

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144359/FO/2025

Date registered valid: 1 December 2025

Proposal: Erection of rooftop extension comprising 4 No. 3 bed residential units to the existing detached block of flats, associated parking, storage and landscaping following demolition of single-storey outbuilding.

Address: Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT

Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: G&O Securities Limited

Agent (if any): Mr Alex Richards, Planning Insight

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 22 January 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

Date of site visit: 8 January 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 13 January 2026 Expired: 20 January 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 8 December 2025 Expired: 31 December 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 applicant site relates to Beech Court within the Old Moat ward of south Manchester. The application site relates to a 4 storey mid-20th century detached flat block with a flat roof constructed of multi light brickwork, with sand-coloured brickwork banding at each level and projecting balconies. It accommodates a total of 16no. residential (Use Class C3) flats. The building is relatively unique in its context, featuring 4no. projecting elements which are centred around a main core.

Within the grounds of the application site are mature trees, lawn landscaping and car parking along the north and east of the site. There is substantial all round boundary screening consisting of privet hedges which is lower to the front boundary. A bin store is sited along the eastern boundary of the site.

Description of area

The apartment block is situated on a cul-de-sac, Willow Bank, and has a matching block on the opposite side of the road known as Willow Court. Willow Bank is a tree lined road with hedgerows, and Beech Court is set back from the street. There are three and 4 storey buildings in the immediate vicinity and a three-storey terraced block at Willow Park at the end of the Cul-de-Sac.

The site sits outside of the Fallowfield District Centre, which is sited further north and north east to the applicant site, centred along Wilmslow Road. Retail uses can be found along Wilmslow

Road, with the McDonalds restaurant located at the Junction of Willow Bank and Wilmslow Road.

Description of development

The current application seeks planning consent for the erection of rooftop extension comprising 4 No. 3 bed residential units to the existing detached block of flats, associated parking, storage and landscaping following demolition of single-storey outbuilding.

4no. 3 bed residential units would be created. The flats would have an internal floor space of:

Flat A 87m² 3B4P

Flat B 76m² 3B4P

Flat C 75m² 3B4P

Flat D 76m² 3B4P

The existing bin store would be removed to make way for 4no. parking spaces. A new bin store would be sited to the north of the site, as would the proposed bike storage.

The proposed materials for the extension would consist of:

- zinc cladding
- anthracite grey aluminium windows
- flat roof

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

Following comments from neighbours that the notice no.1 had not been served on all the neighbours, the agent reviewed such concerns and confirmed all relevant parties were served with notice. The LPA have no reason to take further action on this matter.

The agent was advised that the LPA were unable to support the application on the grounds of design and appearance.

Given that the proposal was considered unacceptable in principle, even in the event of significant revisions, no further negotiations were taken with the agent in respect of the proposed design.

The agent supplied a BNG metric for consideration by colleagues in GMEU.

Planning History

130293/FO/2021- Elevation alterations to main entrance.
Approved 29 June 2021.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

34no. responses were received during the course of the application.

1no. response was a neutral comment requesting a minimum of four swift bricks be provided as part of the proposal, via a planning condition.

1no. response relates to a petition from Groves Town Planning on behalf of the residents and owners of Beech Court. However, no identified neighbours or signatures made part of such submission.

32no. individual letters of objection were received.

The following concerns were raised:

- The design of the rooftop with limited setback, and materials, not in keeping with the local area and brickwork of the existing building would be a poor quality addition to this existing block of flats and not in keeping with other extensions of a similar nature in the immediate area.
- The proposal would be at odds with existing building.
- The design is not compatible with the clean, simple 1970s design of the existing block, nor with the surrounding blocks and nearby townhouses. The appearance of the extension is visually poor and out of keeping with the residential character of the area.
- Conflicts with current leaseholders and concern insufficient notice was served on the leaseholders.
- Traffic and parking concerns as a result of the proposal.
- Overlooking to the Willow Park properties, and other surrounding properties.
- Concern if the waste disposal facility can be accessed.
- Additional parking proposed is inadequate.
- The block may be taken over 11 metres in height and so require involvement from the HSE.
- Over development of the site.
- Garages on the site aren't used for parking as they are not big enough or are too close to the building and cannot be relied on as part of the application as parking provision.
- Internal issues with the required alterations to the existing lift.
- Moving the brick bin-store block to be in front of flat 3 would completely obscure the views from flat 3 and flat 4 windows. The patio of flat 3 would be unusable due to the proximity of the bin store. The planning application is not an accurate representation of how the current large metal bins are currently housed.
- Concern the proposed apartments would be used as HMOs.
- Trees- need to access, impact level of privacy.
- The original submitted description of development was disingenuous.
- Uncertainty to the physical ramifications of the proposed development and the extent to which proposals may require further modification to become capable of practical implementation.
- Concern with drainage connections as a result of the proposal.
- Limited information provided in respect to a proposed bin or cycle store.
- The limited additional housing would not overcome the negative impacts of the proposal.

Councillor Gavin White

Councillor Gavin White raised concerns with the application:

- Massing and Appearance of Rooftop Extension: The design of the rooftop with limited setback, and materials, not in keeping with the local area and brickwork of the existing building would be a poor quality addition to this existing block of flats and not in keeping with other extensions of a similar nature in the immediate area.
- Conflicts with current leaseholders: It would appear that there is no legal way to build this extension - the freeholder is attempting to gain planning permission but would need permission from the 16 current leaseholders who currently own flats in the existing building - who all have 999 year leases. There is no mechanism for permission to be sought from these leaseholders - issues such as amending and extending the lift to give access to a new 5th floor, would mean the residents of the current 16 flats across the existing 4 floors would have the terms of their lease broken for an extended period. The leaseholders have not had any formal notification of

this as leaseholders from the freeholder - only been notified of the application for the LPA. This would seem to be an issue with the validity of the application.

-Space Standards: There is a concern that the 4No. 3 bed flats are below the Manchester Space Standards, and therefore not in accordance with our policies as a City Council.

-Access to Bin Store and Waste Management Strategy: The relocation of the bin store is not practical and would not be serviceable by Biffa and the City Council in the new location, and cause issues with waste removal, recycling and management.

-There is concern from local residents that this planning application is just a means to enable the freeholder to increase the value of the asset, as part of negotiations with the 16 leaseholders who want to buy out the freehold together - there would seem to be no way that the planning application can actually be built so because of this and all the points above, we would ask that this application is refused.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

GMEU reviewed the submitted BNG documents and provided the following response:

The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Rachel Hacking Ecology 2025) shows that a gain of 0.09 (2.32%) habitat and 0.01 (10.20%) hedgerow units will be achieved on site as a result of the development. In order to achieve a 10% net gain in habitat units, at least 0.31 units are proposed to be purchased from an off-site provider. GMEU have no reason to doubt the assessment of the baseline or post-development value of the site and given the very small number of units required to achieve a 10% gain, the LPA can be reasonably confident that these could be acquired and the BNG condition could be discharged. GMEU would have no objection to this, providing habitat banks close to the site are prioritised.

The statutory Biodiversity Gain Plan condition will apply should this planning application receive permission. At condition stage sufficient information will be required to demonstrate how a 10% net gain will be achieved, including a Biodiversity Gain Plan, final version of the BNG metric showing a 10% net gain in habitat units, and evidence that the correct number and type of units have been successfully purchased and allocated to the development.

GMEU note that no information regarding the bat roosting potential of the buildings to be impacted by the development has been submitted. However, based on the structure and context of these buildings, as well as the scope of the proposed works, we would deem no further survey effort necessary as protected species surveys should only be requested when there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and impacted by a development.

Nevertheless, GMEU make several recommendations.

Highway Services

Highways are satisfied the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on the local highways.

The development proposals consist of an extension to a residential development, comprising of four dwellings. Willow Bank is an adopted residential cul-de-sac that is subject to a 20mph speed limit. There is a nearside limited 'No Parking' Order in place.

Trip generation and junction capacity: The addition of four residential units will not generate any significant increase in vehicle trips and therefore no unacceptable traffic impact on the highways is envisaged.

Site accessibility: The site benefits from high levels of accessibility by foot, with areas of Withington, as well as numerous local facilities being only a short walk from the site. Walking to

be a viable alternative to private car use for prospective residents. The site has access to ten bus routes within an acceptable walking distance.

Parking and access: The development proposes four additional dwellings. Based on a requirement for 100% provision, this generates a need for approximately four parking spaces. The site plan indicates the provision of four additional spaces.

Cycle parking: The proposal includes a new enclosed cycle store with capacity for 8 bikes.

Boundary treatments: No boundary treatment works are proposed.

Refuse and servicing: Appropriate bin storage has been indicated within the site's curtilage, with kerbside collection accepted from Willow Bank.

Construction management: A Construction Management Plan is not required. It is considered that sufficient space is available on site to avoid any unacceptable impact on the adjacent highways.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health raised no objections to the proposal and requested the following conditions be attached to any approval granted:

- Demolition/ construction hours condition
- NSE4(b) (Residential sound insulation AND overheating) condition
- Waste condition- The information provided in the submitted Design & Access Statement is sufficient to address this condition.
- Air Quality condition for information in respect of EVCs.

MCC Flood Risk Management

The following comments were received from MCC Flood Risk Management:

The proposed development is located within Flood Zone 1, and it is not subjected to surface water flooding. The application seeks to extend the existing residential block by one storey to provide four new residential units, along with additional cycle and car parking, and enhanced waste storage facilities. There would be no physical alterations to the exterior of the building or increase in impermeable areas. No increase in built footprint is proposed at the site. Furthermore, the development does not include any lowering of existing floor levels or the creation of new basements, hence no condition is required.

Existing Surface Water Drainage System: If the applicant proposes to utilise the existing surface water drainage system connected to the proposed "Cellular confinement system under proposed bike storage", it is recommended that a full survey of the existing drainage infrastructure is undertaken. Any identified remedial works should be completed, and an ongoing maintenance scheme should be established to ensure that the existing drainage system is fit for purpose for the lifetime of the development.

Issues **POLICY**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (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
- c) an environmental objective

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

Chapter 2. Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4. Decision-making

Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities

Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (16th December 2025)

The government has published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework which is intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making.

Of relevance to the application proposals the draft NPPF makes it clear that local planning authorities should amongst other things:

- Work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, where necessary seeking solutions to problems arising from initial proposals, to enable a timely decision.
- Take account of planning matters raised during any pre-application engagement, including any positive responses to this engagement, as well as representations on the proposals.
- Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and this means that for development within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following the adoption of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan

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) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas);
- Policy EN4 (Reducing CO2 Emissions by Enabling Low and Zero Carbon Development);
- Policy EN8 (Adaptation to Climate Change) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy EN14 (Flood Risk) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy EN15 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy EN19 (Waste);
- Policy H1 (Overall Housing Provision) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy H6 (South Manchester);
- Policy T 1 (Sustainable Transport) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy T 2 (Accessible areas of opportunity and need).

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. Residential institutions

DC1.1 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 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 street-scene;
- e. the effect of the loss of any on-site carparking.

DC1.2 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 the original buildings);
- b. they do not create an 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 street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional 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).

DC1.6 For the avoidance of doubt, policies DC1.1 to DC1.4 apply to domestic houses, flats, houses in multiple occupation, nursing homes, rest homes and hotels.

DC7. New Housing Development

DC7.1 The Council will negotiate with developers to ensure that new housing is accessible at ground floor level to disabled people, including those who use wheelchairs, wherever this is practicable. All new developments containing family homes will be expected to be designed so as to be safe areas within which children can play and, where appropriate, the Council will also expect play facilities to be provided.

DC26. Development and Noise

DC26.1 states the Council intends to use the development control process to reduce the impact of noise on people living and working in, or visiting, the City. In giving effect to this intention, the Council will consider both:

- a. the effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise; and
- b. the implications of new development being exposed to existing noise sources which are effectively outside planning control.

DC26.2 states new noise sensitive developments (including large scale changes of use of existing land or buildings) such as housing, schools, hospitals, or similar activities, will be permitted subject to their not being in locations which would expose them to high noise levels from existing uses or operations, unless the effects of the noise can realistically be reduced. In giving effect to this policy, the council will take account both of noise exposure at the time of receiving a planning application and of any increase that may reasonably be expected in the foreseeable future.

DC26.4 states where the council believes that an existing noise source might result in an adverse impact upon a proposed new development, or where a new proposal might generate potentially unacceptable levels of noise, it will in either case require the applicant to provide an assessment of the likely impact and of the measures he proposes to deal satisfactorily with it. Such measures might include the following

- a) engineering solutions, including reduction of noise at source, improving sound insulation of sensitive buildings or screening by purpose-built barriers
- b) layout solutions, including consideration of the distance between the source of the noise and the buildings or land affected by it and screening by natural barriers or other buildings or noncritical rooms within a building; and
- c) administrative steps, including limiting the operating times of the noise source, restricting activities allowed on the site or specifying an acceptable noise limit.

Any or all these factors will be considered appropriate for inclusion in conditions on any planning permission

DC26.5 states the council will control noise levels by requiring, where necessary, high levels of noise insulation in new development as well as noise barriers where this is appropriate.

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 paragraphs 2.3, 2.7, 2.14 and 2.16.

Places for Everyone

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 policy is of relevance:

JP- S1- Sustainable development.

ISSUES

Principle of Development

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 48 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 development is not considered acceptable and is in conflict with the aforementioned development plan policy and associated guidance.

It is considered the erection of rooftop extension comprising 4 No. 3 bed residential units to the existing detached block of flats, associated parking, storage and landscaping following demolition of single-storey outbuilding would be at odds with the mid-20th century design of the existing block in respect of scale, bulk, massing and materiality, which would create a visually intrusive feature which would be out of keeping with the style of development in the immediate area.

On this basis, the proposal is considered to conflict with policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There are no material considerations to indicate otherwise. The principal issues are outlined further below.

Visual Amenity and Design

The apartment block is situated on a cul-de-sac, Willow Bank, and has a matching block on the opposite side of the road known as Willow Court. Willow Bank is a tree lined road with hedgerows, and Beech Court is set back from the street. There are three and 4 storey buildings in the immediate vicinity and a three-storey terraced block at Willow Park at the end of the Cul-de-Sac. There are examples of 5 storey properties which sit within the District Centre of Fallowfield, relating to student accommodation of Mayfair Court, and following an upwards extension at 7 Wynnstay Grove.

The proposed extension would cover the extent of each of the four projecting elements and would be set away from the edge of the building by less than 1 metre. The additional floor would relate to a zinc clad block with a height of 3 metres, resulting in a total height of the building of approximately 15 metres, with a central element extending up to a total height of 16 metres to accommodate the lift.

Given the extent of the development proposed including the extent and scale of the covered area, the total height and the use of contrasting zinc materiality, it is considered the proposal would be out of keeping with the architectural features of the host property. The addition of a monosyllabic block to the top of the building destroys existing balance and proportion. The proposed development provides neither a sympathetic contemporary addition nor attempts to take on board any current merits of features of the existing structure. The choice of materials exaggerates and emphasises the miss-match of proposed and existing. The proposed design, appearance, massing and form of the rooftop extension would be unduly prominent, detracting not only from the original limited architectural character of the host building but would also

detract from the neighbouring development of Willow Court. Although there is a set back of the new storey of 1 metre from the edge of the roof, such set back would be marginal when read from the ground level and so exaggerate the overly dominant feature proposed.

Whilst there are elements of zinc cladding for residential flat blocks that can be seen at 2 Willow Bank, such element is limited in scale acting as a feature as opposed to adding a further storey which increases the number of flats available for use.

The developer has drawn attention to the upwards extension at 7 Wynnstay Grove (see planning ref: 119205/FO/2018). The LPA have viewed the upwards extension to the north of the application site and although 5 storeys have been permitted as per the current submission, the extent of the upwards extension is much smaller than of that proposed. The extension at no.7 sits within the only central block of the host building and is limited in scale. The current proposal would permit an upwards extension covering much more floor space beyond that approved at no.7 and given the extent of footprint covered creates an overly large and visually intrusive feature that would be visible from the surrounding properties and when travelling along Willow Bank.

It is considered that on balance and when weighed against the public benefits of the offer of additional housing units, the proposal would fail to enhance the wider character of the area, which is characterised by buildings of scale predominantly located fronting the arterial route into the centre associated with the District Centre.

Residential Amenity

The proposal has been supported by a daylight and sunlight assessment, prepared by Herrington, which concludes the anticipated impacts would be within the limits prescribed by the BRE guidelines as being acceptable. As such, the proposal is not considered to give rise to undue overshadowing impact upon neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed fenestration within the rooftop extension relates to 20no. new windows at a fifth storey level. These additional windows would afford a similar outlook to existing windows, albeit a storey higher, as such the proposed fenestration is not considered to create significant overlooking impacts over and above the existing situation which would warrant a refusal.

Further, each of the new apartments are compliant with Manchester's Emerging Space Standards and every habitable room within the development is afforded natural light. As such, no concerns are raised in respect of creating adequate accommodation.

Given the proposed increase in height and massing of the application property roof and close proximity between existing buildings, the proposal is considered to create an overbearing impact upon the neighbouring properties including properties to the west along Willow Bank, to the north along Wynnstay Grove, to properties at no.2 Willow Bank and properties at Willow Court. The impact to residential amenity is therefore not considered acceptable, in terms of overdominance.

Highway Safety

Neighbour responses raised concerns in relation to traffic and parking as a result of the proposal, concern if the parking would be sufficient and useable and concern that the waste disposal facility could not easily be accessed. Such issues were reviewed by colleagues in Highway Services who raised no issues in respect of the concerns raised. Highway Services were satisfied with the bin storage indicated within the site's curtilage, with kerbside collection accepted from Willow Bank.

Whilst there are no concerns regarding highway safety, this issue does not overcome the concerns raised in respect of the proposed design of the proposal.

Parking and Cycle Storage

The proposal would result in the addition of 4no. parking spaces along the eastern boundary of the site. This would result in 100% provision for the 4no. additional flats. Such parking spaces would not be considered to give rise to concerns for colleagues in Highway Services and in isolation the LPA have no concerns with such works.

Cycle storage is proposed and would be an improvement on the existing provision, as no cycle storage is available on site. Such element of works is considered acceptable in principle. If the scheme be acceptable, finalised details of the appearance of such cycle storage could be sought via condition.

Waste

A new bin store would be sited to the north of the site, as would bike storage. Colleagues in Environmental Health and Highway Services reviewed the proposal and raised no concern with the submitted information. It is acknowledged that if the scheme be recommended for approval, finalised details of the design of the bin store would be sought via condition. This could include landscaping the screen the bin store from those flats closest to the proposed waste area.

Ecology

The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Rachel Hacking Ecology 2025) shows that a gain of 0.09 (2.32%) habitat and 0.01 (10.20%) hedgerow units will be achieved on site as a result of the development. In order to achieve a 10% net gain in habitat units, at least 0.31 units are proposed to be purchased from an off-site provider. GMEU have no reason to doubt the assessment of the baseline or post-development value of the site and given the very small number of units required to achieve a 10% gain, the LPA can be reasonably confident that these could be acquired and the BNG condition could be discharged. GMEU would have no objection to this, providing habitat banks close to the site are prioritised.

Given the structure and context of the building, as well as the scope of the proposed works, GMEU were satisfied that no further surveys were required in respect of bats and protected species.

Other Matters Raised as part of Local Representations

Following comments from neighbours that the notice no.1 had not been served on all the neighbours, the agent reviewed such concerns and confirmed all relevant parties were served with notice. The LPA have no reason to take further action on this matter.

One neighbour raised concerns the block may be taken over 11 metres in height and so require involvement from the HSE. The HSE must be consulted for high-rise buildings where said building is at least 7 storeys/ 18 metres in height, with 2 plus residential units. As the central element would extend up to a total height of 16 metres (at the highest point), HSE did not need to be consulted as part of this application.

One neighbour raised concern that moving the brick bin-store block to be in front of flat 3 would completely obscure the views from flat 3 and flat 4 windows. The patio of flat 3 would be unusable due to the proximity of the bin store. It is noted the proposed refuse store would be sited approximately 5.8 metres from the building to the north. Whilst it is acknowledged that this would block some views from such flats, the views as existing relate to the garages to the north of the site. Given landscaping is shown to be sited around the bin store and such information could be sought via condition if the scheme be considered acceptable, such issue would not be considered so harmful to warrant a refusal on the scheme.

If the scheme was acceptable, resident concerns in relation to the properties being used as an HMO could 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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application. Given that the proposal was considered unacceptable in principle, even in the event of significant revisions, no further negotiations were taken with the agent in respect of the proposed design. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and therefore refused in a timely manner.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

- 1) The proposed rooftop extension comprising 4 No. 3 bed residential units to the existing detached block of flats, by reason of its design, appearance, siting, form, scale and materiality forms an unduly prominent, incongruous, and obtrusive addition to the

application site. This in turn would have a harmful impact to visual amenity and the appearance of the street-scene, contrary to saved policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Highway Services
Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management

340 - 342 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6AF
32 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
41 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
39 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
Flat 3, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 7, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 8, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 15, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 11, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 8, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 5, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
5 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 6, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 6, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
30 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
25 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
29 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
7 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 12, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 6, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 2, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 10, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
1 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Marie Stopes International Manchester Centre, 5 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 18, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
26 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
21 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
9 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
3 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 1, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 16, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 1, 3A Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 2, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
15 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 7, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 15, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 3, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 5, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 7, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 5, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 6, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 2, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 11, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
11 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
4 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 11, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 5, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP

Flat 2, 3A Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 4, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 6, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 17, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
24 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
Flat 10, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 1, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 8, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
36 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
40 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
27 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
8 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
12 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 9, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 13, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
20 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
Flat 1, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 7, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 15, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 4, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 4, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 1, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 7, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
28 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
23 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
16 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
13 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 14, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 16, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
22 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
Flat 4, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 5, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 1, 7A Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 8, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
34 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
37 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
31 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
2 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
6 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 4, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 10, Willow Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 14, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 17, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 16, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 9, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 14, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 3, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 3, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 12, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 12A, 11 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
38 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
35 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
33 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XT
10 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN

14 Beech Court, Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XN
Flat 9, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 12, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 3, 2 Willow Bank, Manchester, M14 6XP
Flat 2, 9 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XF
Flat 2, 3 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 2, 7A Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG
Flat 1, 7 Wynnstay Grove, Manchester, M14 6XG

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA