

Comments for Planning Application 143452/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143452/FO/2025

Address: Westwood Nursing Home 69 Crumpsall Lane Manchester M8 5SR

Proposal: Change of use from care home (Class C2) to primary school (Class F1), with minor external alterations, associated parking, access, and play space.

Case Officer: Steven McCoombe

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Case Officer,

Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Development - Ansleigh Avenue Access

We write to formally object to the above application on substantive planning grounds. The proposal represents an over-intensification of a constrained site within a quiet residential enclave and fails to accord with the development plan when read as a whole, in particular Policies DM1 and T2 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Our objection is set out below under the principal material considerations.

1. Highway Safety and Unsuitable Access Arrangement

Conflict with Policy T2 - Transport

Policy T2 requires development to be located and designed to ensure safe access, avoid unacceptable highway impacts, and protect residential streets from traffic intrusion. The proposal fails these requirements.

Ansleigh Avenue is a narrow, residential cul-de-sac with:

- No purpose-built turning head capable of accommodating high-frequency manoeuvring
- Limited carriageway width

- Established on-street parking pressure
- No dedicated drop-off, waiting, or circulation infrastructure

The proposed introduction of institutional access via this road would result in concentrated peak-time vehicle movements associated with school drop-off and pick-up periods. This form of surge traffic is fundamentally different in character and intensity from typical residential flows.

The likely consequences include:

- Obstructed sightlines at the junction with Crumpsall Lane
- Increased reversing and multi-point turning within confined space
- Pedestrian displacement into the carriageway
- Conflict between residents, service vehicles, and school-related traffic
- Increased risk to vulnerable road users, including children

Any reliance on travel plans or behavioural assumptions (e.g., staggered arrivals or considerate parking) does not overcome the physical constraints of the highway environment. Planning assessment must be based on realistic operating conditions, not best-case scenarios.

The cumulative impact would materially diminish highway safety and introduce risk in a location not designed for such activity. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy T2.

2. Substantial Harm to Residential Amenity

Conflict with Policy DM1 - Development Management

Policy DM1 requires development to protect amenity, including through the avoidance of unacceptable noise, disturbance, overbearing impact, and loss of residential character. The application fails this test.

(a) Noise and Disturbance

The siting of an active playground immediately adjacent to established residential boundaries would introduce a materially different noise environment to what currently exists.

This is a quiet residential pocket characterised by domestic-scale activity. The introduction of:

- Structured outdoor play
- Organised physical activity
- Repetitive high-frequency sound events
- Daily concentrated peak periods

... represents a clear intensification of use.

The issue is not occasional noise, but the predictable and recurring nature of institutional activity. Even where decibel thresholds may be argued to fall within technical limits, the character and duration of the noise would result in tangible loss of quiet enjoyment.

This constitutes demonstrable harm to residential amenity under DM1.

(b) Seven-Day Operational Intensity

The proposed operating pattern (including weekend use) further exacerbates the impact. Residential occupiers would experience limited respite from activity, eroding the fundamental expectation of a quiet domestic environment.

The scale and frequency of use is not incidental - it is structural to the proposal.

3. Visual Harm and Erosion of Residential Character

The proposed 2.4-metre mesh security fencing introduces an overtly institutional and defensive form of boundary treatment into a domestic streetscape.

Ansleigh Avenue is characterised by low-level boundary treatments, soft landscaping, and a cohesive residential appearance. The introduction of tall perimeter security infrastructure would:

- Create a visually harsh and engineered frontage
- Introduce a fortress-like character
- Undermine the established domestic scale of the avenue
- Erode the visual amenity of the street scene

Policy DM1 requires development to respond positively to local character. This proposal does not.

4. Overdevelopment of a Constrained Site

Taken cumulatively, the application seeks to insert a high-intensity institutional use into a spatially constrained residential context without the infrastructure to support it.

The proposal prioritises operational expansion over contextual compatibility. The result is:

- Traffic intensification on unsuitable roads
- Loss of amenity to adjoining residents
- Introduction of institutional visual character
- Displacement of safe informal residential use of the street

The development plan does not support growth at any cost. It requires development to be appropriate to its setting. This proposal is not.

Conclusion

The application gives rise to clear and foreseeable harm in respect of:

- Highway safety
- Residential amenity
- Visual character
- Residential street function

The adverse impacts are neither minor nor adequately mitigated. When assessed against Policies DM1 and T2 of the Manchester Core Strategy, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and should therefore be refused.

We respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority gives full weight to the material considerations set out above and refuses planning permission.

Yours faithfully