
Planning application number: 145491/JO/2026- additional comments

From [REDACTED]
Date Mon 27/04/2026 20:04
To Holly Wright <[REDACTED]>
Cc [REDACTED]

 1 attachment (3 MB)

IMG_8692.jpeg;

You don't often get email from katedartnall@yahoo.co.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Hi

In addition to my previous comments below, I attach a photo showing the view from our bedroom window, which shows how much our view is impacted by the development.

I would also like to add two further points in relation to tree T1. Tree T1 is a mature horse chestnut tree on our property. It has a Tree Preservation Order.

1. The tree canopy overhangs one of the proposed parking spaces, according to the plans. We believe the canopy to be larger than this, in which case it would impact two of the parking spaces. Conkers will fall from the tree in the autumn, potentially damaging residents' cars. We worry that residents would then want the canopy size to be reduced. However, we have been told on several occasions by tree surgeons that the main large branch which overhangs the development site is too large to be cut back without adversely affecting the health of the tree.

2. The arboriculturist's report explains that in order to protect this tree, it would require a cellular confinement system. How would we be assured that this is being used?

Kind regards
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: [REDACTED]
To: holly.wright@manchester.gov.uk <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Sent Saturday, 25 April 2026 at 12:09:44 BST
Subject: Planning application number: 145491/JO/2026

Hi

I have already submitted comments about this on the Planning portal, but as it said that these comments had been truncated, I am emailing them to you as well.

Re: Application number: 145491/JO/2026

As neighbours who share a 24m boundary with this proposed development, we have the following concerns regarding this planning application:

We have had a number of conversations with the current developer and his architect and we have appreciated this communication with us. However, we have been clear with them that we remain opposed to car parking being included within the rear garden.

When the original planning application was made, in 2021, the planning decision explicitly included conditions that the rear garden should be used solely as a leisure amenity for residents, with no rear car parking, and that 9 existing mature trees detailed on the plans should be retained. Since this time, all but 1 of these trees have been removed, and we understand that this was made a condition of the sale of the land to the current owner. At the time when the trees were being removed (May 2025), a planning officer visited the site and was told that there were no plans to use the rear space for rear car parking. We were assured by the planning department via email at that time that car parking to the rear was not something they would support.

It is important to consider the rear garden as it was at the time the original application was made, which was a haven for wildlife, with a number of mature trees, including sycamore, privet, holly, ash, rowan, elm, apple, laburnum, midland thorn, as opposed to its current condition which is a building site from which all but one of the trees have been removed (in contravention of the original planning conditions). Inclusion of car parking would be a significant change from the original garden, and cars entering and leaving the property, potentially at all hours of day and night, would impact us both in terms of their headlights and their noise. Please note that due to the unusual angle of the property boundaries, our first-floor bedroom window is directly on the boundary, and looks directly at the garden of 515-521, and so would look directly over the car park. The lost mature trees will have had a far higher biodiversity impact than the new ones. The inclusion of car parking spaces mean that there is not enough room to replace them with more substantial trees.

A 3D image is included in the planning application, this image differs substantially from the rear garden landscape plan image submitted; the lawn is a different size and shape and the 3 D plan appears to include considerably more trees than the plan which is submitted for approval.

We do not consider the parking to be necessary, given the excellent public transport links in Chorlton, as outlined by the developer in another application he has recently made in Chorlton ([145297/FO/2026 | Erection of a 3/4 storey building to provide 8no. two bedroom apartments, with access, informal amenity space, landscaping and associated works | 404 Wilbraham Road Manchester M21 0UU](#), see transport note [145297_FO_2026-TRANSPORT_NOTE-2797877.pdf](#)).

We are also concerned about the safety of the vehicular access to the property given that the access route is only wide enough for one car, and we worry that a car trying to turn in, when another car is leaving, would end up blocking the road/cycle path.

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 145491/JO/2026

From planning@manchester.gov.uk <planning@manchester.gov.uk>

Date Sat 25/04/2026 12:04

To Holly Wright <[REDACTED]>

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 25/04/2026 12:03 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 515 To 521 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AQ

Proposal: Variation of Conditions 2 (specified plans), 4 (waste management), 5 (cycle parking), 6 (electric vehicle charging points), 7 (landscaping scheme) and 10 (car parking) and removal of Condition 21 (rear garden amenity space) attached to planning permission 142731/JO/2025 to amend rear landscape garden with the inclusion of five additional car parking spaces.

Case Officer: Holly Wright

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Re: Application number: 145491/JO/2026
As neighbours who share a 24m boundary with this proposed development, we have the following concerns regarding this planning application:

We have had a number of conversations with the current developer and his architect and we have appreciated this communication with us. However, we have been clear with them that we remain opposed to car parking being included within the rear garden.

When the original planning application was made, in 2021, the planning decision explicitly included conditions that the rear garden should be used solely as a leisure amenity for residents, with no rear car parking, and that 9 existing mature trees detailed on the plans should be retained. Since this time, all but 1 of these trees have been removed, and we understand that this was made a condition of the sale of the land to the current owner. At the time when the trees were being

removed (May 2025), a planning officer visited the site and was told that there were no plans to use the rear space for rear car parking. We were assured by the planning department via email at that time that car parking to the rear was not something they would support.

It is important to consider the rear garden as it was at the time the original application was made, which was a haven for wildlife, with a number of mature trees, including sycamore, privet, holly, ash, rowan, elm, apple, laburnum, midland thorn, as opposed to its current condition which is a building site from which all but one of the trees have been removed (in contravention of the original planning conditions). Inclusion of car parking would be a significant change from the original garden, and cars entering and leaving the property, potentially at all hours of day and night, would impact us both in terms of their headlights and their noise. Please note that due to the unusual angle of the property boundaries, our first-floor bedroom window is directly on the boundary, and looks directly at the garden of 515-521, and so would look directly over the car park. The lost mature trees will have had a far higher biodiversity impact than the new ones. The inclusion of car parking spaces mean that there is not enough room to replace them with more substantial trees.

A 3D image is included in the planning application, this image differs substantially from the rear garden landscape plan image submitted; the lawn is a different size and shape and the 3 D plan appears to include considerably more trees than the plan which is submitted for approval.

We do not consider the parking to be necessary, given the excellent public transport links in Chorlton, as outlined by the developer in another application he has recently made in Chorlton (145297/FO/2026, 404 Wilbraham Road Manchester M21 0UU, see transport note 145297_FO_2026-TRANSPORT_NOTE-2797877.pdf).

We are also concerned about the safety of the vehicular access to the property given that the access route is only wide enough for one car, and we worry that a car trying to turn in, when another car is leaving, would end up blocking the road/cycle path.

Kind regards

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Re: Objection: Application 145491/JO/2026 – 515–521 Barlow Moor Road

From [REDACTED]

Date Mon 27/04/2026 16:10

To Holly Wright [REDACTED]

Cc [REDACTED]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Hi Holly, thank you for your quick response.

[REDACTED]

On 27 Apr 2026, at 16:00, Holly Wright <Holly.Wright@manchester.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I write to confirm receipt of your representation in relation to planning application 145491/JO/2026.

Your comments will be taken into account during the consideration of the application.

Kind Regards,
Holly Wright

Planning Officer
Development Management Area Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth and Development
Manchester City Council

[REDACTED]

Postal address: Manchester City Council, PO Box 532, Manchester, M60 2LA

Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB

The advice in this email is given in good faith and on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation that may be made by the Council, or any formal decision by the Council.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 April 2026 08:13
To: Holly Wright <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection: Application 145491/JO/2026 – 515–521 Barlow Moor Road

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Holly,
Please find attached my formal objection to planning application **145491/JO/2026** for the site at 515–521 Barlow Moor Road.
I am a resident of [REDACTED] and my property is directly affected by the proposed changes. I have set out my concerns in full within the attached document, including the impact on residential amenity, light disturbance, noise, and the loss of the originally approved garden space.
I have also included a supporting photograph from my bedroom to demonstrate the direct relationship between my property and the proposed rear parking area.
Please confirm receipt of this objection and that it will be taken into consideration as part of the decision-making process.
Kind regards,
Tim Robinson

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 145491/JO/2026

Site: 515–521 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester

Address: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the above planning application.

I am the owner/occupier of [REDACTED], [REDACTED] properties who have already submitted objections. My property has a close and direct relationship with the rear of the application site, with our rear courtyard/garden and bedroom windows overlooking this area.

1. Fundamental conflict with the approved scheme

The original planning permission (2021) clearly established that:

- The rear garden would remain residential amenity space only, with no rear car parking, and
- Nine mature trees within the site were to be retained

This application seeks to introduce rear parking, which represents a fundamental alteration to the approved scheme, rather than a minor variation of conditions.

In addition, the removal of almost all of the previously protected trees has already taken place, contrary to those conditions. Allowing this application would effectively regularise a breach of planning control and undermine the integrity of the original decision.

2. Direct and significant harm to residential amenity

Due to the position of my property [REDACTED] the impact of this proposal would be immediate and substantial.

Our rear courtyard/garden and bedroom windows directly face the rear of the site. We already experience disturbance from the ongoing development, including consistently elevated noise levels associated with construction activity. In addition, existing security lighting from the site currently shines directly into our rooms at night.

The introduction of rear car parking would move this from a temporary situation to a permanent and intensified source of disturbance.

In particular:

- Vehicle movements would introduce ongoing noise
- Headlights would shine directly into bedrooms
- Additional lighting would increase light pollution

- Continuous activity would introduce noise and air pollution

3. Overlooking and loss of privacy

The upper flats already overlook our property. Increased activity would worsen privacy impacts.

4. Loss of trees and biodiversity

The removal of mature trees has already reduced screening and biodiversity. Parking prevents meaningful replacement.

5. Sustainable transport inconsistency

The site is in a well-connected area and additional parking is not justified.

6. Highway safety concerns

The narrow access creates risks for vehicles and cyclists.

7. Protected tree (TPO)

There are concerns about root damage and long-term viability.

8. Overdevelopment

Parking reduces usable amenity space and worsens living conditions.

9. Drainage concerns

Increased hardstanding may increase runoff with no clear mitigation.

Conclusion

This proposal would cause harm to amenity, biodiversity and safety. I respectfully request refusal.

Yours faithfully,

[Your Name]

Photo 1: Bedroom View Towards Proposed Rear Car Parking Area

View from bedroom at [REDACTED] showing direct line of sight to the rear of 515–521 Barlow Moor Road, where the proposed car parking would be located (beyond the boundary fence). The

proximity between the properties is very close, and this bedroom directly overlooks the site. Existing security lighting from the development already shines directly into this room at night. The introduction of rear car parking would result in regular vehicle headlights and additional lighting shining directly into this bedroom, significantly increasing light disturbance, noise, and overall impact on residential amenity.



Objection to planning application 14591/JO/2026

From [REDACTED]
Date Mon 27/04/2026 16:27
To Holly Wright <[REDACTED]>

 1 attachment (568 KB)
ObjectionToPlanningApplication14591JO2026.pdf;

You don't often get email from thomas.charrin@doctors.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Mrs. Wright,

Please find attached our Objection to planning application 14591/JO/2026 - also submitted via the portal.

This version includes our details as well as the mentioned pictures.

I hope this finds you well

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Subject: Objection to planning application 14591/JO/2026
Site: 515-521 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ

Address: [REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing to object to the above application as a nearby residents who would be directly affected by the proposed changes.

We live at [REDACTED]. The rear of 521 Barlow Moor Road is in direct line of sight from our property - we can see directly into the rear space in question and our bedroom window sits directly in line with the proposed undercroft (drive-through tunnel).

We were particularly drawn to this property because of the peaceful green space to the rear, which feels like a small sanctuary and is rare in this part of Manchester. That sense of quiet and separation from busy roads is a defining feature of the surrounding properties. **Prior to purchasing, we carefully reviewed the planning history of this site in detail. In July 2021 a decision notice explicitly stated in Condition 21 that: "the rear garden shall be used exclusively as amenity space and not for the parking of vehicles".** The Council's decision on this was a key factor in our decision and gave us confidence and reassurance that the space behind our new home would remain a quiet garden area rather than an active parking space. We made our decision to purchase on reliance of that position and as such are extremely concerned about this revised proposal.

Timing and procedural concerns

- The timing and manner in which this issue is now being revisited is concerning to us. The current proposal appears to rely on a subsequent amendment (removing reference to parking numbers) to reopen an issue that had already been fully considered, rejected, and resolved in 2021. If the applicant considered that restriction to be unacceptable or commercially unviable, there were appropriate opportunities at that time to challenge or appeal the decision, or to seek a formal variation through the proper planning processes.
- Instead, the scheme has been implemented and progressed under the approved parameters, only for rear parking to now be reintroduced at a very late stage through a further application. From a resident's perspective, this creates a sense that a previously settled planning decision is now being reopened without any clear material change in circumstances since the 2021 decision. It appears that the applicant is attempting to incrementally reintroduce an element that was previously refused, rather than respecting the outcome of the original decision.
- More concerning, the only apparent justification offered is a supporting letter from a local estate agent indicates that increased parking provision would make the development more attractive and easier to sell. Whilst that may be the case, it does not in itself demonstrate a planning need for additional parking, particularly where a lower level of provision has already been assessed and approved as acceptable. **This suggests that the proposal is not driven by a change in circumstances or necessity, but rather by a desire to enhance marketability.** Enhanced marketability is not justification for overriding a previously agreed planning condition, introducing additional impacts on neighbouring residents and reducing established amenity space.
- **We are struggling to understand what new planning justification - besides marketability - now exists to revisit a restriction that was clearly and deliberately imposed and relied upon by both the Council and local residents.**
- The approach feels less like a response to new circumstances and more like a continuation of an earlier intention that did not secure approval. We believe this approach undermines

planning certainty and gives the impression of a previously resolved matter being reintroduced late in the process, rather than properly reconsidered at the appropriate stage of decision-making.

APL and parking justification

- We are familiar with APL developments, having previously rented in one of their properties for 4 years and known several other individuals living in similar schemes they have delivered locally.
- On the point of marketability, it should be noted that APL-style renovated flats are already in very high demand in Chorlton and are not difficult to let or sell. As long-term renters prior to buying there has historically been strong demand for these types of properties, including waiting lists for APL developments. In that context, the suggestion that additional parking is required to make the scheme viable or attractive carries little weight.
- We also note an entry from a local estate agent in support of the proposed plans and have to say this is not the experience we have had as renters in an APL property. Our first-hand experience was not of an occupancy by residents who rely on car ownership to the extent that has been implied in this application; especially given the proximity to local transport links here in Chorlton. Furthermore, many comparable APL developments operate successfully with limited or no on-site parking - Hastings Avenue, Silverdale Road, Zetland Road, Brundretts Road.
- Increasing parking provision in this context encourages car dependency and conflicts with sustainable transport objectives. Given that 6 spaces for 11 units has already been accepted, no robust justification has been provided for increasing this number.

Light impact

- Of particular concern is that our bedroom window sits directly in line with the proposed covered undercroft meaning vehicle headlights entering and exiting the site would shine directly toward this window. The enclosed nature of the undercroft is likely to channel and intensify light, creating a focused and intrusive effect rather than general background illumination.
- This is not a minor inconvenience. It has the potential to significantly affect sleep and day-to-day comfort in our home.
- We are also concerned that our property does not appear to have been considered in the lighting and glare impact assessment, with properties 4 and 6 High Lane being the only ones to be considered despite us sitting in direct in line with the proposed undercroft – see pictures.

Noise impact

- Having reviewed the submitted Noise Impact Assessment, we do not believe it adequately reflects the likely real-world impact of the revised changes. It is our firm belief that conclusions of “negligible impact” should be treated with caution as we have read this report thoroughly and identified some concerns regarding its methodology.
- While the report references the use of an undercroft for vehicle access, it does not appear to meaningfully assess the acoustic implications of this type of enclosed structure. In practice, such spaces can amplify and channel sound, particularly from engines, door slams and acceleration, creating short bursts of concentrated noise rather than diffuse background sound.
- The assessment relies primarily on averaged noise levels (LAeq) rather than maximum noise events, which risks masking the intermittent and impulsive nature of vehicle movements. From a residential perspective, particularly during evening and night-time periods, it is these individual noise events that are most noticeable and disruptive, rather than long-term averages.
- The report also relies on several idealised assumptions, including very low vehicle speeds and consistent user behaviour, which will not reflect real conditions in a residential setting.

Horse Chestnut Tree

- We do not believe the proposal takes a sufficiently careful or responsible approach to the long-term protection of the horse chestnut in 4 High Lane's rear garden which sits at the rear of 521 Barlow Moor Road. Importantly, concerns about parking beneath the horse chestnut tree were **explicitly raised during the 2020–2021 consultation process**. In consultee comments in **July 2020**, it was noted that parking spaces in this location were not realistic due to the significant seasonal fall of conkers, which could damage vehicles. It is quite clear that this potential problem has already been identified and understood and implicitly resolved through the decision not to have parking at the rear of the property.
- Up to now, this tree has simply existed as part of a garden environment. It has not created conflict because the space beneath it has not been used in a way that puts it at odds with people's day-to-day activities or possessions.
- We have strong concerns that by introducing parking spaces directly beneath or close to the canopy, the development effectively places vehicles in an area where the natural seasonal behaviour of the tree becomes an issue. What has always been a neutral, and in our view, positive feature of the space risks being reframed as a nuisance. This creates a foreseeable (and entirely avoidable) chain of events whereby vehicles may experience damage or inconvenience from falling debris, leading to frustration from residents or owners, which in turn results in pressure for pruning, cutting back, and ultimately the potential removal of the tree.
- This cannot happen. It is a protected tree and **it is our view that this proposal engineers a conflict with the tree, rather than responding to one**. This is exactly the kind of situation that the 2021 scheme appeared to avoid by removing rear parking altogether. Reintroducing parking in this location risks undoing that resolution and placing a mature, protected tree in a vulnerable position over time. It would be very disappointing to see such a well-established feature of the site gradually come under pressure; not because of any inherent issue, but because of a design decision that places it in conflict with surrounding uses. Furthermore, given the size of the tree we are not convinced that damage to the tree's roots will not be sustained under the current proposals.

Wildlife and ecology

- It is our understanding that trees have already been removed from the site in a way that may not have aligned with the conditions of the sale. Against that backdrop, this latest proposal feels like a continuation of that pattern of pushing beyond what was previously agreed and eroding trust further. For residents who have relied on the approved scheme, this is particularly troubling.
- The rear garden area is not just amenity space in visual terms. It functions as a small but meaningful ecological pocket within a dense urban environment. The combination of mature trees, planting, and relatively undisturbed green space supports a variety of local wildlife, including birds, insects and other small urban species.
- Parking will inevitably reduce the ecological value of this space through loss of planting, disturbance, noise, light intrusion, and general activity. These changes may appear minor in isolation, but collectively they degrade the habitat and reduce its ability to support wildlife.
- There appears to be a lack of proper regard for the existing ecological value of the site and the role it plays in supporting local wildlife. This runs counter to the spirit of the approved scheme, which retained and protected this space as a green, low-impact environment.

Design conflicts

- The approved 2021 layout places one of the forecourt parking bays directly in front of what was then decided to be a pedestrian access. Reintroducing this undercroft as vehicular access rather than pedestrian access would require a removal or reconfiguration of approved spaces and different layout. This removal or reconfiguration of the 6

approved forecourt parking spaces has not been addressed in any of the drawings/plans included in this new application.

Summary

While we recognise that some aspects of the revised proposal (soft landscaping) are positive, the reintroduction of rear parking fundamentally alters the nature of what was approved and relied upon and should therefore be entirely rejected.

It would:

- conflict with the approved 2021 scheme
- undermine Condition 21
- significantly harm residential amenity
- introduce direct light and noise impacts to habitable rooms
- place a protected tree at long-term risk

More broadly, it gives the impression of a previously resolved issue being reintroduced through incremental changes, rather than through a transparent and timely planning process. For these reasons, we strongly object and request that the application be refused.

Should the applicant wish to continue improving the scheme, we would encourage a focus on enhancing landscaping and green space, rather than the reintroduction of hardstanding and vehicular use. This approach would reflect the intent of the 2021 approval, which prioritised amenity, greenery and a long term residential would complement the character of the Chorlton community.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

Picture 1 + 2: Bedroom view towards the proposed undercroft/driveway (circled in red)



Picture 1



Picture 2

Comments for Planning Application 145491/JO/2026

From planning@manchester.gov.uk <planning@manchester.gov.uk>

Date Mon 27/04/2026 16:19

To Holly Wright [REDACTED]

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 27/04/2026 4:19 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	515 To 521 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AQ
----------	--

Proposal:	Variation of Conditions 2 (specified plans), 4 (waste management), 5 (cycle parking), 6 (electric vehicle charging points), 7 (landscaping scheme) and 10 (car parking) and removal of Condition 21 (rear garden amenity space) attached to planning permission 142731/JO/2025 to amend rear landscape garden with the inclusion of five additional car parking spaces.
-----------	---

Case Officer:	Holly Wright
---------------	--------------

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
-------	------------

Email:	[REDACTED]
--------	------------

Address:	[REDACTED]
----------	------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
-----------------	-----------

Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
---------	--

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Subject: Objection to planning application 14591/JO/2026 Site: 515-521 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
-----------	---

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to object to the above application as a nearby residents who would be directly affected by the proposed changes.

We live at *redacted* and completed on the purchase in the second half of 2025. The rear of 521 Barlow Moor Road is in direct line of sight from our property - we can see directly into the rear space in question and our bedroom window sits directly in line with the proposed undercroft (drive-through tunnel).

We were particularly drawn to this property because of the peaceful green space

to the rear, which feels like a small sanctuary and is rare in this part of Manchester. That sense of quiet and separation from busy roads is a defining feature of the surrounding properties. Prior to purchasing, we carefully reviewed the planning history of this site in detail. In July 2021 a decision notice explicitly stated in Condition 21 that: "the rear garden shall be used exclusively as amenity space and not for the parking of vehicles". The Council's decision on this was a key factor in our decision and gave us confidence and reassurance that the space behind our new home would remain a quiet garden area rather than an active parking space. We made our decision to purchase on reliance of that position and as such are extremely concerned about this revised proposal.

++++
Timing and procedural concerns
++++

- The timing and manner in which this issue is now being revisited is concerning to us. The current proposal appears to rely on a subsequent amendment (removing reference to parking numbers) to reopen an issue that had already been fully considered, rejected, and resolved in 2021. If the applicant considered that restriction to be unacceptable or commercially unviable, there were appropriate opportunities at that time to challenge or appeal the decision, or to seek a formal variation through the proper planning processes.
- Instead, the scheme has been implemented and progressed under the approved parameters, only for rear parking to now be reintroduced at a very late stage through a further application. From a resident's perspective, this creates a sense that a previously settled planning decision is now being reopened without any clear material change in circumstances since the 2021 decision. It appears that the applicant is attempting to incrementally reintroduce an element that was previously refused, rather than respecting the outcome of the original decision.
- More concerningly, the only apparent justification offered is a supporting letter from a local estate agent indicates that increased parking provision would make the development more attractive and easier to sell. Whilst that may be the case, it does not in itself demonstrate a planning need for additional parking, particularly where a lower level of provision has already been assessed and approved as acceptable. This suggests that the proposal is not driven by a change in circumstances or necessity, but rather by a desire to enhance marketability. Enhanced marketability is not justification for overriding a previously agreed planning condition, introducing additional impacts on neighbouring residents and reducing established amenity space.
- We are struggling to understand what new planning justification - besides marketability - now exists to revisit a restriction that was clearly and deliberately imposed and relied upon by both the Council and local residents.
- The approach feels less like a response to new circumstances and more like a continuation of an earlier intention that did not secure approval. We believe this approach undermines planning certainty and gives the impression of a previously resolved matter being reintroduced late in the process, rather than properly reconsidered at the appropriate stage of decision-making.

++++
APL and parking justification
++++

- We are familiar with APL developments, having previously rented in one of their properties for 4 years and known several other individuals living in similar schemes they have delivered locally.
- On the point of marketability, it should be noted that APL-style renovated flats are already in very high demand in Chorlton and are not difficult to let or sell. As long-term renters prior to buying there has historically been strong demand for these types of properties, including waiting lists for APL developments. In that context, the suggestion that additional parking is required to make the scheme viable or attractive carries little weight.
- We also note an entry from a local estate agent in support of the proposed plans and have to say this is not the experience we have had as renters in an APL property. Our first-hand experience was not of an occupancy by residents who rely on car ownership to the extent that has been implied in this application; especially given the proximity to local transport links here in Chorlton. Furthermore, many comparable APL developments operate successfully with limited or no on-site parking - Hastings Avenue, Silverdale Road, Zetland Road, Brundretts Road.

- Increasing parking provision in this context encourages car dependency and conflicts with sustainable transport objectives. Given that 6 spaces for 11 units has already been accepted, no robust justification has been provided for increasing this number.

+++++++
Light impact
+++++++

- Of particular concern is that our bedroom window sits directly in line with the proposed covered undercroft meaning vehicle headlights entering and exiting the site would shine directly toward this window. The enclosed nature of the undercroft is likely to channel and intensify light, creating a focused and intrusive effect rather than general background illumination.
- This is not a minor inconvenience. It has the potential to significantly affect sleep and day-to-day comfort in our home.
- We are also concerned that our property does not appear to have been considered in the lighting and glare impact assessment, with properties 4 and 6 High Lane being the only ones to be considered despite us sitting in direct in line with the proposed undercroft - see pictures.

+++++++
Noise impact
+++++++

- Having reviewed the submitted Noise Impact Assessment, we do not believe it adequately reflects the likely real-world impact of the revised changes. It is our firm belief that conclusions of "negligible impact" should be treated with caution as we have read this report thoroughly and identified some concerns regarding its methodology.
- While the report references the use of an undercroft for vehicle access, it does not appear to meaningfully assess the acoustic implications of this type of enclosed structure. In practice, such spaces can amplify and channel sound, particularly from engines, door slams and acceleration, creating short bursts of concentrated noise rather than diffuse background sound.
- The assessment relies primarily on averaged noise levels (LAeq) rather than maximum noise events, which risks masking the intermittent and impulsive nature of vehicle movements. From a residential perspective, particularly during evening and night-time periods, it is these individual noise events that are most noticeable and disruptive, rather than long-term averages.
- The report also relies on several idealised assumptions, including very low vehicle speeds and consistent user behaviour, which will not reflect real conditions in a residential setting.

+++++++
Horse Chestnut Tree
+++++++

- We do not believe the proposal takes a sufficiently careful or responsible approach to the long-term protection of the horse chestnut in 4 High Lane's rear garden which sits at the rear of 521 Barlow Moor Road. Importantly, concerns about parking beneath the horse chestnut tree were explicitly raised during the 2020-2021 consultation process. In consultee comments in July 2020, it was noted that parking spaces in this location were not realistic due to the significant seasonal fall of conkers, which could damage vehicles. It is quite clear that this potential problem has already been identified and understood and implicitly resolved through the decision not to have parking at the rear of the property.
- Up to now, this tree has simply existed as part of a garden environment. It has not created conflict because the space beneath it has not been used in a way that puts it at odds with people's day-to-day activities or possessions.
- We have strong concerns that by introducing parking spaces directly beneath or close to the canopy, the development effectively places vehicles in an area where the natural seasonal behaviour of the tree becomes an issue. What has always been a neutral, and in our view, positive feature of the space risks being reframed as a nuisance. This creates a foreseeable (and entirely avoidable) chain of events whereby vehicles may experience damage or inconvenience from falling debris, leading to frustration from residents or owners, which in turn results in pressure for pruning, cutting back, and ultimately the potential removal of the tree.
- This cannot happen. It is a protected tree and it is our view that this proposal

engineers a conflict with the tree, rather than responding to one. This is exactly the kind of situation that the 2021 scheme appeared to avoid by removing rear parking altogether. Reintroducing parking in this location risks undoing that resolution and placing a mature, protected tree in a vulnerable position over time. It would be very disappointing to see such a well-established feature of the site gradually come under pressure; not because of any inherent issue, but because of a design decision that places it in conflict with surrounding uses. Furthermore, given the size of the tree we are not convinced that damage to the tree's roots will not be sustained under the current proposals.

++++
Wildlife and ecology
++++

- It is our understanding that trees have already been removed from the site in a way that may not have aligned with the conditions of the sale. Against that backdrop, this latest proposal feels like a continuation of that pattern of pushing beyond what was previously agreed and eroding trust further. For residents who have relied on the approved scheme, this is particularly troubling.
- The rear garden area is not just amenity space in visual terms. It functions as a small but meaningful ecological pocket within a dense urban environment. The combination of mature trees, planting, and relatively undisturbed green space supports a variety of local wildlife, including birds, insects and other small urban species.
- Parking will inevitably reduce the ecological value of this space through loss of planting, disturbance, noise, light intrusion, and general activity. These changes may appear minor in isolation, but collectively they degrade the habitat and reduce its ability to support wildlife.
- There appears to be a lack of proper regard for the existing ecological value of the site and the role it plays in supporting local wildlife. This runs counter to the spirit of the approved scheme, which retained and protected this space as a green, low-impact environment.

++++
Design conflicts
++++

- The approved 2021 layout places one of the forecourt parking bays directly in front of what was then decided to be a pedestrian access. Reintroducing this undercroft as vehicular access rather than pedestrian access would require a removal or reconfiguration of approved spaces and different layout. This removal or reconfiguration of the 6 approved forecourt parking spaces has not been addressed in any of the drawings/plans included in this new application.

++++
Summary

While we recognise that some aspects of the revised proposal (soft landscaping) are positive, the reintroduction of rear parking fundamentally alters the nature of what was approved and relied upon and should therefore be entirely rejected.

It would:

- conflict with the approved 2021 scheme
- undermine Condition 21
- significantly harm residential amenity
- introduce direct light and noise impacts to habitable rooms
- place a protected tree at long-term risk

More broadly, it gives the impression of a previously resolved issue being reintroduced through incremental changes, rather than through a transparent and timely planning process. For these reasons, we strongly object and request that the application be refused.

Should the applicant wish to continue improving the scheme, we would encourage a focus on enhancing landscaping and green space, rather than the reintroduction of hardstanding and vehicular use. This approach would reflect the intent of the 2021 approval, which prioritised amenity, greenery and a long term residential would complement the character of the Chorlton community.

Yours faithfully,
redacted

Picture 1 + 2: Bedroom view towards the proposed undercroft/driveway (circled in red) - provided via email to Holly Wright

Kind regards

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Comments for Planning Application 145491/JO/2026

From planning@manchester.gov.uk <planning@manchester.gov.uk>

Date Mon 27/04/2026 16:41

To Holly Wright <[REDACTED]>

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 27/04/2026 4:41 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	515 To 521 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AQ
----------	--

Proposal:	Variation of Conditions 2 (specified plans), 4 (waste management), 5 (cycle parking), 6 (electric vehicle charging points), 7 (landscaping scheme) and 10 (car parking) and removal of Condition 21 (rear garden amenity space) attached to planning permission 142731/JO/2025 to amend rear landscape garden with the inclusion of five additional car parking spaces.
-----------	---

Case Officer:	Holly Wright
---------------	--------------

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
-------	------------

Email:	[REDACTED]
--------	------------

Address:	[REDACTED]
----------	------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
-----------------	-----------

Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
---------	--

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am concerned that the scope for these plans keep increasing and yet I can't see how any of these additions are benefitting us as neighbours or the community at large. A parade of shops that did benefit the community have been removed and now they wish to remove an area of green space that benefits our neighbourhood and ecosystem. I struggle to understand why the correct number of parking spaces weren't requested in the initial planning application making me believe this is a strategy rather than an oversight. I don't believe the planning application process should be abused in this way and as I cannot see any benefit to the proposed changes I strongly object to them.
-----------	---

Kind regards

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Objection to Planning Application : 145491/JO/2026; Variation of conditions

From [REDACTED]

Date Mon 27/04/2026 20:59

To Holly Wright [REDACTED]

Cc [REDACTED]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

To Holly Wright at [REDACTED]

Re: Application number: 145491/JO/2026; Variation of conditions

Site: 515-521 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester

Summary of our objection:

My husband and I live at [REDACTED] and the rear of our property overlooks the rear of this proposed building development and tunnel to its rear.

We did not receive the letter dated 7.4.2026 outlining the variation of conditions and became aware of it via our neighbours at no [REDACTED]

We are strongly opposed to the conditions set out in this application, particularly that condition 21 is removed so that 5 additional car parking spaces can be made at the rear of the property.

Planning history and detrimental impact on biodiversity of this rear plot.

With respect to the original planning application which was made in 2021, the planning decision explicitly included conditions that the rear garden should be used solely as a leisure amenity for residents, with no rear car parking, and that the nine existing mature trees detailed on the plans would be retained. In July 2021, previous planning records stated in condition 21 **'that the rear garden should be used exclusively as amenity space and not for the parking of vehicles'**. This was in part as a result of our previous objections to this rear space being turned into a car park but also to retain the ecological and biodiverse nature of the garden within an urban area.

Without any notification or explanation, in 2025, we witnessed the felling of all but one of the trees within the garden. The rear garden had been a rich biodiverse area inhabited by birds, insects, squirrels and even hedgehogs and had had a variety of mature trees including sycamore, privet, holly, ash, rowan, elm, apple, laburnum, midland thorn – the current area is now a building site and with one tree remaining and this action to fell the trees was a direct contravention of the original agreed planning conditions. This action clearly paved the way for this current planning application. The new trees proposed in the accompanying drawings have much less biodiversity impact than the previous mature trees which were felled. By having 5 additional car parking spaces at the rear of the property,

this means there is not enough room to replace the felled trees with more mature trees. Cars will reduce the return of natural species to the area.

Impact of noise and light on our property

Car parking at the rear of the development will have a detrimental impact on our current tranquil back garden. Our garden is very important to us as a tranquil place and as a biodiverse area, particularly as we have to put up with the increased volume and noise of traffic, and vehicle parking on High Lane at the front of our property.

There will be cars entering and leaving the property via the tunnel which was previously deemed only for pedestrian access, potentially at all hours of day and night. We sleep at the rear of our property and are in direct sight of the rear of the property. We will be subjected to noise and to light pollution from headlights and car parking protective lighting, potentially at any time during a 24-hour period. The enclosed photograph is taken from our rear bedroom window and shows our proximity to the tunnel and building development for 515-521 Barlow Moor Road.



Horse chestnut tree in No 4 High Lane garden

Please note that the horse chestnut tree, itemised as T1 in the arboricultural impact assessment, report BS 5837:2012, has a tree preservation order (TPO) on it. We note the potential damage to the roots of this tree from the position of the proposed bicycle storage building albeit a cellular confinement process is implemented. We do not know how effective this is over time. Furthermore, by making car parking spaces, we cannot be reassured that the roots of this tree will not be damaged. This is one of the oldest trees in Chorlton with an expansive root span below the rear of this proposed development. It must be protected from any future damage to its roots and branches.

Also, is the canopy of the horse chestnut accurately reflected in the 2502/P/100 rear garden landscape plans? The position of this tree, in relation to the proposed car parking spaces means that the cars beneath its canopy and beyond, will be affected by seasonal dropping of leaves, sap and conkers. This will make the tree vulnerable in the future if residents in the development make an application for it to be reduced in size or worse scenario, felled.

We believe that these points to protect the tree justify the need for the original planning decision in 2021 to remain and that the rear area is an amenity space only.

Chorlton public transport systems

We see no justification for 5 additional car parking spaces at this property in that Chorlton has good bus and tram systems and cycle lanes as part of a strategy to reduce the need to have cars in this area. Furthermore, the proposed development is also providing space for bicycle storage.

We agree with our neighbours at no [REDACTED] on the following points:

- A 3D image is included in the planning application, this image differs substantially from the rear garden landscape plan image submitted; the lawn is a different size and shape and the 3D plan appears to include considerably more trees than the plan which is submitted for approval.
- We do not consider the parking to be necessary, given the excellent public transport links in Chorlton, as outlined by the developer in another application he has recently made in Chorlton ([145297/FO/2026 | Erection of a 3/4 storey building to provide 8no. two bedroom apartments, with access, informal amenity space, landscaping and associated works | 404 Wilbraham Road Manchester M21 0UU](#), see transport note [145297 FO 2026-TRANSPORT NOTE-2797877.pdf](#)).
- We are also concerned about the safety of the vehicular access to the property given that the access route is only wide enough for one car, and we worry that a car trying to turn in, when another car is leaving, would end up blocking the road/cycle path.

In summary, we completely oppose this application and request that the condition 21 remains firmly in place with no additional car parking spaces being built and that the garden redesign is revised to enhance its biodiversity by planting trees similar to the trees which were felled and to encourage urban wildlife to return.

Our objection to this application has also been submitted via the Manchester City Council Planning Portal

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 145491/JO/2026

From planning@manchester.gov.uk <planning@manchester.gov.uk>

Date Mon 27/04/2026 20:46

To Holly Wright [REDACTED]

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 27/04/2026 8:46 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 515 To 521 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AQ

Proposal: Variation of Conditions 2 (specified plans), 4 (waste management), 5 (cycle parking), 6 (electric vehicle charging points), 7 (landscaping scheme) and 10 (car parking) and removal of Condition 21 (rear garden amenity space) attached to planning permission 142731/JO/2025 to amend rear landscape garden with the inclusion of five additional car parking spaces.

Case Officer: Holly Wright

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

To whom it may concern:

Re: Application number: 145491/JO/2026; Variation of conditions

Site: 515-521 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester

My husband and I live at No [REDACTED] and the rear of our property overlooks the rear of this proposed building development and tunnel to its rear.

We did not receive the letter dated 7.4.2026 outlining the variation of conditions and became aware of it via our neighbours at no [REDACTED]

We are strongly opposed to the conditions set out in this application, particularly that condition 21 is removed so that 5 additional car parking spaces can be made at the rear of the property.

Planning history and detrimental impact on biodiversity of this rear plot. With respect to the original planning application which was made in 2021, the planning decision explicitly included conditions that the rear garden should be used solely as a leisure amenity for residents, with no rear car parking, and that the nine existing mature trees detailed on the plans would be retained. In July 2021, previous planning records stated in condition 21 'that the rear garden should be used exclusively as amenity space and not for the parking of vehicles'. This was in part as a result of our previous objections to this rear space being turned into a car park but also to retain the ecological and biodiverse nature of the garden within an urban area.

Without any notification or explanation, in 2025, we witnessed the felling of all but one of the trees within the garden. The rear garden had been a rich biodiverse area inhabited by birds, insects, squirrels and even hedgehogs and had had a variety of mature trees including sycamore, privet, holly, ash, rowan, elm, apple, laburnum, midland thorn - the current area is now a building site and with one tree remaining and this action to fell the trees was a direct contravention of the original agreed planning conditions. This action clearly paved the way for this current planning application. The new trees proposed in the accompanying drawings have much less biodiversity impact than the previous mature trees which were felled. By having 5 additional car parking spaces at the rear of the property, this means there is not enough room to replace the felled trees with more mature trees. Cars will reduce the return of natural species to the area.

Impact of noise and light on our property

Car parking at the rear of the development will have a detrimental impact on our current tranquil back garden. Our garden is very important to us as a tranquil place and as a biodiverse area, particularly as we have to put up with the increased volume and noise of traffic, and vehicle parking on High Lane at the front of our property.

There will be cars entering and leaving the property via the tunnel which was previously deemed only for pedestrian access, potentially at all hours of day and night. We sleep at the rear of our property and are in direct sight of the rear of the property. We will be subjected to noise and to light pollution from headlights and car parking protective lighting, potentially at any time during a 24-hour period. We will also send these comments to you by email to include a photograph taken from our rear bedroom window and which shows our proximity to the tunnel and building development for 515-521 Barlow Moor Road.

Horse chestnut tree in No 4 High Lane garden

Please note that the horse chestnut tree, itemised as T1 in the arboricultural impact assessment, report BS 5837:2012, has a tree preservation order (TPO) on it. We note the potential damage to the roots of this tree from the position of the proposed bicycle storage building albeit a cellular confinement process is implemented. We do not know how effective this is over time. Furthermore, by making car parking spaces, we cannot be reassured that the roots of this tree will not be damaged. This is one of the oldest trees in Chorlton with an expansive root span below the rear of this proposed development. It must be protected from any future damage to its roots and branches.

Also, is the canopy of the horse chestnut accurately reflected in the 2502/P/100 rear garden landscape plans? The position of this tree, in relation to the proposed car parking spaces means that the cars beneath its canopy and beyond, will be affected by seasonal dropping of leaves, sap and conkers. This will make the tree vulnerable in the future if residents in the development make an application for it to be reduced in size or worse scenario, felled.

We believe that these points to protect the tree justify the need for the original planning decision in 2021 to remain and that the rear area is an amenity space only.

Chorlton public transport systems

We see no justification for 5 additional car parking spaces at this property in that Chorlton has good bus and tram systems and cycle lanes as part of a strategy to reduce the need to have cars in this area. Furthermore, the proposed development is also providing space for bicycle storage.

We agree with our neighbours at no [REDACTED] on the following points:

- A 3D image is included in the planning application, this image differs substantially from the rear garden landscape plan image submitted; the lawn is a different size and shape and the 3 D plan appears to include considerably more trees than the plan which is submitted for approval.

- We do not consider the parking to be necessary, given the excellent public transport links in Chorlton, as outlined by the developer in another application he has recently made in Chorlton (145297/FO/2026 | Erection of a 3/4 storey building to provide 8no. two bedroom apartments, with access, informal amenity space, landscaping and associated works | 404 Wilbraham Road Manchester M21 0UU, see transport note 145297_FO_2026-TRANSPORT_NOTE-2797877.pdf).
- We are also concerned about the safety of vehicle access to the property given that the access route is only wide enough for one car, and we worry that a car trying to turn in, when another car is leaving, would end up blocking the road/cycle path.

In summary, we completely oppose this application and request that the condition 21 remains firmly in place with no additional car parking spaces being built and that the garden redesign is revised to enhance its biodiversity by planting trees similar to the trees which were felled and to encourage urban wildlife to return.

Kind regards

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
