

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144788/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 22 January 2026
Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and garage conversion with roof over side extension.
Address: 54 Merston Drive, Manchester, M20 5WT
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Ayyub Rahman
Agent (if any): Mr Rashid Mehmood, I. Planning Services
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 12 March 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 6 February 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 4 February 2026 Expired: 25 February 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 29 January 2026 Expired: 19 February 2026

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 54 Merston Drive within the south Manchester ward of Didsbury East. The application site relates to a detached, two storey red brick dwellinghouse sited at the top of the cul-de-sac of Merston Drive which faces in an easterly direction. The property is characterised by a dual pitched roof, hipped front porch and two storey flat roof side extension sited close to the boundary with no.52 Merston Drive, and a single storey rear extension. External amenity space for the property takes the form of paved areas and some areas of soft landscaping with mature trees and soft landscaping sited along the southern and western boundary of the site.

Description of area

The applicant site sits within a residential area to the east of Kingsway comprising of similar properties. The rear boundary of the site backs onto the Kingsway to the west.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and garage conversion with roof over side extension.

The part single storey rear extension would involve infilling the currently open area to the rear of the garage and to the side of the dining room. The part two storey rear extension would involve creating a first floor extension across the built form of the existing and proposed first floor rear extension. Such extension would have a projection of 3 metres and the extension would have a total height of 8 metres.

The existing two storey flat roof garage would be amended to have a pitched roof, with a height of approximately 7 metres. The existing garage would be amended to a ground floor bathroom.

The proposal would involve the insertion of 1no. window within the front elevation, 4no. windows within the rear elevation and 1no. obscure glazed window within the northern elevation.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed within the submitted application form as to match the host property.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

2no. windows within the proposed southern elevation were removed from the proposal due to concerns with overlooking to the detriment of no.52 Merston Drive.

Discussions took place with the agent in respect to a second stair case proposed within the development.

Discrepancies with labels attached to plans were addressed with the submission of revised plans.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site, including the two storey side extension. Google Maps imagery shows the side extension has been there from at least August 2019 and so would be considered to have deemed consent.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and 1no. neutral response was received. The representative requested a swift brick condition should be attached to any approval granted to provide enhancement for biodiversity.

MCC Flood Risk Management

Colleagues in MCC Flood Risk Management requested a Flood Risk Assessment be attached to any approval granted. The Team also requested informatives in respect of the Environment Agency, existing surface water drainage system and a nearby culvert be attached to any approval granted.

MCC Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)

The Team reviewed the proposed works, including the requirement for supervised root pruning and excavation within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of trees T5) and T6), and the associated site-monitoring arrangements.

Given that these trees are located on the boundary of Kingsway, the Team would have no objection to the works taking place on the condition that all measures outlined in Sections 3.7

(Supervised Root Pruning and Excavation) and 3.8 (Site Monitoring) are fully adhered to throughout the development process, to ensure their long-term health and structural stability and prevent unnecessary stress or decline that could compromise their condition adjacent to the busy highway.

T8# Sycamore- recommendation- remove to facilitate the development: The tree has poor form, low amenity value and would not qualify for TPO status, therefore the Team can confirm they would have no objection to the removal of this tree.

Issues POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) an environmental objective.

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

- i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- ii. Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places.
- iii. Chapter 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (16th December 2025)

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

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

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

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

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

Policy DM1 (Development Management);

Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) (partially superseded by PfE);

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas);

Policy EN9 (Green Infrastructure);

Policy EN15 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) (partially superseded by PfE).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
- d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow

gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

Places for Everyone (2022-2039)

Places for Everyone is a long-term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth. It has been published by the GMCA on behalf of the nine districts and took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024. The Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:

JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and garage conversion with roof over side extension. The scheme has been subject to amendments which were considered necessary to overcome concerns raised in respect of the potential for the perception of overlooking from windows within the northern side elevation. Discussions took place with the agent in respect of the second staircase proposed. Given such revisions and given the proposal would provide the homeowners with additional living accommodation to support the changing needs of families without moving, such development can be considered acceptable in principle. The proposal is considered to support the general thrust of provisions within policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Residential Amenity

No.52 Merston Drive:

No.52 Merston Drive sits to the north of the applicant site and as existing experiences the two storey flat roof side extension connected to the applicant site. Additional built form would be erected to the rear of the existing garage structure and would result in a 3 metre extension at both levels but would come no closer to the shared boundary than the existing garage. Given a 4.5 metre gap would be retained between this element of development and the common boundary, and given the applicant site sits at a splayed nature to that of the neighbour to the north and some built form would be partially blocked by the neighbour's garage, it is not considered this element of development would adversely impact the neighbour in respect of overbearing or any loss of light.

A window would be inserted within the side elevation at ground floor level of such extension behind the existing garage and would relate to a bathroom window. Given the location of such window, it is not considered to give rise to any adverse overlooking implications to no.52. Further, the window would be conditioned to be obscure glazed within any approval granted.

The conversion of the garage would result in the loss of the garage door to be replaced with a window. Whilst the window would face the side wall of the neighbouring property, any overlooking implications would not be considered to be severe for this neighbour. Further, the neighbour's window that would be closest to be impacted has a level of obscure glazing.

Given the applicant site's location at the head of the cul-de-sac and given there are no immediate neighbours to the east, south or west, there are no further neighbours that would be impacted in respect of residential amenity.

Use of the property and extension:

It is noted the proposal would involve the insertion of a 2nd stair case. The applicant was asked to remove the second stair case, for concern the extension could be used independently to the main dwellinghouse. Justification was provided from the agent as to why the second staircase was required, who confirmed they had no intention to sub-divide the accommodation, which would always operate as ancillary accommodation. On balance and with the inclusion of a condition to this effect, such issue would not be considered reasonable to refuse the application and so can be accepted in this instance.

It is noted an existing first floor window within the front elevation would now relate to a bedroom as a result of the proposal. To protect the privacy of the applicant, a condition would be attached to any approval granted for the window to be obscure glazed, so to minimise opportunity for adverse privacy implications.

In short, the proposal is considered pursuant to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Visual Amenity

The garage conversion with roof over side extension would be visible from within the streetscene. The existing flat roof structure of the two storey side extension relates poorly to the roof form of the host property and so the change of the roof form is welcomed. The loss of the garage door to be replaced by a window is considered common place in residential settings and so does not give rise to any concern in respect of visual harm.

As such the proposal is pursuant to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of

the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design, Appearance and Scale

Materials:

The materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed and would match the properties within the streetscene. A materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Part single rear extension:

The part single storey rear extension would infill the area between the existing two storey side extension and the existing dining room extension. Such projection would be 3 metres and so would be pursuant to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP where it specifies rearward projections should not exceed 3.65 metres. Given the projection would key into the existing development, the scale of this element is considered acceptable.

Part two storey rear extension:

This element of works would have a projection of 3 metres and so would be pursuant to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP where it specifies rearward projections should not exceed 3.65 metres. The extension would sit above the extension at ground floor level and so the projection is considered appropriate. Given the applicant site's hidden location with no neighbours to the west, such projection is considered to be accommodated within the site without giving rise to any adverse amenity implications. The entire roof would be enlarged, as opposed to having a separate roof line for the rear extension. However given the concealed location of the property and given the property would still retain the dual pitched roof as is seen as existing, such roof alteration is considered to be accepted in the site without giving rise to an overly bulky structure.

Garage conversion with roof over side extension:

The garage conversion in isolation could be achieved through the route of permitted development and as the materials to be used would match the host property, such element of works would be considered acceptable in respect of design. The introduction of a hipped roof is a welcome improvement from the existing flat roof which is considered contrary to Policy DC13.b of the UDP.

In short, the proposed design and scale of the proposal is considered pursuant in regard to the resultant appearance and so would be considered contrary to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and EN1.

Off Street Parking

Whilst the proposal would result in the loss of the existing garage, there would be adequate off street parking provision as a result of the proposal. No concern is raised in respect of this.

Bin Storage

Adequate space would remain for bins to be stored within the private amenity space connected to the property. No information is required in respect of bin storage.

Flood Risk

The site lies within Flood Zone 2. Colleagues in the LLFA requested a full Flood Risk Assessment be attached to any approval granted. However, given the proposed development is a residential extension, a full Flood Risk Assessment was not required as it would be disproportionately onerous given the limited scale and nature of the works, and the LLFA was satisfied that suitable Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures can be incorporated to mitigate residual risk. An informative has been attached to the decision advising the applicant to incorporate PFR measures.

Swift Bricks

A representative received during the course of the application requested a swift brick condition should be attached to any approval granted to provide enhancement for biodiversity. Whilst a condition is considered onerous given the scale of development, an informative to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Impact to Trees

To support the application, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement was supplied for consideration by colleagues in Arboriculture. 6 individual trees, two groups of trees and one woodland groups were surveyed for the purpose of the appraisal.

The Team reviewed the proposed works, including the requirement for supervised root pruning and excavation within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of trees T5) and T6), and the associated site-monitoring arrangements.

Given that these trees are located on the boundary of Kingsway, the Team would have no objection to the works taking place on the condition that all measures outlined in Sections 3.7 (Supervised Root Pruning and Excavation) and 3.8 (Site Monitoring) are fully adhered to throughout the development process, to ensure their long-term health and structural stability and prevent unnecessary stress or decline that could compromise their condition adjacent to the busy highway.

T8# Sycamore- recommendation- remove to facilitate the development: The tree has poor form, low amenity value and would not qualify for TPO status, therefore the Team can confirm they would have no objection to the removal of this tree.

Given the Arboriculture Team are happy with the proposals and given conditions would be attached to any approval granted to ensure the works are done in accordance with the submitted documentations, the proposal can be considered acceptable in accordance with policies EN3, EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

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

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, guided the applicant through issues arising with the application and appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Documents:

-Application Form, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 22 January 2026.

-Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Lally Tree Management, dated 21 January 2026, report ref: 2796_AIA.01), stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 22 January 2026.

-Arboricultural Method Statement (Lally Tree Management, dated 21 January 2026, report ref: 2796_AMS.01), stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 22 January 2026.

Drawings:

-Location Plan, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 December 2025.

-Proposed- Elevations and Floor/Roof Plans, numbered IPS/R/54/M205WT REV B, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 11 March 2026.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) The window in the ground floor of the northern elevation of the development relating to a bathroom, and the window in the first floor of the eastern elevation of the host property relating to a bathroom hereby approved shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be inserted in the ground or first floor of any elevations of the development hereby approved, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

6) Works to trees should be implemented in accordance with the approved details within 'Arboricultural Method Statement (Lally Tree Management, dated 21 January 2026, report ref: 2796_AMS.01)', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 22 January 2026, including recommendations within sections 3.7 (Supervised Root Pruning and Excavation) and 3.8 (Site Monitoring).

Reason - In order to avoid damage to trees adjacent to 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 EN3, EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

7) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the

written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to construction)

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

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.

8) The proposed extension hereby approved shall only be used as ancillary accommodation in connection with the existing residential property 54 Merston Drive and for no other purpose.

Reason - In the interests of visual and residential amenity, pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Informatives

1) Swift bricks

If the development can accommodate it, it is requested that consideration is given to the installation of Swift Bricks. Swift bricks must be fitted in accordance to the specifications of BS 42021:2022 - Integral nest boxes.

2) Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures

The applicant is advised to incorporate Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures to a minimum of 150mm above the surface water flood level or a minimum of 600mm above the fluvial flood level.

3) Environment Agency Flood Warning and Met Office severe weather warnings

It is recommended that all residents/building operators sign up for the Environment Agency Flood Warning service and Met Office severe weather warnings email alert service.

4) Existing Surface Water Drainage System

If the applicant proposes to re-use the existing surface water drainage system, it is recommended that a full survey of the existing drainage infrastructure is undertaken. Any identified remedial works should be completed and an ongoing maintenance scheme should be established to ensure that the existing drainage system is fit for purpose for the lifetime of the development.

5) Culvert

MCC records highlight that the underground River Mersey is located within close proximity to the site (approximately 40m to the south of the site), while our records are frequently updated to ensure the highest level of accuracy, the records cannot guarantee 100% accuracy for all culverted assets. Therefore, we would request that the applicant informs the onsite contractor to remain observant and to take the appropriate safety precautions during excavation works. If any major unknown drainage assets are found

beneath the site, then further investigation works should take place to identify the asset and MCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) should be contacted immediately. Any alterations to an ordinary watercourse will require consent from MCC LLFA under Land Drainage Act 1991. The developer can apply for land drainage consent (if required) via the following link:

<https://manchester.civicapayforms.co.uk/Sales/LaunchInternet.aspx?saleform=drainage>.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management
Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)

52 Merston Drive, Manchester, M20 5WT

49 Merston Drive, Manchester, M20 5NT

50 Merston Drive, Manchester, M20 5WT

Waterside Hotel And Leisure Club, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 5WZ

Waterside Hotel And Leisure Club, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 5WZ

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -

Green Belt Land - Greater Manchester Green Belt Local Plan 1984

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA