

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133383/FO/2022

Date registered valid: 19 April 2022

Proposal: Change of use of the ground floor to shisha smoking place (sui generis) and elevational alterations to ground floor and extension to rear boundary wall

Address: Huntsman Inn, 130 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, Manchester, M14 5AH

Ward(s): Moss Side Ward

Applicant: Mr Saheeb Hussain, 130 Huntsman Inn, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH

Agent (if any): Mr Yunus Jiva, AZH Consultancy 190 Armadale Road, Ladybridge, Bolton, BL3 4TP

Case officer: Steven McCoombe
Tel: 0161 234 4607
Email: steven.mccoombe@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 30 June 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Change of use

Date of site visit: 20 May 2022

Standard consultations:

Printed: 5 May 2022 Expired: 26 May 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 5 May 2022 Expired: 26 May 2022

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 appeal site relates to a two storey, former public house (Huntsman Inn), which fronts the main arterial route of Wilmslow Road and is now occupied by 'Ta-Mya by Pasha' – a restaurant.



The building incorporates a two-storey extension to the rear which backs onto an L shaped service yard, enclosed by a brick wall to the rear boundary and metal gates to side boundary which allows access to Claremont Road.

To the front is a narrow, enclosed forecourt area with awning above.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

The site is situated within the heart of Rusholme district centre – a busy linear centre focused north to south along a long stretch of Wilmslow Road. The centre contains a variety of small-scale commercial uses, with a particular focus on food and drink establishments.

In terms of the immediate surroundings, the building is adjoined to one side by a two-storey supermarket selling world foods and to the other by a single storey clothes shop. Immediately to the front of the building is a pedestrian crossing. To the rear is a public pay and display car park, beyond which are two storey, terraced dwellinghouses along Claremont Road to the north-west and Whitecliff Close to the west respectively.

Description of development

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of the ground floor to a shisha smoking place (sui generis), together with elevational alterations to the ground floor, along with an extension to the rear boundary wall.

Shisha relates to tobacco smoked in a water pipe or hookah, especially when mixed with flavourings.

Externally, it is proposed that the ground floor have openings along two sides. To the rear it is proposed to increase the height of the existing boundary wall to a total height of 5.5 metres, together with the creation of a new external door to the northern side elevation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents/Occupiers – 1 neighbour representation has been received which considers that the proposed use would exacerbate existing anti-social behaviour in the area.

Platt Claremont Residents Association

The proposed use is dangerous to health and contrary to the 2001 government law about smoking indoors.

In addition, concern is raised about how the proposed use would impact waste management arrangements and that the fumes arising from the use of shisha would proliferate the air and reach houses along Claremont Road.

Environmental Health - Scenario 4 must be implemented with all mitigation methods detailed. Conditions are advised with respect to noise, external equipment, waste management, fumes and construction hours.

Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security) – It is noted that similar developments to that proposed have attracted regular incidents of public order offences and violent crime. A range of security measures are advised.

Cadent

An informative regarding Cadent infrastructure and legal interests is requested.

Planning History

102581/FO/2013/S1

Erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension and full height glazing to front elevation and installation of flue and air conditioning equipment. *Approved 8 July 2013.*

110905/FO/2015/S1

Change of use and subdivision of public house (Class A4) to two hot food take-aways (Class A5), erection of front single-storey extension with terrace area above, installation of two flues to the rear, single-storey detached outbuilding and a gated access from Claremont Road. *Approved 4 May 2016.*

120947/FO/2018

Change of use from public house (Class A4) to restaurant (Class A3) together with the erection of two storey extension to rear and elevational alterations including front canopy. *Approved 17 December 2018.*

APP/B4215/W/19/3226481

Dispute of Condition No.13 attached to planning permission referenced 120947/FO/ 2018 which states that: No part of the premises shall be used for the smoking of shisha at any time and none of the areas outside the building, including to the rear, shall be used as an external seating area or for use by patrons of the premises. *Appeal Dismissed 9 July 2019.*

ENF/14909/20

Enforcement notice issued on 14 September 2021, in relation to a breach of planning control as alleged, that on 17 December 2018, planning permission was granted for the change of use of the premises from a public house to restaurant together with the erection of a two-storey extension to rear and elevational alterations including front canopy (ref.120947/FO/2018).

The permission was subject to condition 13, which states: No part of the premises shall be used for the smoking of shisha at any time and none of the areas outside the building, including to the rear, shall be used as an external seating area or for use by patrons of the premises. The planning permission has been implemented in breach of this condition, in that the smoking of shisha was taking place on the premises.

APP/B4215/C/21/3284746

Breach of condition 13 attached to planning permission referenced 120947/FO/2018 which states that: No part of the premises shall be used for the smoking of shisha at any time and none of the areas outside the building, including to the rear, shall be used as an external seating area or for use by patrons of the premises. *Appeal Dismissed and Enforcement Notice Upheld 4 March 2022.*

Policy

Local Development Framework

The principal document within the framework is the Manchester Core Strategy which sets out the spatial vision for the City and includes strategic policies for development during the period 2012 – 2027.

'The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy 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.

Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) - refers to the key spatial principles which will guide the strategic development of Manchester together with core development principles. It is stated that developments in all parts of the city should create well designed places which enhance or create character, make a positive contribution to the health, safety and well-being of residents, consider the needs of all members of the community and protect and enhance the built environment. Further, development should seek to minimise emissions, ensure the efficient use of natural resources, reuse previously developed land wherever possible, improve access to jobs, services and open space and provide good access to sustainable transport provision.

Policy DM1 (Development Management) - states that new development should have regard to more specific issues for which more detailed guidance may be given within supplementary planning documents. Issues include: the appropriate siting and appearance of development, the impact upon the surrounding area, the effects on amenity, flood risk, green infrastructure, parking/access, accessibility, community safety and crime prevention, health, the adequacy of internal accommodation and amenity space and refuse storage/collection.

In addition, the below, saved policy of the UDP is considered relevant.

Saved policy DC26 (Noise) of the UDP states that the Council intends to use the development control process to reduce the impact of noise on people living and working in the City. In particular, consideration will be given to the effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise.

National Planning Policy Framework

The central theme to the revised NPPF is to achieve sustainable development. The Government states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.

Section 4 provides guidance on the decision-making process and mirrors legislation in stating that planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Section 12 'Achieving well-designed places' states at paragraph 130:

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Paragraph 134 goes on to state that:

‘Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Issues

Background

Planning permission was granted in 2018 for the change of use of the building from a public house (Class A4) to restaurant (Class A3), together with the erection of two storey extension to rear and elevational alterations including front canopy (Ref: 120947/FO/2018).

This permission includes a condition (13) that states:

No part of the premises shall be used for the smoking of shisha at any time and none of the areas outside the building, including to the rear, shall be used as an external seating area or for use by patrons of the premises.

Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties, pursuant to saved policies DC10 and DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

An appeal was lodged in July 2019 against the imposition of this condition (Ref: APP/B4215/W/19/3226481) which was subsequently dismissed. The Inspector noted that the removal of the condition would cause material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential properties due to noise, general disturbance and unpleasant odours emanating from the premises. The smoking of shisha from the premises would materially harm nearby local residents' reasonable enjoyment of their homes.

Following the dismissal of the appeal, the premises began to allow the smoking of shisha at the premises. This culminated in an enforcement notice being issued for breach of the condition.

The enforcement notice was appealed (Ref: APP/B4215/C/21/3284746), which was subsequently dismissed, and the enforcement notice was upheld on 4 March 2022.

In paragraph 10 and 11 of that decision letter (DL) the appointed Inspector noted that:

“There are essentially two parts to the condition, that which prevents the smoking of shisha anywhere on the premises and that which precludes the use of any external areas by customers. The breach identified in the notice relates to the use for shisha smoking and the appellant’s evidence seeks to demonstrate that this should be permitted inside the building as built/proposed. They do not appear to suggest that the part relating to the use of outside areas should be deleted.

The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to noise and disturbance and odours.”

The Inspector overall concluded that that the appeal should not succeed and condition 13 is reasonable and necessary to prevent unacceptable harm to the living conditions of nearby residents arising from noise and disturbance and odours.

The current application now seeks to change the use of the ground floor to a shisha smoking place (sui generis), together with elevational alterations to the ground floor and extension to rear boundary wall. This proposal was submitted as part of an alternative scheme under ground (a) of the enforcement appeal.

Principle

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions are to be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The NPPF at paragraphs 2 and 47 reinforces this requirement and at paragraph 12 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making, and that where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted.

In the case of this application, the principle of the proposed change of use is not considered acceptable and conflicts with the aforementioned development plan policy and associated guidance.

In the 4 March 2022 appeal, at paragraph 14 and 15 of the DL, the Inspector notes:

“It seems unlikely to me that smoking inside the approved building would result in harm to the living conditions of residents by way of noise and disturbance and odours. However, since smoking in enclosed public spaces is prohibited, in my view the smoking of shisha would most likely take place in the open/semi-open area to the rear of the site, as the previous Inspector found.

Should shisha smoking occur in the areas outside to the rear of the building, I consider, in the absence of contrary evidence, that there is a reasonable prospect harm would be caused to the living conditions of those nearest residents by reason of odours, particularly in the summer months when residents are more likely to be in their gardens and have windows open. Furthermore, as found by the previous Inspector, there is a reasonable prospect of a significant nuisance arising from the noise and general activity of people gathered outside the building.”

Whilst the application is proposed as to offer a form of mitigation in relation to the concerns surrounding the impact of noise and disturbance, the proposed wall would in effect serve to extend the footprint of the building, the wall height being equal to that along the existing boundary with No. 126-128; the Council consider that the extended wall would result in a visually harmful and intrusive feature, which would add to the negative feel of the area and undermine visual amenity.

As noted in the most recent appeal decision at paragraph 16 of the DL, the Inspector agrees that:

“...it is not the role of the planning system to duplicate or to impose more stringent controls on activities regulated under other legislation. However, in this case the condition is not unreasonable since it is illegal in any event to smoke in an enclosed public space, and it is necessary since it would prevent customers smoking shisha outside the premises.”

The use of the premises for the smoking of shisha has clearly been assessed and deemed to be unacceptable, this via two previous appeal decisions (as referenced above). It is considered that in this case, whilst the applicant has sought to try and address some of those concerns, this has introduced a new issue, namely an increased expanse of a brick boundary wall, which is considered visually intrusive.

The previous appeals did not conclude that an extension to the built form would overcome the negative impacts of the use; its absence has indeed been addressed as the use has been in operation contrary to a condition specifically imposed to control it. This condition and its effective control have been assessed in the context of the overall use of the premises. Even with the extended wall, it is the Council's view that there remains a reasonable prospect that the use of the premises as proposed, would harm the living conditions of the nearest residents by reason of odours and significant nuisance arising from noise and general activity.

Visual Amenity

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, as the National Planning Policy Framework underline the importance to be attached to protecting the character and appearance of an area and the need to adhere to the Council's design principles. This includes appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing and materials, and the impact on surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

The NPPF advocates further the need for good design.

Paragraph 130 states:

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and 3
f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Paragraph 134 goes on to state that:

‘Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

In this case, it is considered that the proposed increase in boundary wall height would be visually intrusive.

The wall is highly visible from the adjoining car park and neighbouring residential roads to the east and north-west.

It is considered that the proposed wall by reason of its excessive height and blank appearance would form a visually intrusive and unattractive feature, adding to the negative feel of the area.

The wall would substantially obscure the areas of glazing and design intent of the host rear elevation, creating a bland, uninteresting and imposing fixture.

The wall would be particularly noticeable to passing vehicles/pedestrians due to the open nature of the site setting, formed by the adjacent car park and open road frontage. It is therefore believed that the proposed wall would introduce a visually harmful feature that undermines the character and appearance of the street-scene and visual amenity in general.

In light of the above, it is considered that the position and appearance of the proposed development fails to create a satisfactory relationship with the surrounding context and given the overarching policy framework and planning guidance which seeks to enable visually attractive development which adds to the overall quality of an area, the proposed development is not considered appropriate in this location.

Residential Amenity

Given the nature of the proposed activity, which would necessitate the use of an open or semi-open area, and the layout of the approved scheme, the smoking of shisha would take place towards the rearmost part of the building, which includes external openings to the north and western, ground floor elevations.

The Council are concerned that with the need to allow sides of the building to be open for ventilation purposes, activities associated with the ground floor use would generate noise and disturbance that would be harmful to the nearest residential occupiers.

The nearest residential occupiers are situated approximately 15 metres to the north-west, along Claremont Road.

The semi-open design of the premises would generate noise by way of talking, shouting, the playing of music/audio equipment, the use of equipment or crockery and general activity. This in turn would be disruptive to nearby occupiers.

The harmful impact would be more acute late at night for the nearest occupiers along Claremont Road and Whitcliff Close and when during the warmer months, bedroom windows could reasonably be expected to be left open. Given that the premises is authorised to remain open between the hours of 11.00 - 23.30 Monday to Thursday and from 1100 - 00.30 on Fridays and Saturdays, there is a reasonable chance that noise nuisance could occur.

Whilst internally, the premises can be satisfactorily insulated to prevent noise break-out, the control of noise breakout is problematic when the openings are left open and when the rear yard could potentially be used.

The applicant has produced a Noise Impact Assessment which accompanies the application. The assessment includes 4 scenarios to determine differing noise impacts as a result of noise breakout. The assessment seeks to recommend mitigation is required, with a view to minimising the noise impact on nearby residential occupiers.

The scenarios are as follows:

- Scenario 1 – all openings on the northern and western elevations unglazed;
- Scenario 2 – all openings on north and west elevations unglazed and extended to the rear wall;
- Scenario 3 – first floor windows closed and no extension to rear wall;
- Scenario 4 – first floor windows closed and extension to rear wall.

Of all the scenarios assessed, scenario 4 predicts that noise breakout would fall below the lowest measured background sound level at 1 metre from each receptor. This corresponds to a non/not substantial impact upon all surrounding receptors.

In light of the above scenario 4, the relevant mitigation involves first floor windows being closed and for an extension to the rear wall. This has resulted in the proposal including an extension to the already high boundary wall, enclosing the rearmost external area with a wall of 5.5 metres in height, thereby visually extending the appearance of the built form of the building.

Environmental Health have reviewed the assessment and consider that on the basis of the submitted acoustic assessment, the mitigation measures highlighted within scenario 4 would need to be implemented in order to comply with the Council's noise criteria.

Whilst the City Council as Local Planning Authority still have concerns surrounding the use of the rear yard and noise breakout, it is accepted that the mitigation proposed would have some impact on noise in that immediate space, but as previously noted there has been no conclusion formed by the Secretary of State on appeal that an extension to the built form would overcome the overall negative impacts of the use. A condition could be included, if necessary to prevent the use of the rear yard, although such a condition has previously been imposed and has resulted in enforcement action to control activity that has been deemed to have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of nearby residents.

Despite the limited mitigation offered by the proposed increased boundary treatment, is not considered visually acceptable - as outlined above.

Odours

Previously, concerns were expressed about the use of the premises for the smoking of shisha and the harmful impact that this would have on the amenity of the nearest residential occupiers, as consequence of unpleasant odours. In response, the applicant has produced an Odour Assessment which also considers the effects of shisha smoke, as well as kitchen ventilation.

The assessment concludes that with an active extraction system at ceiling height that discharges at high level, odour concentrations would not be at an unacceptable level; although this extraction system would not control those external areas and such odours impacting on nearby residents which have already been deemed to be unacceptable.

Environmental Health concur that with the installation of appropriate odour control equipment, the effects of odours on residential amenity is unlikely to result in adverse effects and can be sustained. A condition surrounding the specification of the equipment would be necessary if the application were deemed to be acceptable.

It is noted however that the assessment is based on the internal use of the premises, albeit with external openings. The assessment does not cover the use of the outside rear yard and therefore concerns would remain about unpleasant odours and the impact to residential amenity, should the rear yard be used for smoking shisha. The applicant has confirmed that there is no intention to use the rear yard other than for an emergency escape and bin/cycle storage and related activities. However, as previously stated it is the Council's view that there remains a reasonable prospect that the use of the premises as proposed, would harm the living conditions of the nearest residents by reason of odours and significant nuisance arising from noise and general activity; this includes a reasonable prospect that the smoking of shisha would take place in the open area to the rear.

A condition preventing the use of the rear yard for shisha use could be imposed and this has already been deemed necessary on two occasions by the Secretary of State; the applicant has already shown that conditional controls would provide the Council with little comfort, as enforcement action to control that activity has already been necessary in order to protect the living conditions of nearby residents.

Other Matters

Smoking in enclosed public spaces is prohibited in England, pursuant to the Health Act 2006.

It is not clear how the intended use of the premises for the smoking of shisha would comply with the relevant legislation, given that the premises is open to the public and substantially enclosed.

City Council guidance refers to the definition of enclosed or substantially enclosed premises. A copy of the guidance which is extracted from the Smoke Free (General Provisions) Regulations 2007.

A Substantially Enclosed Premises will be considered to be substantially enclosed if it has a ceiling or roof, but there are openings in the walls which are less than half of the total area of walls, including other structures that serve the purpose of walls and constitute the perimeter of the premises. When determining the area of an opening, no account can be taken of openings in which doors, windows or other fittings can be opened or shut.

Given the above, it is clear that the premises could not be legally used for smoking in any form, including shisha, as the premises can be defined or categorised as enclosed. The extraction of smoke from inside the premises would not overcome the requirements under the Health Act;

door or window openings cannot be taken into account in terms of the open nature of a premises, either when open or closed. The building which includes a ceiling, is considered to be enclosed on four sides, in which case it would be illegal to use the building itself for the smoking of shisha.

Whilst the Council accepts that it is not the role of the planning system to duplicate other legislative controls, account should be taken of the relevant law surrounding smoking in enclosed public spaces.

Aside from the Council's responsibilities surrounding the safeguarding of residential amenity, the Council has expended considerable resources in pursuing enforcement action against unlawful premises, due to many premises in the area not being suitable in physical terms for the smoking of shisha and because there has been a blatant disregard for the smoking ban in public spaces.

There are concerns therefore that despite the applicant's confirmation that there is no intention to use the external area, there is a need to safeguard against this possibility, as other premises in the area have done so.

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 worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application, but these concerns have not been overcome. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and therefore refused in a timely manner.

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

- 1) The proposed extension to and increase in wall height, would as a consequence of its siting and appearance, form a visually intrusive and unattractive feature, which would be harmful visual amenity. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies DM1

and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 2) The proposed use of the ground floor as a shisha smoking place would have a detrimental impact on the amenity and living conditions of the nearest residential occupiers in terms of noise, disturbance and odours. The proposed use is therefore contrary to saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health
Greater Manchester Police
Rusholme, Fallowfield & Moss Side Civic Society

126 - 128 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
552B Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5XL
552A Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5XL
Flat 7, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
Flat 6, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
Flat 5, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
Flat 4, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
Flat 3, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
Flat 2, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
Flat 1, 203A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
205 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
203 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
554 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5XL
Second Floor, 215 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
Zara Hair And Beauty, First Floor, 215 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
Ground Floor, 215 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
Basement, 215 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
499 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5WU
Flat At, Huntsman Inn, 130 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
209 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
209A Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
215 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
211 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
First Floor, 132 - 142 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
124 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
122 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
132 - 142 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
Ground Floor, 132 - 142 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AH
205B Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
207 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AQ
550 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5XL
552 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5XL
213 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AG
548 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5XL
501 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5WU
497 Claremont Road, Manchester, M14 5WU

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal of PD Rights Change Of Use from Class C3 to Class C4
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH