

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142452/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 29 October 2025
Proposal: Increase in height of front boundary wall with railings to 1.5 metres
Address: 89 Hinchley Road, Manchester, M9 7FG
Ward(s): Charlestown Ward

Applicant: Miss Lynn O'Connor
Agent (if any):
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 17 December 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 20 November 2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 11 November 2025

Expired: 2 December 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 November 2025

Expired: 2 December 2025

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 89 Hinchley Road within the north Manchester ward of Charlestown. The application site relates to a detached, two storey, sand stone coloured new build dwellinghouse characterised by gable roof feature, integral garage and single storey front outrigger. The property sits on the corner of Hinchley Road and Rushway Avenue. Amenity space to the front of the property relates to an open off street driveway to accommodate 2no. cars, a small section of soft landscaping and a low brick wall borders the southern boundary of the site (max height 450mm). The boundary treatment further along Rushway Avenue is higher (approximately 2.3 metre height) than the boundary treatment on the corner.

Description of area

The immediate context is residential in nature and the property sits within the context of the new build estate to the north of Charlestown Road. Further north sits the former Co-op Academy North Manchester.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the increase in height of front boundary wall with railings to 1.5 metres.

The boundary would increase to 1.5 metres at the highest point (which relates to the brick piers); the brick walls would have a height of 635mm with metal railings above with a height of 1.3 metres. The boundary treatment would be built next to the existing 2.3 metre high boundary treatment and would wrap around the southern boundary of the site.

The existing landscaping that can be seen at the site would be retained.

Materials to be used have been listed as:

- Wall: facing brick to match existing with blue brick details and soldier course details to match existing
- Pillars: brickwork details to match existing
- Railings: wrought iron railings in black

Negotiations during the course of the Application

An existing plan and elevational drawings were provided for review during the course of the application.

The agent confirmed the existing hedges at the site would be retained as a result of the proposal.

Further information was supplied in respect of the resultant appearance of the boundary treatment.

A 2x2m visibility splay was requested by colleagues in Highway Services to understand if the boundary treatment proposed would give rise to any conflict with visibility splays/ sightlines with any pedestrians or motorists.

The overall height of the boundary treatment was reduced as the 1.8 metre height proposed gave rise to a visually intrusive feature on a prominent corner.

Planning History

No planning history can be found for the property of 89 Hinchley Road. Planning history can be found for the development of the wider estate including planning ref: 073908/FO/2004/N1- Former North Manchester High School, Land Off Charlestown Road- House type substitutions to 34 dwellings (7 No. 2 storey 4 bed detached and 27 No. 3 storey 3/4 bed town houses). Approved 21 January 2005.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and no responses were received.

Highway Services

Highway Services requested further information before they could provide a detailed response on the application. Highways requested a 2x2 metre visibility splay so that highways could determine the sightlines from the driveway. If the sightline goes through the proposed new wall / railings

then the applicant will have to reduce the solid wall height to 600mm and then prove that the driver will be able to see sufficiently through the railings.

Further Highway comments dated 17 December 2025:

The applicant has provided the amended drawing 01 rev B. Highways are satisfied that the proposed wall with the included visibility splay does not interfere with the wellbeing of users of the highway.

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.

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

HC1: Planning for healthy communities (Chapter 16. Promoting health communities)

DP3: Key principles for well-designed places (Chapter 14. Achieving well-designed places)

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.

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) and
Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

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.

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

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:

i.JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted development application is for the increase in height of front boundary wall with railings to 1.5 metres. It is noted that the applicant could increase the height of the boundary treatment at this point to 1 metre against a highway under General Permitted Development rights, with no level of visual permeability. Further, it is noted the design of the boundary treatment has been amended to overcome any concern raised. Given this, the principle of development can be supported. 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

Due to the nature of the proposal, the proposal would not give rise to any adverse implications in relation to loss of light nor adverse privacy implications. Due to the property's positioning on a corner whereby the neighbour no.2 Rushway Avenue is separated from the applicant site by a road, the proposal would not give rise to any overbearing or tunnelling implications.

Visual Amenity

The initial scheme had an original height, at the highest point, of 1.8 metres. Given the boundary treatment's prominent position against the two roads, the scheme was reduced to have a height at the highest point of 1.5 metres. After 635mm in height, metal railings would be installed. This would offer a level of visual permeability and so offer relief to the height and scale of the proposal.

Further, during the course of the application, the proposed materials were provided for consideration:

- Wall: facing brick to match existing with blue brick details and soldier course details to match existing
- Pillars: brickwork details to match existing
- Railings: wrought iron railings in black

Such materials would match those used within the existing boundary treatment, except for the introduction of the metal railings. Such materials are considered appropriate and the metal

railings to be installed are evident at the boundary treatment of no.2 Rushway Avenue. As such, the materiality would follow a precedence within the wider streetscene and so would not give rise to any visual implications. A materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

On balance and in this instance, the scheme is considered to be pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and JP-S1 of Places for Everyone.

Design, Scale and Appearance

The boundary would increase to 1.5 metres at the highest point (which relates to the brick piers); the brick walls would have a height of 635mm with metal railings above with a height of 1.3 metres.

As previously stated, it is noted that the applicant could increase the height of the boundary treatment at this point, against a highway, to 1 metre under General Permitted Development rights, with no level of visual permeability. Highway Services request a level of visual permeability after 600mm, although this is difficult to reach given the works that can be achieved without the benefit of consent. As such, a level of visual permeability is reached after 635mm and so is considered to offer a good level of visual permeability. Whilst it is noted the highest point of the structure would have a height of 1.5 metres and so exceed permitted development rights by 0.5 metres, as the increase is minimal and given the level of interest and visual permeability from the proposed wrought iron railings, the increase in height beyond permitted development can be accepted in this instance.

On balance and in this instance, it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development can be supported, in accordance with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1.

Considerations raised by Highway Services

Highway Services requested further information before they could provide a detailed response on the application. Highways requested a 2x2 metre visibility splay so that highways could determine the sightlines from the driveway. If the sightline goes through the proposed new wall / railings then the applicant will have to reduce the solid wall height to 600mm and then prove that the driver will be able to see sufficiently through the railings.

Highway Services reviewed the submitted documentation and were satisfied that the proposed wall with the included visibility splay does not interfere with the wellbeing of users of the highway.

Off street parking would be retained as a result of the proposal and so no issue in terms of parking provision is raised.

Highway concerns are considered to be addressed during the course of the application and so can be supported in line with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and SP1.

Bin Storage

No change to bin store provision would occur as a result of the proposal.

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, a revised scheme has been provided to overcome concerns raised and appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

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

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:

-Drawing- Location Plan, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 21 August 2025.

-Application Form, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 29 October 2025.

-Correspondence- Email with Agent- Amendment to Description of Development, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 December 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Site Plan and Street Scene Elevation, numbered 100 01 REV B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 December 2025.

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 for the proposed boundary treatment hereby approved shall be as follows:

-Wall: facing brick to match existing with blue brick details and soldier course details to match existing

-Pillars: brickwork details to match existing

-Railings: wrought iron railings in black

The approved details shall be implemented as part of the development and be in place prior to the first occupation of the development.

The boundary treatment shall be retained and maintained in situ thereafter and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no boundary treatment shall be erected on site other than that shown on the approved plans.

Reason - In the interest of visual amenity and security of the site pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services

2 Rushway Avenue, Manchester, M9 7GA
343 Charlestown Road, Manchester, M9 7BS
87 Hinchley Road, Manchester, M9 7FG
4 Rushway Avenue, Manchester, M9 7GA
1 Rushway Avenue, Manchester, M9 7GA
14 Fay Avenue, Manchester, M9 7BT

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development High Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_HIGH_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Historic Landfill Site 50m Buffer -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (More) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA