associated elevational alterations:

The change in the front door would be a design preference and would be similar to others in the immediate area. No issues in terms of design and appearance occur, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Materials:

The materials to be used are considered acceptable and would match the host property. The materials chosen are considered appropriate for the residential setting and a materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Car Parking

No change to parking provision would occur as a result of the proposal.

Bin Storage

A bin store has been presented to sit within the front amenity space which relates to an enclosed timber bin structure. The details are considered appropriate and such details would be conditioned within any approval granted.

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: Approve

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. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and a revised scheme considered to overcome issues raised has been provided in a timely manner. Appropriate conditions have been attached to any approval granted.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

-Application Form, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 28 November 2024.

-Correspondence- Materials Schedule, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 22 January 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Plans and Elevations, numbered 003 9, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 24 January 2025.

-Drawing- Location and Site Plan, numbered 001.6, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 24 January 2025.

-Waste Management- Bin Store Plan, numbered 004 3, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 6 February 2025.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no openings, including windows and doors, shall be inserted within the elevations of the extension, other than those shown on the approved drawings, unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellinghouse, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Notwithstanding the materials shown with the 'Drawing- Proposed- Plans and Elevations, numbered 003 9', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 24 January 2025, the materials to be used throughout the proposal hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details as set out in the 'Correspondence- Materials Schedule', specified in Condition 2 of this approval.

Reason- In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with 'Waste Management- Bin Store Plan, numbered 004 3', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 6 February 2025, in relation to a secure and ventilated bin storage area. The bin storage area shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and be in place prior to the first use of the development and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the provision of off-street car parking, and the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no part of the residential unit shall be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) other than the purpose(s) of C3(a) not precluding occupation by two unrelated people sharing a property.

Reason - In the exceptional circumstances of a proliferation of HMOs restricting housing choice and adversely affecting sustainability and in the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through the provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to paragraph 7.4 of the Guide to Development in Manchester: Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

9 Plymtree Close, Manchester, M8 4JR
19 Haversham Road, Manchester, M8 4JB
15 Haversham Road, Manchester, M8 4JB
16 Haversham Road, Manchester, M8 4JB
20 Haversham Road, Manchester, M8 4JB
7 Plymtree Close, Manchester, M8 4JR
18 Haversham Road, Manchester, M8 4JB

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA