

Comments for Planning Application 143452/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143452/FO/2025

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

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

Case Officer: Steven McCoombe

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Planning Officer,

I write to formally object to the planning application relating to 69 Crumpsall lane

We are the owners and residents of the bordering property to the rear which directly adjoins the proposed development site and shares a boundary with the proposed playground area. Our objection is made on clear material planning grounds, as set out below.

1. Existing Highway Safety Concerns and Increased Traffic Risk

Our property is located within a small residential cul-de-sac that already experiences significant on-street parking pressure. Vehicles are frequently parked close to the junction and along the road, restricting visibility and narrowing access.

Tragically, in 2013 a local resident was fatally struck by a vehicle at the corner of our street.

Parked cars and restricted sightlines were known concerns at that location. This demonstrates that the junction already has a history of vulnerability in terms of pedestrian and highway safety.

The proposed school operating Monday-Friday 8:00-17:30 and weekends 9:00-13:00 will inevitably generate concentrated drop-off and pick-up periods, resulting in:

Increased vehicle movements within a confined turning area

Informal and short-term parking near the junction

Obstruction of driveways

Compromised visibility splays

Increased risk to pedestrians and children

Potential delays for emergency vehicle access

The cul-de-sac was not designed to accommodate this intensity of traffic generation. The proposal would materially exacerbate existing and historically documented highway safety concerns. A

Traffic Impact Assessment and enforceable Traffic Management Plan would be essential; however, even with mitigation, the fundamental physical constraints of the road remain.

2. Noise, Loss of Residential Amenity and Risk of Future Intensification

Our property directly shares a boundary with the proposed playground. Outdoor play noise on a daily basis, including weekends, would represent a substantial and ongoing intrusion into our home and garden.

This is currently a quiet residential area. The introduction of an institutional use operating seven days per week represents a significant and harmful change to the character of the cul-de-sac. Both occupants of our household work full-time from home. Prolonged and repetitive playground noise immediately adjacent to our boundary would materially interfere with our ability to carry out our employment.

We are particularly concerned given previous local reporting of comparable situations. On 10 June 2021, 19 September 2021, and 8 June 2022, the Manchester Evening News reported on residents in Salford and Higher Broughton experiencing sustained disturbance from school playground noise within residential settings. Those reports referenced ongoing complaints, mitigation measures, and operational alterations following resident concerns.

These cases demonstrate that when educational facilities are positioned in very close proximity to residential boundaries, noise impacts can be significant, persistent, and difficult to resolve once permission is granted. There is therefore a foreseeable risk that noise impacts here may exceed expectations and require future alteration or intensification, further compounding harm to neighbouring amenity.

3. Boundary Proximity and Inadequate Mitigation

The proposal places an active playground directly along our shared residential boundary without adequate buffering.

No detailed information has been provided regarding:

Acoustic fencing specifications

Noise attenuation measures

Landscape buffering

Restricted outdoor play schedules

Given the immediate adjacency to private gardens, the absence of robust mitigation measures is unacceptable and would result in significant loss of residential amenity.

4. Visual Impact and 2.4 Metre Mesh Security Fencing

The application proposes a 2.4 metre high mesh security fence along the street frontage and our boundary wall.

Such fencing would be visually intrusive, out of character with the domestic nature of the cul-de-sac, and harmful to the street scene. It would introduce an institutional appearance inconsistent with surrounding residential properties, materially altering the character and visual amenity of the area.

5. Secondary Noise Impacts

Our dog spends considerable time in our garden. Continuous playground activity directly adjacent to our boundary is likely to trigger reactive barking, creating additional and avoidable noise disturbance within the cul-de-sac. This further demonstrates the incompatibility of the proposed use in such close proximity to established residential gardens.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposal would:

Exacerbate existing and historically documented highway safety risks

Significantly worsen parking congestion within a constrained cul-de-sac

Result in substantial and ongoing loss of residential amenity

Harm the visual character of the street

Represent an inappropriate intensification of use in a quiet residential setting

For these reasons, we respectfully request that Manchester City Council refuse planning permission for this development.