

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144193/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 7 October 2025
Proposal: Installation of a new boundary fence to secure garden area
Address: 11 Pipewell Avenue, Manchester, M18 8ZA
Ward(s): Gorton & Abbey Hey Ward

Applicant: Ms Carol Gale
Agent (if any): Miss Emily Colgan, Manchester City Council
Case officer: Ciara Gettinby
Tel: 0161 234 3048
Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: **25 November 2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Standard consultations:

Printed: 22 October 2025 Expired: 12 November 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 22 October 2025 Expired: 12 November 2025

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The property associated with this application is located adjacent to Taylor Street Playing Fields. The property sits at the end of a cul-de-sac and is a semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse made of red brick and brown uPVC window frames. The property features a pitched roof with brown tiles. To the front of the property is a hardstanding driveway and the side and rear garden is separated by existing brown fence panels and shrubbery.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

The application site is located within the Gorton and Abbey Hey Ward of Manchester. The area is predominantly residential in character, with many properties of a similar design and age. Other properties within the area consist of semi-detached family dwelling houses, the area benefits from a large amount of green space with Gorton Park, the Playing fields and King George V Park within walking distance.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a boundary fence to secure the garden area. The fence panels will be of the same height as existing fence panels and will enable the applicant to combine the garden to the side with the rear garden aspect.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per appendix 1- no comments or objections.

Manchester Highways Services- Initial objections to the proposal on highways safety grounds, after the agent included a 2m visibility splay to the scheme, highways were satisfied with the proposal.

Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture) We have no objections with the above application, subject to the works being carried out according to BS3998: Tree Work. A condition has been attached to satisfy concerns.

Policy

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

The Manchester Core Strategy- Development Plan Document 2012- 2027 (The Core Strategy) was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012, it is a key document for the local plan which provides a framework that planning applications are assessed against.

Policy DM1- Development Management

Policy SP1- Spatial Principles

Policy EN1- Design Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework- The Governments own planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied.

Chapter 8- Promoting healthy and safe communities

Chapter 12- Achieving well designed and beautiful places

Issues

Principle- The submitted application is for the erection of a 1.883m fence around the southeastern boundary of the site, for the purpose of increased privacy and creating a larger outdoor amenity space. Although the principle is accepted, consideration must be given to the proposals siting and scale, appearance and impact upon the visual and residential amenity and highways safety.

Siting and Scale

The proposed fencing would measure 1.883m in height expanding along the southeastern boundary of the property for a total of 13m. The fencing would face onto Pipewell Avenue and would be uniform in terms of height and design. The panels would be situated along the side and front boundary of the property. The fence panels would be made of timber and would block visibility into the garden area.

Overall, the siting and scale of the proposal is considered acceptable as it would not result in an 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the site or street scene, would not introduce an overbearing presence into the locale and would not incur considerable public benefits as a result of its implementation, including increasing privacy and increasing private outdoor amenity space, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

Due to the location and nature of the proposed boundary treatment, the proposal would not give rise to any adverse loss of light nor privacy implications. Due to the nature of the location at the end of the cul-de-sac, pedestrian footfall would not be frequent.

The erection of the perimeter fencing to Pipewell Avenue with a proposed height of 1.83m would not give rise to any adverse amenity implications to surrounding neighbours on the basis of creating an overbearing feature. The new fence panels would replicate the existing fence in colour and design.

The adjoining neighbour, no. 9 Pipewell Avenue is not considered to be affected by the proposal as it is separated from the development. The opposing neighbour, no. 12 Pipewell Avenue would face the fence panels. However, as there is a distance of 15m between the properties, the fence panels are not considered to cause any residential amenity issues for no. 12 Pipewell Avenue. Considering there have been no objections, and the location of the fence, the proposal is not believed to significantly harm the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupants.

Given the similarity in design with the existing fence panels, it is not considered to give rise to adverse visual amenity implications. Overall, the proposal would not create any adverse impacts to visual/ residential amenity, pursuant to Policy DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Highways and Pedestrian Safety

Originally Manchester's Highway Services objected to the application, as the closeness of the fence to the rear of the footway creates a potential hazard for pedestrians. The fence height and density would have blocked any inter-visibility. However, the introduction of the 2m visibility splay satisfied highways concerns. The revised scheme allows for clearer visibility between pedestrians and cars pulling in and out of the applicant's driveway.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as it broadly complies with policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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

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. No significant problems have arisen during the course of the application, and the applicant has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the development plan.

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

- (1)** The development must have begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of permission. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990.
- (2)** The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:

Proposed drawings (elevations and ground floor plans) ref- PWA-MCC-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0006
Location Plan, ref- PWA-MCC-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0006

Received on 25 November 2025

Reason- to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

- (3)** The materials to be used hereby permitted shall be as agreed in accordance with the details agreed at application stage in type, size, colour and texture including:

-Timber fencing in colour 'natural'

Reason- to ensure the overall appearance is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

- (4)** All tree work should be carried out by a competent contractor in accordance with British Standard BS 3998:2010 "Recommendations for Tree Work".

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with policies EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services

Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)

12 Pipewell Avenue, Manchester, M18 8ZA

9 Pipewell Avenue, Manchester, M18 8ZA

14 Pipewell Avenue, Manchester, M18 8ZA

10 Pipewell Avenue, Manchester, M18 8ZA

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