

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144231/FO/2025

Date registered valid: 29 October 2025

Proposal: Erection of 25 dwellings (Use Class C3), including a mix of apartments and cottages, creation of a new access point and provision of landscaping.

Address: Land At Tan Yard Brow, Manchester

Ward(s): Gorton & Abbey Hey Ward

Applicant: Franstep Limited

Agent (if any): NJL Consulting

Case officer: Ian Jarvis
Tel: 0161 234 4079
Email: ian.jarvis@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 27 January 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Major Dwellings

Date of site visit:

Standard consultations:

Printed: 11 November 2025

Expired: 2 December 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 November 2025

Expired: 2 December 2025

Site notice

Posted: 16 December 2025

Expired: 9 January 2026

Press advert

Published: 18 November 2025

Expired: 9 December 2025

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area 1994

Tree Preservation Order: No

This application relates to a large (0.38 hectare) site that lies in the Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area. The site is irregular in shape, which is wider to the north and narrower to the south. The site has a long road frontage to the west (Tan Yard Brow), and a smaller road frontage to the south. The site is completely open/undeveloped with areas of grass/greenery/vegetation and is otherwise surrounded by other areas of open land and greenery. These areas include the Gore Brook, to the north along with the Gorton Heritage Trail, a mapped trail through the Conservation Area, and the Fallowfield Loop to the east, which is a major walking and cycling route linking East Manchester to South Manchester. The Gore Brook lies at the bottom of the Valley and Tan Yard Brow rises, from this point until it joins Hyde Road. The site therefore has differing levels throughout.

The surrounding area is mostly residential, with listed buildings close to the northern boundary of the site (56- 60 High Bank and Spring Bank Farm). Otherwise, the area is considered to be semi-rural in character, with numerous areas of open space, tree-lined streets and recreational routes, as indicated above, with more dense residential areas being located further north and south of the site, and outside the Conservation Area boundary.

There is no planning history for the site.

It is proposed to develop the site for residential purposes, with 25 units proposed in two blocks. The proposal refers to a mix of apartments and cottages, but the block identified as cottages (Block 2), shows four units on the ground floor, and four units on the second floor, so these are,

in effect, apartments, and the scheme therefore represents the construction of 25 units, which are all apartments.

Block 2 is a two storey structure that largely runs parallel with Tan Yard Brow, and is situated to the north of the site. As well as rising, from North to South, the site also rises from West to East, so all flats, in this block, are accessed from within the site, at second floor level, with 8 doors indicated, on what is seen as a single storey elevation, from this side (four doors provide immediate access, to the upper floor flats, and four doors provide access to four individual stairways down to the lower floor flats. The ground floor flats can also be accessed from individual doorways, from Tan Yard Brow. Due to site levels, it is also the case that the block is in two distinct halves, with different roof/eaves and fenestration levels. All 8 flats, in this block, are one bedroom, two-person, units.

The vehicular access, to the site, is proposed to the south of this block, providing a site access road that leads to the parking area and Block 1, which is a two/three storey structure. This block has a front elevation that faces northwards that runs from East to West. It sits close to block A, but is positioned slightly further southwards. From the front and rear it is viewed as two-storey, with accommodation in the roofspace, with a central three storey element that is visible from the side elevations. Access to all the flats is taken from a door, in the side elevation, that leads to an internal corridor and stairway to the upper floor flats, although the ground floor flats also include double doors, on the side and rear elevations, leading onto the lounge area of that flat. All 17 flats, in this block, are two bedroom, three person units.

The scheme includes the provision of 25 car parking spaces, which are provided in rows, largely in front of the two blocks, and all of which are directly accessed from the site access road. The proposal also includes the provision of 25 cycle spaces, and associated garden areas/landscaping, including the creation of a walking/ramped route, from the rear of Block 1 to Hyde Road

The application is for a major development, in a Conservation Area, and has been advertised, on site and in the press.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents/adjoining occupiers - 58 objections have been received, from local residents, for the following reasons:

- Tan Yard Brow is already too busy, especially at peak times, and cannot accommodate additional traffic.
- The road and infrastructure cannot accommodate these additional living units. It would lead to increased congestion, and make daily travel difficult for existing residents.
- It will be a danger to all residents as Tan Yard Brow is already heavily parked, and blind spots are created. Additional vehicles will add to this danger.
- The surrounding road network cannot accommodate the amount of lorries needed for the construction process.
- The road is already in poor condition, and is already excessively used by large vehicles, including from the nearby aggregates yard.
- Tan Yard Brow has a one way road system, with traffic not permitted to access is, from Hyde Road, but many cars frequently disregard this order, to the detriment of highway safety, so more houses, and more traffic, is highly likely to lead to an increased number of vehicles doing this.
- The area is already affected by noise, from nearby industrial premises, and this disturbance would be exacerbated, particularly during the construction phase.
- The area needs family housing, for local people, rather than apartments.

- The proposal does not give sufficient weight to preserving the character and setting of the nearby listed buildings and the Conservation Area.
- The Council's Conservation Area policy states that development in a Conservation Area should be limited and small scale, but the development would significantly increase Tan Yard Brow's housing stock, transforming this semi-rural location into a suburban area.
- It would lead to the loss of a significant area of green space, in the Conservation Area, which would change the character of the area.
- The application provides no justification for why benefits of the development outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area.
- The Conservation area includes many trees and open spaces that provide a precious resource, for wildlife, and this proposal would compromise this resource.
- There is an historic bridge, on Tan Yard Brow, that is already weak, and it would not withstand such an increase in vehicular traffic.
- Existing infrastructure and amenities could not cope with the additional demand generated.

An objection was also received, from the operator of a nearby commercial use, for the following reasons:

- The elevated position, of the proposed houses, would lead to overlooking of their yard, representing a significant security risk by allowing visibility into an area that needs to remain secure.
- The provision of 25 new apartments and potential overspill parking on Tan Yard Brow, would create additional highway safety issues and exacerbate existing congestion issues.
- The introduction of new residential uses, in close proximity to commercial uses, could lead to complaints about noise, even though these commercial uses have operated lawfully for many years.
- Significant infrastructure improvements should be carried out before approval is considered. These should include reconstructing the bridge to allow 2 way traffic and road safety mitigation measures.

One neutral comment was received from someone who identified themselves as an RSPB Swift champion. They asked that, if the development were approved, that swift nest bricks be incorporated into the development.

A further comment was received from a resident, who indicated a neutral response, but concerns were expressed about implications on traffic and wildlife, which they felt warranted further analysis.

One response was received, supporting the proposal, from a resident who considers that the area needs more houses.

Abbey Hey Residents Association - Makes the following comments:

There are numerous times when drivers break the one way rules on the road. Traffic travelling into the city are clearly shown at the junction AHEAD ONLY. This is ignored by many, Traffic that uses the road illegally is traveling at speed. The traffic from Abbey Hey is usually stopped at the junction with Hyde Road waiting for the opportunity to turn left. At all times of the day there is usually a queue waiting to turn left on to the main road and at peak times the queues can be back beyond Tannery Row.

The traffic using the road illegally often fail to understand how narrow the road is over the bridge at the bottom of the hill.

Tan Yard Brow is used as an access from Ashton Old Road to Hyde Road by any commuters.

Apart from residents vehicles, have deliveries, visitors, etc to the proposed housing been taken into account?

Access in recent years has been made easier onto Hyde Road - this now appears to be buildings and landscaping obscuring the view.

Some traffic coming from Tan Yard Brow wishes to cross Hyde Road to access the streets such as Sandheys and Gratrix. This is a particularly time consuming manoeuvre.

25 car parking spaces with 17 two bedroomed flats and 8 one bedroom flats appears to be a low number. Many people own cars and at least 2 per property is often the number, visitors, deliveries and services will have little opportunity to park and the road outside the complex is not suitable for any parking,

Tan Yard Brow is used as a pedestrian access to public transport on Hyde Road and is used by many people on a daily basis and also as access to child care provision by parents.

Construction traffic will also cause problems for local residents.

Highways Services - Makes the following comments:

TRIP GENERATION:

Accepted that the adjacent highway network can facilitate such additional demands with no highway capacity concerns

HIGHWAYS SAFETY:

The Crashmap accident database has been reviewed for the most recent five-year period (2018-2022).

The database indicates that there have been 5 slight incidents within the study area.

Highways request that 2024 accident data are included.

SITE ACCESSIBILITY:

Site is reasonably accessible by sustainable modes

ACCESS:

Vehicular Access:

A new vehicular access point is proposed from Tan Yard Brow. This is subject to a S278 agreement. Highways request that tactile paving and dropped kerbs are provided at the proposed access junction with Tan Yard Brow.

The Transport Statement confirms that the internal access road is 5.0m wide - Confirmation is required on whether the internal road will be offered up for adoption. If so, a 5.5m access road is standard.

Any redundant vehicular access point should be reinstated to MCC adoptable standards.

Swept path assessments have been undertaken based on the latest plan.

Highways request that further swept path assessments are provided demonstrating the following: A large car accessing the site, manoeuvring into the parking bay and egressing the site in a forward gear. This should include end-of-aisle parking bays.

Largest anticipated delivery vehicle accessing, manoeuvring and egressing the site in a forward gear.

A 2.4m x 25m visibility splay assessment has been undertaken at the proposed access junction. Whilst the Left-Hand visibility splay is achievable subject to TROs, Highways have concerns that the proposed landscaping fronting Block 2 impacts the right-hand visibility splay and should therefore be maintained to a height of 600mm and subject to TROs.

Highways requests that No Waiting restrictions are in place covering the site access and visibility splay extents.

Pedestrian Access:

It should be ensured that all pedestrian routes within the curtilage of the site are constructed to a minimum width of 1.8m to cater for wheelchair and any pushchair users.

Tactile paving and dropped kerbs should be provided within the site at uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points.

Highways request that footways surrounding the site are resurfaced as part of the highways work. A minimum footway width of 2.0m should be retained along Tan Yard Brow.

A secondary pedestrian access route is proposed from Hyde Road.

It should be ensured that all aspects of the ramp including the gradient, resting/ landing platform and handrailing is DDA compliant, as referenced within Design for Access 2 documents.

PARKING:

25 spaces is acceptable in principle.

The Transport Statement confirms that a minimum 6m aisle width will be provided to the rear of all parking spaces - This should be shown on an updated site plan with dimensions included.

Clarification is sought on parking space dimensions - This should be shown on an updated site plan with dimensions included

OFF-SITE HIGHWAYS WORKS:

A S278 agreement will be required for any highway works which impact the adopted highway.

TRO REVIEW:

Highways request that a review of Traffic Regulation Orders on the surrounding streets in the vicinity of the development is undertaken.

Highways requests that No Waiting restrictions are in place covering the site access and visibility splay extents.

Any changes in TROs are to be done via a S278 agreement and to be funded by the applicant.

EV CHARGING:

Allocated Parking: 100% EV charging provision (min. 7kW) is required.

CYCLE PARKING:

Acceptable in principle.

Visitor cycle parking should be in place.

Cycle store should be secured with CCTV and lighting.

Cycle parking should be monitored as part of any conditioned Travel Plan.

PUBLIC REALM:

It is understood that the public realm is within the red line boundary of the site and will not impact the adopted highway.

BOUNDARY TREATMENTS:

It is recommended that all fencing / railings adjacent to the adopted highway are visually permeable from a distance of 600mm upwards to ensure adequate visual permeability for child pedestrians.

REFUSE AND SERVICING:

Location of the refuse storage area for Block 2 should be confirmed - This should be shown on an updated plan with dimensions included.

A Waste Management Strategy should be conditioned and attached to any planning permission that may be granted.

TRAVEL PLAN: Although the development does not trigger the requirement for a Travel Plan, it is recommended that one is in place.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT:

A detailed CMP will be required prior to any construction works taking place and conditioned with any planning approval.

Strategic Area and Citywide Support Manager - Recommends that conditions are attached, to any permission, in relation to contaminated land (remediation strategy and verification report), construction works, acoustic measures, refuse, air quality and lighting.

Neighbourhood Officer (trees) - Do not have any objections to the application, subject to the work being carried out following their AIA (Arboricultural impact assessment) and BS3998: Tree Work Recommendations. Their AIA states that they will protect the retained trees during construction, which must be adhered to.

Flood Risk Management Unit - Recommends that conditions are attached, to any permission, in relation to the provision of a sustainable surface water drainage system.

Work and Skills Team - Recommend that a condition is attached, to any permission, in relation to a local labour agreement, during the construction process.

Greater Manchester Police - No objections, provided that the development is built to secured by design standards

Transport for Greater Manchester - Makes the following comments:

From a review of the Transport Statement, the TRICS assessment demonstrates that the development trips will be below TfGM's threshold for any further assessment work.

In terms of access arrangements, the site will be served from a simple priority junction from Tan Yard Brow. The junction should include tactile paving and dropped kerbs. Visibility splays in accordance with Manual for Streets are achievable from the site access. Servicing will be undertaken on street from Tan Yard Brow.

TROs may be necessary covering the site access and visibility splays.

It is noted that pedestrian access is achievable via the new footways from Tany Yard Brow or via a new pedestrian access from Hyde Road.

Covered cycle parking for 25 cycles is proposed adjacent to the cottages. This should be a secure covered store suitable for overnight accommodation and also be covered by CCTV and lighting.

United Utilities - Recommends that a conditions is attached, to any permission, in relation to the provision of a sustainable surface water drainage system and foul water drainage scheme.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - Makes the following comments:

Ecological Assessment

The habitat descriptions are very brief in the report, They would expect a species list or indication of what species were present in the modified grassland, please can this be provided.

Great crested newts (GCN) - the methods in the PEA report (page 11) say that a 250m search was carried out for presence of ponds, ditches or watercourses that may support GCN, however the results (page 19) says: 'The site was deemed negligible potential for GCN, and no instances of ideal hibernacula were noted on site.' Justification should be provided as to why the site is negligible for GCN and should not just be stated without reasoning. They would assume that GCN could use the grassland, scrub and adjacent scrub/trees in their terrestrial phase based on photos and aerial imagery. There are also no results of the desk study such as any waterbodies within 250m which GCN may utilise. Please can this be provided.

Himalayan balsam is shown in photo 6 along Gore brook which is offsite (around 7m from site boundary), however vigilance should be applied given it is adjacent to the boundary of the site and therefore could spread onto the site itself.

The badger Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) in Appendix 2 should be followed and secured by condition to safeguard any badgers that could be present in the locality/on-site.

The PEA survey was done in July 2024 which makes it quite outdated.

They also have the following recommendations as these have not been included in the PEA report:

Work that will impact on habitats where nesting birds may be present (for example vegetation clearance), should not be undertaken in the main bird nesting season (March - August) unless suitable checks for active bird nests have been undertaken. We would suggest that a condition to this effect be placed on any permission.

Planning policy encourages enhancements and net gains for biodiversity to be delivered through the planning system. Wherever possible measures to enhance the site for biodiversity should be secured as part of this planning application and could include the integration of bat and bird boxes onto the new buildings or suitable trees. They would suggest that a condition to this effect be placed on any permission.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Baseline Trees:

The PEA report says that there are no trees on-site, however the gain plan (section 1.5) says that there is one sycamore tree in boundary to be removed. Clarification on baseline trees should be provided.

The baseline tab in the metric says 8x poplar trees and 3x self-seeded trees are present. One tree is shown on BNG baseline plan to be removed. Please can the plan be updated to show where the other trees are located. This should also be inline with the Arb assessment for accuracy.

The baseline tab in the metric includes ruderal/ephemeral habitat, this is not shown on baseline map and therefore it is unclear where this habitat is and it should be included.

Proposed Habitats:

There are 19 small trees and 6 medium trees proposed. If medium trees are to be used, evidence must be provided as to how they meet this criteria e.g. by purchasing a larger tree standard etc. When reducing the 6 medium sized trees to small, the application is achieving a loss of -15.92% of habitat units and there is a trading rules error. This issue must be resolved if the 10% BNG is to be achieved on-site.

The 'Landscaping Proposals' drawing shows that there are proposed trees/shrubs and retained grassland areas. In the metric, no grassland has been retained and vegetated gardens have been proposed. Their assumption is that these habitats are all within communal amenity space as opposed to private gardens, however this should be clarified. If they are in amenity space that will be managed (not by residents), then these habitats should be included in the BNG.

Where the mixed scrub has been proposed on the BNG map, it does not appear that this is in line with the Landscaping Proposals.

For the proposed trees/habitats on-site (provided they aren't in private gardens), a 30 year Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be required to detail how they'll be managed and maintained.

Summary

In summary, insufficient information has currently been provided for this application including lack of information regarding great crested newts and issues/discrepancies with the BNG assessment. This further information is required prior to determination of the application.

Environment Agency - No objections, provided that conditions are attached, to any permission, in relation, to flood risk management and contaminated land.

Issues

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) - Sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these should be applied. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has 3 overarching objectives:

An economic objective - to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land, of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

A social objective - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

An environmental objective - to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy

It states that 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 visibly 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.

Section 12 'Achieving Well Designed Places' states that 'the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants. Communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process (paragraph 131).

Section 16 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' states that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraphs 212 to 213 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. 61

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 215 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 219 states that Local Planning Authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework - On 16th December 2025 the government has published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework.

Of relevance to this application, 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.

- Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- In order to contribute to climate change mitigation and the transition to net zero, development proposals should, where relevant to the proposal: Be located where a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes exists,
- Substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing accommodation that will contribute towards meeting the evidenced needs of the local community, taking into account any up-to-date local housing need assessment, and other relevant evidence.
- Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution, assessment and delivery of development proposals.

The draft guidance includes proposed policies as follows:

HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets

1. Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance.
2. Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on heritage assets and their setting should identify the degree of harm
3. In making this assessment it is the effect on an asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.
4. Decision makers should be satisfied that this assessment accurately reflects the effects on heritage assets caused by the proposals.
5. Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, heritage assets with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be employed and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets

1. When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.
2. Development proposals which would have a positive effect on designated heritage assets should be approved.
3. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.
4. Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the development is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss,

HE9: Conservation areas

1. Development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should:

- a. Retain and restore buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area wherever possible; and
- b. Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.

2. Not all elements of a conservation area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where a development proposal would result in the loss of a building or other element which contributes to the character or appearance of a conservation area that is desirable to preserve or enhance, the assessment of impact should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole, and the effects of this considered in accordance with policies HE5 and HE6.

3. Proposals that preserve those elements of a conservation area that make a positive contribution to it (or which better reveal its significance) should be approved.

Whilst this is a draft NPPF for consultation it is considered that the development proposals are not in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it. As set out in the printed report, it is not considered that the proposal responds to the evidenced needs of the local community, does not represent sustainable development and does not respect the Conservation Area setting of the site.

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. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.

Policy SP1 identifies the City Council's Core Development Principles and states that development in all parts of the City should:-

Make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including:-

- Creating well designed places that enhance or create character
- Making a positive contribution to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents
- Considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income.
- Protect and enhance the built and natural environment

Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible.

Improve access to jobs, services, education and open space by being located to reduce the need to travel and provide good access to sustainable transport provision.

Policy H4 relates to sites in East Manchester and states that, over the lifetime of the Core Strategy, East Manchester will accommodate around 30% of new residential development. Priority will be given to family housing and other high value, high quality development where this can be sustained. High density housing will be permitted within the parts of East Manchester that fall within the Regional Centre which are adjacent to the City Centre. These neighbourhoods include Ancoats, New Islington, Holt Town and Chancellor's Place; to the west of Alan Turing Way, and within Eastlands, Newton Heath, Openshaw and Gorton district centres as part of mixed-use schemes.

Policy EN1 relates to Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas. It states that all development in Manchester will be expected to follow the seven principles of urban design, as identified in national planning guidance and have regard to the strategic character area in which the development is located. Opportunities for good design to enhance the overall image of the City should be fully realised, particularly on major radial and orbital road and rail routes.

Policy EN3 relates to heritage, and states that throughout the City, the Council will encourage development that complements and takes advantage of the distinct historic and heritage features of its districts and neighbourhoods, including those of the City Centre. New developments must be designed so as to support the Council in preserving or, where possible, enhancing the historic environment, the character, setting and accessibility of areas and buildings of acknowledged importance, including scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas and archaeological remains. Proposals which enable the re-use of heritage assets will be encouraged where they are considered consistent with the significance of the heritage asset.

Policy EN9 relates to Green Infrastructure. It states that new development will be expected to maintain existing green infrastructure in terms of its quantity, quality and multiple function. Where the opportunity arises and in with current Green Infrastructure Strategies the Council will encourage developers to enhance the quality and quantity of green infrastructure, improve the performance of its functions and create and improve linkages to and between areas of green infrastructure. Where the benefits of a proposed development are considered to outweigh the loss of an existing element of green infrastructure, the developer will be required to demonstrate how this loss will be mitigated in terms of quantity, quality, function and future management.

Policy EN15 relates to Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. It states that the Council will seek to maintain or enhance sites of biodiversity and geological value throughout the City. Developers will be expected to identify and implement reasonable opportunities to enhance, restore or create new biodiversity, either on-site or adjacent to the site, contributing to linkages between valuable or potentially valuable habitat areas where appropriate.

Policy EN19 relates to waste and states that the Council will require all developers to submit a waste management plan to demonstrate how both construction and demolition waste will be minimised and recycled on site wherever possible and how the sustainable waste management needs of the end user will be met.

Policy T2 states that outside the City Centre all new development should provide appropriate car parking facilities, taking account of the guidance in Appendix B (of the Core Strategy). In all parts of the City proposals should have regard to the need for disabled and cycle parking, in line with appendix B (this indicates maximum car parking standards for various uses).

Notwithstanding the above, Policy T2 requires that consideration is given to the particular circumstances of each proposal to determine the appropriate levels of car parking that may be required. Policy T2 requires the provision of proportionate Traffic Impact Assessments and Travel Plans for all major applications and for any proposals where there are likely to be access or transport issues.

Policy DM 1 states that all development should have regard to the following specific issues for which more detailed

guidance may be given within a supplementary planning document:-

- Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.
- Impact on the 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.

- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality and road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise.
- Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes.
- Community safety and crime prevention.
- Design for health.
- Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.
- Refuse storage and collection.
- Vehicular access and car parking.
- Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage.
- Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private.
- Flood risk and drainage.
- Existing or proposed hazardous installations.

Unitary Development Plan - The lies in the Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area, as indicated in the plan, and is covered by saved policy GO12. This states that the Council will permit proposals in Line with the Gore Brook Valley Park Strategy to create an informal open space linking Sunny Brow Park and Debdale Park, and will refuse planning permission for proposals which conflict with that objective. Further improvements will include landscape works to Brookfield Churchyard and leisure uses on land adjacent to Gorton Reservoir.

Saved Development Control Policy DC18.1 relates to Conservation Areas and states:

The Council will give particularly careful consideration to development proposals within Conservation Areas.

a. The Council will seek to preserve and enhance the character of its designated conservation areas by carefully considering the following issues:

- i) the relationship of new structures to neighbouring buildings and spaces;
- ii) the effect of major changes to the appearance of existing buildings;
- iii) the desirability of retaining existing features, such as boundary walls, gardens, trees, (including street trees);
- iv) the effect of signs and advertisements;

v) any further guidance on specific areas which has been approved by the Council.

b. The Council will not normally grant outline planning permission for development within Conservation Areas.

c. Consent to demolish a building in a conservation area will be granted only where it can be shown that it is wholly beyond repair, incapable of reasonably beneficial use, or where its removal or replacement would benefit the appearance of character of the area.

d. Where demolition is to be followed by redevelopment, demolition will be permitted only where there are approved detailed plans for that redevelopment and where the Council has been furnished with evidence that the development will be undertaken.

e. Development proposals adjacent to Conservation Areas will be granted only where it can be shown that they will not harm the appearance or character of the area. This will include the protection of views into and out of Conservation Areas.

Saved Development Control policy DC26, of the Unitary Development Plan, relates to development and noise and states that 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.

Saved policy DC18.1 relates to Listed Buildings and states that the Council will have regard to the desirability of securing the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of such

buildings and to protecting their general settings by; not permitting any external or internal alterations or addition to a listed building where, in its opinion, there would be an adverse effect on its architectural or historic character; and seek to preserve and enhance the setting of listed buildings by appropriate control over the design of new development in their vicinity, control over the use of adjacent land, and where appropriate, by the preservation of trees and landscape features.

Saved policy DC26.1 states that 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.
- b. the implications of new development being exposed to existing noise sources, which are effectively outside planning control.

The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance was formally adopted in April 2007, and is therefore relevant in this case. At that time, Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' stated that to facilitate efficient delivery of high quality development, Local Planning Authorities should draw on relevant guidance and standards and promote the use of appropriate tools and techniques, such as Design Coding alongside urban design guidelines, detailed masterplans, village design statements, site briefs and community participation techniques.

In the City of Manchester, the relevant design tool is the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance. This guidance 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, that is character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability.

The guidance advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods, the design of streets should promote neighbourliness and design should respect and be informed by location. The guidance also advises that buildings should relate well to each other and building heights should be carefully considered. In terms of ease of movement, cul-de-sacs are discouraged, the street network should contribute to the character of the area, safe routes for cyclists and pedestrians will be promoted, and public transport should be easy to use. Places with attractive and successful public areas are encouraged with open spaces reflecting and accommodating future uses with children and young people being considered in the design and location of open spaces. Neighbourhoods should contain a mix of housing, safety and security are vital elements of the urban area, the impact of parking areas should be minimised and new developments should maximise access for disabled people.

Point 10.9 relates to external space and states that all residents should enjoy useable private amenity space wherever they choose to live in the City. All new developments should be designed to provide on-site amenity space which is fit for purpose and which is informed by, and relates to, the character of the area. Simply this means the provision of gardens that perform well as multi-functional space. Gardens are valuable within any development by contributing the following:

- A safe play area for children
- Additional storage outside the house
- The provision of outside drying area for clothes which additionally assists the environmental sustainability of a development
- Space in which to relax which helps the overall sense of well-being
- An increased amount of planting which enhances the quality of the natural environment

- The space to provide home grown food which benefits the health of the local community.

Manchester Residential Quality Guidance 2016 sets out the direction for the delivery of sustainable neighbourhoods of choice where people will want to live and also raise the quality of life across Manchester and was approved by the Executive at its meeting on 14 December 2016. The ambitions of the City are articulated in many places, but none more succinctly than in the 'Manchester Strategy' (2016). The guidance has been produced with the ambition, spirit and delivery of the Manchester Strategy at its heart. The delivery of high-quality, flexible housing will be fundamental to ensuring the sustainable growth of Manchester. To achieve the City's target of carbon neutrality by 2050, residential schemes will also need to be forward thinking in terms of incorporating the most appropriate and up to date technologies to significantly reduce emissions. It is therefore essential for applicants to consider and integrate the design principles contained within the draft guidance into all aspects of emerging residential schemes. In this respect, the guidance is relevant to all stages of the development process, including funding negotiations, the planning process, construction and through to operational management.

The guidance sets standards for securing high quality and sustainable residential development in Manchester. The document includes standards for internal space within new dwellings and is suitable for applications across all tenures. It adopts the nationally described space standards and this has been applied to an assessment of the size and quality of the proposed units. The guidance states that one bedroom, two-person, flats should have a minimum floor area of 50 square metres and two bedroom, three person, flats should have a minimum floor area of 61 square metres. All the proposed apartments are slightly above this requirement.

Places for Everyone - The approved Places for Everyone Plan is a Joint Development Plan Document, providing a strategic plan and policies, for 9 of the 10 boroughs which make up Greater Manchester.

The Plan identifies the essential aspect of the efficient and effective use of land with the preference to be given to making as much use as possible of suitable previously developed brownfield land and vacant buildings when meeting development needs.

Relevant policies of PfE in this instance are:

JP-S1: Sustainable development

JP-C8: Transport Requirements of New Development

JP-G8 : A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

JP-P1: Sustainable Places

JP-P2: Heritage - This states that the LPA will proactively manage and work with partners to positively conserve, sustain and enhance our historic environment and heritage assets and their settings. Opportunities will be pursued to aid the promotion, enjoyment, understanding and interpretation of heritage assets, as a means of maximising wider public benefits and reinforcing Greater Manchester's distinct character, identity and sense of place.

Principle of development - The site was formerly occupied by a semi-detached house, now demolished, on a row of similar residential properties. The application effectively proposes to replace this house, which is considered to be acceptable in principle. This is subject to other considerations, such as design, amenity, car parking, relationship with the Conservation Area and BNG requirements.

Principle of residential development - The site lies in the Conservation Area and is part of a network of sites that contribute to the Conservation Area, given its openness and landscaping, which contributes to its semi-rural character. The present semi-rural nature of the area might imply that new building activity would be inappropriate, on the site, but the area does contain a

number of residential properties that link into wider residential areas beyond. It is therefore considered that there is the potential for some limited small-scale residential development that otherwise respects the character of the Conservation Area, and conserves its semi-rural appearance.

Impact on the Conservation Area - The Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area comprises a mix of land and buildings centred on the Gore Brook Valley. The northern part of the Conservation Area retains a verdant appearance and, when combined with the narrowness of Tan Yard Brow, provides a sense of the pre-industrial semi-rural character. This rural character is reinforced by the short terrace of listed cottages on Tarn Yard Brow and Spring Bank Farmhouse.

The Heritage Statement highlights the fact that the site was previously more extensively developed and contained a mix of buildings linked to the railway (now forming part of the Fallowfield Loop). The site currently contributes aesthetic value and sense of historic character also evidenced in the stone boundary wall bounding the site. While the existence of former structures on the site provides historic precedent, it is not considered that this justifies the massing and form of development proposed. It is recognised that the wider suburbanisation of the area has also altered the contextual setting to the area and has in part undermined the semi-rural character, but it is considered that this emphasises that conserving the verdant and semi-rural character is currently more pressing and eroding this further would fail to conserve the character of the Conservation Area.

It is considered that the proposed Block 1 two and three storey apartment building would present a significant building mass on elevated ground which would be visually dominant and impacting on the semi-rural character of the area. It is considered that the deep footprint and mix of gables would fail to create a coherent architectural form or resonate with the character of the area. Combined with extensive hardstanding for parking and brick retaining walls the development would appear incongruous in the existing rural setting. The apartment building would appear very dominant when viewed from the north and thereby fail to conserve the verdant character of the Conservation area. The applicant has submitted revised plans, which show a slight reduction in the height of this block, but this is considered to be a negligible reduction, that does not address these concerns. Also, the car parking spaces have been changed from tarmac to paving stone, but this is still a hard surface finish, that does not reduce the amount of hardstanding proposed.

The proposed block of 8 units fronting Tarn Yard Brow is considered to relate better to the architectural appearance of the listed cottages in the Conservation Area, as their massing and scale would be more consistent with traditional buildings in the Conservation area. Their siting would however require significant excavation of the banking and removal of stone boundary wall which would adversely harm the character and heritage significance of the heritage asset. It is considered that there is no reason why the stone wall could not be rebuilt to form a front boundary to this block and thereby mitigate the harm. These units would also have very limited private amenity space and the porch structures to the rear add a cluttered feel. Also, window styles and doors could be better refined to be more sympathetic to the historic character.

It is considered that the west elevation of Block 1, facing on to the access road, does not clearly identify as a main entrance and presents a confusing array of gables failing to present a high-quality design. Stone banding and lighter brick colouring to the top floor would further clutter the elevations. The stone ashlar projecting bays are also not typical of the area.

It is considered that the development, by virtue of its massing, design and prominence undermines the semi-rural character of the area and would thereby fail to conserve or enhance the Gore Brook Valley Conservation area. It would thereby conflict with NPPF policies 212, 215 and 219 and PpE Policy JP-P2. It would also conflict with guidance set out in the Conservation

Area Appraisal for the Gore Brook Valley which seeks to conserve the rural aspects of the conservation area.

Impact on the setting of listed buildings - The site lies in close proximity to a small number of grade II listed buildings which are situated to the north of the Gore Brook. These are 60-66 High Bank, Spring Bank Farmhouse and Adjoining Farm Building and 56-60 Tan Yard Brow.

The site lies in the immediate background of the listed cottages at 56-60 Tan Yard Brow and given the elevated nature of the site, the development would fall within the wider setting of the listed cottages. There is, therefore a clear visual relationship with the asset and the proposed development. The row of cottages comprising nos. 56 to 60 Tan Yard Brow were built for the tannery workers and sit on a sloping site adjacent to Gore Brook. The ground floor windows have the original segmental arched heads, but all the original doors and windows have been replaced. The cottages however still retain a pre-industrial character and semi-rural setting.

As the site rises steeply to the south from Gore Brook the new apartment building Block 1 would be visually prominent and form the backdrop to the setting of the cottages. Given its siting, height and massing it would have a domineering and urbanising impact on the semi-rural setting which would diminish the appreciation of the listed buildings especially when viewed from the North. There would be some seasonal filtering from existing trees bounding the site but the structure would still be impactful given the elevated nature of the proposed development which would be visible above the tree canopy. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be detrimental to the setting of these listed buildings.

Whilst the development would constitute less than substantial harm to the semi-rural character of the Conservation Area and the setting of designated heritage assets, as indicated in Section 16 of the NPPF, it is considered that the proposed development by virtue of its massing, siting and design would have an urbanising effect, and result in overdevelopment of the site that would detract from the verdant character of the Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area. It is considered that, for residential development to be supported on this site, an alternative form of development is needed that is more sympathetic to the verdant character of the area.

Site layout - The site retains a good amount of open land, but this is largely provided to the south of the proposed blocks, where the footway/ramp link to Hyde Road is proposed. In the main area of development it is considered that the proposed development is dominated by building and hardstanding, and this would be the overriding characteristic of the development, when viewed from Tan Yard Brow and internally within the site. The proposed blocks are positioned in such a way, that this also contributes to an over dominant appearance of the development, and lead to a loss of part of the open aspect of the development, as indicated above. Saved policy GO12, of the Manchester UDP, covers this site and its purpose is to improve the local environment and provide a comprehensive network of linked open spaces and varied recreational uses. The Gore Brook Valley Park Strategy has been pursued by the Council for many years and has the Strategic objective of improving access to areas of open land from the surrounding residential areas. It seeks to create and retain the informal open space links, through the Conservation Area, and it is considered that the urbanisation of this part of Tan Yard Brow, would be contrary to this objective, adversely impacting upon the current semi-rural nature of the locality. The proposed site layout is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

Housing mix/affordable housing - It is the case that the majority of properties in the Conservation Area, and surrounding wider area, are family housing, which is the main characteristic of the area. It is considered that smaller residential units tend to attract people who will live in the property for a comparatively short period of time and consequently they do not have the same interest in the well-being of an area as those who are less transient. It is

believed that this cyclical change in occupiers has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area and a development, that comprises wholly of apartments, is considered to be inappropriate in this location. as it would fail to provide the type of accommodation to which the community aspires.

The proposed apartments are all one and two bedroom units, with no larger family units provided. The applicant was asked to consider providing a development that included family housing, but this has not been provided. It is therefore considered that the development would provide low quality residential units that would be unsuitable for use as family accommodation and would offer no scope for flexibility in accommodating changing family requirements. It is probable that the proposed new flats could cater for individual occupiers for relatively short periods of time, i.e. transient occupiers. It is considered that the proposal would act against the drive to improve housing choice in the local area and inhibit the area's ability to retain residents in the long term. A likely consequence of increasing transience is lower aspirations within the community and an increased risk of poor management and therefore urban blight within the community, to the detriment of ongoing regeneration and the associated drive to achieve sustainable communities.

The applicant indicates that all 25 flats would be for social rent. The applicant states that the flats would be let in accordance with the requirements of the government's policy statement on Rents for Social Housing and the Regulator of Social Housing Rent Standard, but no registered provider has been identified. Whilst this can be considered to be a benefit, of the proposal, this does not dictate that only apartments can be provided on site and social family housing could have formed part of the scheme. Also, it is considered that the fact that all the apartments would be for social rent, does not justify the approval of a development that is otherwise considered to be unacceptable, for the reasons outlined in this report.

Residential amenity/highways - A significant number of objections have been received, to this proposal, from local residents. Concerns relate to noise, from the development, as well as the need for family housing, rather than apartments, and the impact of the development on the character and setting of the nearby listed buildings and the Conservation Area. The most commonly identified concern though was the introduction of 25 new residential units and the impact that this would have upon Tan Yard Brow, and the surrounding road network, in terms of increased traffic, congestion and the potential for overspill on-street parking, on what is already a narrow road. A further issue identified is that Tan Yard Brow is partly a one-way street, with access prohibited from Hyde Road. However, as this is not controlled by CCTV, drivers continually breach this restriction, leading to vehicles travelling the wrong way down a one-way street, and it is considered that the additional number of vehicular trips taking place, would undoubtedly lead to some future residents also following this pattern. It is considered that, for a residential development to be considered on this site, this point would need to be addressed.

Despite the concern of residents, Highways Services have not formally objected to the application, at this time. However, requests for additional information was requested, from the applicant, in relation to matters such as the provision of accident data and a review of Traffic Regulation Orders, in the vicinity of the site, site access and pedestrian access arrangements, a swept path analysis, car parking dimensions and the provision of EV charging points. A response was not received, from the applicant, and it cannot therefore be confirmed that these site arrangements are acceptable, and that the proposal would not lead to adverse highway safety implications for the surrounding road network.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - The detailed comments of the Greater Manchester Ecological Unit are provided above. In summary, the GMEU consider that insufficient information has currently been provided for this application including lack of information regarding habitat descriptions, in particular that for great crested newts and there are issues and discrepancies

with the BNG assessment. This matter was identified to the applicant, but no response was received. It cannot therefore be determined that the proposed development would not adversely impact upon existing habitats, or that BNG requirements can be met on site.

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 identified issues in a proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. In this instance it was not possible to negotiate an appropriate solution that was acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. Negotiations were entered into matters including the scale of development, site layout and relationship of the proposed development to the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings, but no significant amendments to the scheme were received, that addressed indicated concerns. In addition, no response was received in relation to requests for further information regarding highways and BNG matters. The applicant was requested to withdraw the application, so that all points could be addressed, but they wish the application to be determined, based on the latest submitted scheme.

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

1) The proposed development by reason of its design, scale, appearance, building height and site layout, would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area. The proposed works would form an incongruous feature within the

street scene and disrupt the relationship of the site with Tan Yard Brow, in this part of the Conservation Area, to the detriment of the local townscape. The proposed development would represent an overdevelopment of the site that would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the site's contribution to the Conservation Area, resulting in an urbanising effect that would cause harm to the special interest of the Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area, the local sense of place and its distinctive semi-rural composition. As such, the proposed development is contrary to saved policy DC18.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies DM1, EN3 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2) The proposed development by reason of its design, scale, appearance, building height and site layout, would have a harmful impact on the openness and semi-rural appearance of Tan Yard Brow and the Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area in that it does not enhance or maintain informal open space links, which currently exist throughout the Conservation Area. It would create additional built form on Tan Yard Brow, which would require significant excavation of the banking and removal of stone boundary wall which would adversely harm the character and openness/semi-rural nature of the locality. As such, the proposed development is contrary to saved policies GO12 and DC18.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies DM1, EN15 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3) The proposed development, by reason of its siting, height and massing, would be visually prominent, forming the backdrop to the setting of nearby listed buildings (56 to 60 Tan Yard Brow) and would have a domineering and urbanising impact on the semi-rural setting which would diminish the appreciation of the listed buildings. The development therefore results in an unduly harmful impact on the visual amenity and character of the listed buildings resulting in less than substantial harm. The required public benefits do not exist to outweigh the level of harm caused. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy JP-P2 of Places for Everyone, Policies SP1, EN1, EN3 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, Saved policy DC19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

4) The applicant has failed to demonstrate that there is the demand for the type of accommodation proposed, namely apartments, in this location outside of a district centre/commercial centre and within an area of predominantly family residential houses, where a need for further family housing has been identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP1, H1 and H4 of Manchester Core Strategy Development and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5) The proposed development would result in an over-intensive use of the property, with a consequential increase in the levels of activity, including increased 'comings and goings', noise disturbance, traffic congestion and parking pressures in the vicinity of the site. This in turn would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, 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 provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

6) The applicant has failed to provide sufficient details to fully assess the highways implications of proposal, as the application is lacking in details relating to the provision of accident data and a review of Traffic Regulation Orders, in the vicinity of the site, site access and pedestrian access arrangements, a swept path analysis, car parking dimensions and the provision of EV

charging points. The applicant has not therefore demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact upon the existing highway network, that safe accessing and egressing of the site, by vehicles, is provided, and that there would be no adverse impact upon pedestrian safety and the amenity of local residents, in the vicinity of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies T1, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7) The applicant has failed to provide sufficient details to fully assess the potential loss of habitats on site and Biodiversity Net Gain requirements on site. The applicant has not therefore demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact upon the existing site habitats, and biodiversity on site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy EN15 of the Manchester Core Strategy, Policy JP-G8 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document, guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)
MCC Flood Risk Management
Heritage & Urban Design
Greater Manchester Police
United Utilities Water PLC
Environment Agency
Transport For Greater Manchester
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Work & Skills Team

6 Woodland Avenue, Manchester, M18 7HF
Store, The Tannery, Tan Yard Brow, Manchester, M18 8UJ
PureGym, Wall Way, Manchester, M18 7LN
17 Sandheys Grove, Manchester, M18 7FE
11 Sandheys Grove, Manchester, M18 7FE
4 Woodland Avenue, Manchester, M18 7HF
8 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
4 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
2 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
7 Gratrix Street, Manchester, M18 7FH
5 Gratrix Street, Manchester, M18 7FH
3 Gratrix Street, Manchester, M18 7FH
Flat 3, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Flat 2, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Flat 1, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Flat 4, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
774 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
Newton And French, Tan Yard Brow, Manchester, M18 8UJ
Flat 8, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Holiday Inn Express, Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7LJ
First Floor Flat, 778 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
Ground Floor Flat, 778 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
3 Tannery Way, Manchester, M18 8LH
774A Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
1 Tannery Way, Manchester, M18 8LH
778 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
Flat 2, 9 Gratrix Street, Manchester, M18 7FH
Flat 3, 758 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
15 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
3 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
764 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
3 Tanners Street, Manchester, M18 8WT
Flat 7, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Flat 6, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Flat 5, 752 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
9 Gratrix Street, Manchester, M18 7FH
758 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
Flat 2, 758 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
9 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
Flat 1, 758 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF

Flat 1, 9 Gratrix Street, Manchester, M18 7FH
Flat 3, 776 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
Flat 2, 776 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
Flat 1, 776 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
6 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
19 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
17 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
13 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
19 Sandheys Grove, Manchester, M18 7FE
762 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
11 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
776 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7JD
7 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
5 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
1 Willow Grove, Manchester, M18 7FG
15 Sandheys Grove, Manchester, M18 7FE
12 Woodland Avenue, Manchester, M18 7HF
1 Tanners Street, Manchester, M18 8WT
The Tannery, Tan Yard Brow, Manchester, M18 8UJ
Workshop 1, The Tannery, Tan Yard Brow, Manchester, M18 8UJ
7 Tannery Way, Manchester, M18 8LH
5 Tannery Way, Manchester, M18 8LH
13 Sandheys Grove, Manchester, M18 7FE
760 Hyde Road, Manchester, M18 7EF
8 Woodland Avenue, Manchester, M18 7HF
2 Woodland Avenue, Manchester, M18 7HF
10 Woodland Avenue, Manchester, M18 7HF

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
Conservation Area - Gore Brook Valley Conservation Area 1994
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Flood Zone Plus Climate Change -
Main River Consultation Zone -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA