MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Delegated Officer Report

Summary of application details

Application reference:	PLA-2026-000203
Application type:	Full planning permission
Proposal:	Conversion of property to two self contained flats
Site address:	29 Peel Grove, Manchester M12 4WE
Ward(s):	Longsight
Date application valid:	06 May 2026
Applicant name:	Mr Riaz Butt
Agent (if any):	Mr Dean King
Case officer:	Carl Glennon
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date of recommendation:	30 June 2026

Description of site, building and/or area

The application property is located in a residential cul-de-sac. An alleyway adjacent to the eastern boundary separates the site from St Peters Highway School and a bus company and social club.

This application relates to a two storey house comprising of a pitched roof and gable elevation. The external elevation comprises of white render. The property is situated at the eastern end of a three unit terrace. The property has linked front and rear gardens that have been hard surfaced. The property has a part single, part two storey extension and garage to the eastern elevation. Outbuildings, located in the rear garden, were formerly used for vehicle repairs allowed under appeal referenced APP/B4215/A/11/2156694/NWF. The outbuilding incorporates a roller shutter doorway and access to a car parking area to the north of the site. The existing house comprises:

i. Basement – Living room and storage
ii. Ground floor – Living room, bathroom and kitchen
iii. First floor – Three bedrooms and two bathrooms.



Fig.1 – Views of the front and rear of 29 Peel Grove.

Description of development

The development would involve the conversion of the existing three bedroom dwelling house (Class C3) into two flats with the following configuration:

i. Flat 1 – Livingroom and storage in the basement. Within the ground floor two bedrooms with en suite bathroom and kitchen/ dining room would be formed (2 bed, 4 person accommodation over 72 sq. metres);

ii. Flat 2 – Would be located to the first floor and comprises living room, one bedroom with ensuite and kitchen /dining room (1 bed, 2 person accommodation over 55 sq. metres).

Access to both flats would be gained via a front door and shared ground floor hallway. Car parking has been identified within the front garden area.



Fig. 2 – Proposed layout

Relevant planning history

Appeal

APP/B4215/A/11/2156694/NWF - Retrospective Application for subdivision of garden area and retention of use of garage as a car repair garage with provision of associated car parking Allowed 15 December 2011

Planning history

i. 094681/FO/2010/N2: Refused - 14.01.2011
29 Peel Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M12 4WE
Retrospective Application for subdivision of garden area and retention of use of garage as a car repair garage with provision of associated car parking

ii. 095515/LE/2011/N2: Refused - 16.05.2011
29 Peel Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M12 4WE
CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT for the continuous use of a commercial car repair garage (Class B2) within the grounds of a domestic dwelling.

Consultation, notification and publicity responses

Consultations

Local residents – No comments received.

Environmental Health – Recommend the following:

i. A condition limiting construction hours in a residential area.

ii. Implementation of the development in conjunction with the proposed front garden bin storage.

GM Police Design for Security – Recommend the following:

i. Windows to the first floor apartment along the east elevation and the north elevation to the bedroom should be PAS 24 with laminated glazing.
ii. The boundary to the rear and along the public footpath to the east should be repaired where necessary.
iii. The entrances should be illuminated in the hours of darkness via the use of dusk till dawn sensors on the light fixtures.
iv. An intercom system should be used at the entrance so that residents can vet visitors before opening the door to them. There should be no unrestricted trade access into the building.
v. A secure mail delivery system should be provided.
vi. Any alterations to the existing building should be complete to the Secured by Design standards, this included any replacement doors or windows.

Notifications and publicity

None required

Negotiations

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework Plan-making and national decision-making policies December 2025.

Chapter 6. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Policy HO7: Meeting the need for homes - States that in applying the policies in this Framework, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing accommodation that will contribute towards meeting the evidenced needs of the local community. In this case, the development would reduce the supply of family housing and thereby undermines efforts to address this under provision. Policy HO7 would thereby not be accorded with.

The following chapters of the NPPF, adopted December 2024, are also relevant:

i. Chapter 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes - States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that: a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed; the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The development would result in the loss of a property that has the potential to support family occupation, which would contrary to the objectives of Chapter 5.

Sustainable Development Joint Development Plan Document - Places for Everyone (2022-2039)

Policy JP-P6 - Health - States that development should maximise its positive contribution to health and wellbeing, whilst avoiding any potential negative impacts of new development. It is considered that the development would result in an overly intensive use of the site and be harmful to the character and amenities of the area. Policy JP-P6 would not thereby be accorded with.

Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy

Policy SP 1 (Spatial Principles) - For the reasons, set out in this report it is not considered that the development would accord with policy SP1, particularly regarding the impact of the intensified use of the application property. It is also considered that the related excessive noise and activity would be harmful to residential amenity and discourage the sustained occupation of the application property.

Policy EN19 Waste - Subject to review of bin capacities, it is considered that site has the capacity to achieve satisfactory waste and recycling storage and collection in accordance with policy EN19.

Policy H1 (Overall Housing Provision) - Discusses the need to manage the supply and availability of housing in the city. It also seeks to ensure that housing supply contributes to creating mixed communities by providing house types in response to the needs of a diverse and growing Manchester population. The development would conflict with policy H1 by reducing the supply of much needed family housing in the city.

Policy H5 (Central Manchester) - States, amongst other things, that over the lifetime of the Core Strategy, the area will accommodate around 14% of new residential development. Priority will be given to family housing and other high value, high quality development where this can be sustained. The development would undermine these objectives.

Policy DM1 Development Management - Discusses a range of issues that all development should have regard to. The development fails to accord with policy DM1 as it would:

i. Adversely impact upon on the residential character of the area;
ii. Harm to the amenities of future and neighbouring residents. This harm would be attributable to additional noise, disturbance and activity associated with the development.
iv. Have the potential increase demand for on street car parking. This would be particularly harmful to the amenity of the area, as there is a noticeable incidence of on-street car parking and traffic congestion.

Unitary Development Plan saved policies - The following policy is relevant:

DC26 - Development and Noise - The development has the potential to significantly additional noise, disturbance and activity in and around the application property due to the intensity of occupation. The result harm to residential amenity would be contrary to saved policy DC26.

Assessment

Principle of the development – The application has not been submitted with any evidence to suggest that the condition of the is no longer viable. The existing layout suggests the internal configuration of a space is capable of sustained occupation by a family. It is acknowledged that properties at 15, 22, 24, 25 and 26 Have been previously granted planning permission for flat conversions. Purpose built flats have also been built at 28-30 Peel Grove. However, these previous developments were granted planning permission before the adoption of the Core Strategy and the adoption of current policy that seeks to safeguard the supply of housing capable of accommodating families. There is also concern that the quality of the internal space

would not encourage sustained occupation. It is considered that the development would add to the proliferation of flat conversions and potentially increase the intensity of activity, noise and disturbance in and around the site. Such circumstances would be potentially harmful to residential amenity as the application property is in a relatively tightly constrained cul-de sac. Give the above concerns, the principle of the development would thereby fail to accord with Core Strategy policies DM1, H1, H5 and SP1.

Quality of proposed accommodation – Flat 1 would be positioned over two floors. The applicant has indicated that Flat 1 would have an overall area of 72 sq. metres. However, this would be dependent upon the positioning of the living room (to Flat 1) being located in the basement and would not be served by windows. The absence of natural light to a principal habitable room would be significantly harmful to residential amenity. Access to Flat 2 would be directly accessed via a staircase leading from the shared hallway. In the absence of a lobby and door (separating public and private space) the access arrangements to Flat 2 would present significant security and privacy concerns. The formation of such poor quality accommodation would discourage the sustained occupation of the converted property.

Outbuildings and previous mixed use – Historically an appeal decision (Ref: APP/B4215/A/11/2156694/NWF) allowed the operation of vehicle repairs within the site. The appeal decision was subject to several restrictive conditions, including the operation of development by the appellant as resident of the property. Vehicle repairs were required to cease should the ownership change. As the appellant no longer owns the property the permitted vehicle repairs can no longer be undertaken. However, the related outbuildings remain and adversely affect the quality of amenity space within the site and the wider amenities of the area. The applicant has not submitted proposals to ensure the removal of the outbuildings

Waste management – The development has indicated the formation of two separate bin enclosures in the front garden area. This storage would achieve appropriate bin capacities, but its siting would be visually obtrusive. However, more appropriate bin storage could be formed in the rear garden area.

Cycle storage – Although not identified, the site has the capacity to accommodate cycle storage within the site.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010
Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations
This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved polices 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.

Conclusion

The development would result in the loss of a house that is capable of supporting family occupation. The quality of the internal space would not encourage the sustained occupation of the proposed flats. The intensity of occupation resulting from the development would increase noise, disturbance and traffic generation in and around the site. The development would thereby be harmful to the amenities of the area and contrary to Core Strategy policies DM1, H1, H5 and SP1 and Places for Everyone policy JP-P6.

Article 35 Declaration

The development would result in the loss of a house that is capable of supporting family occupation. The quality of the internal space would not encourage the sustained occupation of the proposed flats. The intensity of occupation resulting from the development would increase noise, disturbance and traffic generation in and around the site. The development would thereby be harmful to the amenities of the area and contrary to Core Strategy policies DM1, H1, H5 and SP1 and Places for Everyone policy JP-P6.

Recommendation: Refuse

Reason for Refusal

1) The proposed development would result in the loss of quality residential accommodation and reduce the supply and availability of family housing in the locality. The development would thereby fail to positively respond to an identified housing need and undermine the formation of cohesive and sustainable neighbourhoods where people would choose to live. The development would thereby be contrary to policies DM1, H1, H5 and SP1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

2) The proposed development would result in an over intensive use of the application dwellinghouse and result in a consequential increase in the levels of noise and disturbance, activity and traffic generation through its occupation as two self-contained flats. The proposed form of occupation would undermine the formation of sustainable communities, have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residents and thereby be contrary to policies H1, H5, DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

3) The configuration of the internal space would secure a layout that would support the appropriate arrangement of habitable rooms and provision of natural light (to the living room of Flat 1) and the provision of secure access and egress (to Flat 2).The layout of the development would thereby be harmful to residential amenity and may potential discourage the sustained occupation of the proposed flats. The development would thereby be contrary to policies DM1, H1, H5 and SP1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.