

List No. 4

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Didsbury West Ward | Application Number 079737/FO/2006/S2 | Date of Appln 12th Jun 2006 | Committee Date 28th Sep 2006 |
| Proposal | Erection of a pair of part 2/part 3 storey semi-detached dwellinghouses following the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse | | |
| Location | 12 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD, | | |
| Applicant | Bluetree Estates Ltd Market Court, 20-24 Church Street, Altrincham, WA14 4DW | | |
| Agent | Ludlam Associates The Bank, 99 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JQ | | |

Description

This application was deferred at the Planning and Highways Committee Meeting on 24th August 2006 in order to allow local residents more time to consider the revised proposals and to allow for the display of new site notices advertising the revised scheme.

"Delstar", 12 Elm Road is a part single/part 2 storey detached dwellinghouse, with single storey garage extension to the front, which is situated within the Blackburn Park Conservation Area. It is believed that the dwelling dates from the 1950's/60's, while the garage extension is a later addition from the 1970's. To the rear of the dwelling there is garden area, while to the front there is a hardsurfaced area and smaller lawn. There are three trees situated within the front lawn, a mature Horse Chestnut, a young mature Prunus and a young mature Cypress. The remainder of the front garden/hardsurfaced area is substantially landscaped with shrub borders and conifer hedge screens to the boundaries with no. 13 Parkfield Road South and 14 Elm Road respectively. Beyond the rear garden of no. 12 Elm Road stands Elmwood Lodge, an apartment development of some 24 flats, while on the opposite side of Elm Road stands no. 19 Elm Road, a 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouse.

The applicants are proposing to erect a pair of part 2/part 3 storey five bedroomed semi-detached dwellings on the site, following the demolition of no. 12 Elm Road. The semi-detached dwellings would be Edwardian in character and follow the building line established by no. 14 Elm Road. Parking facilities for both dwellings would consist of a hardsurfaced area to the front, with each having their own driveway off Elm Road. A lawn is also proposed to the front of each dwelling.

Since submission of their proposal, the applicants have amended it by reducing the overall footprint and moving it closer to Elm Road in order to be more comparable with the building line established by the neighbouring properties.

To facilitate the development the applicants are proposing to fell the Prunus and Cypress, while still retaining the Horse Chestnut.

An application for Conservation Area Consent to demolish no. 12 Elm Road also appears on this agenda under reference 079738/CC/2006/S2.

List No. 4

Consultations

Local Residents - 18 letters of objection, in respect of the originally submitted scheme, have been received from Local residents, the main points of which are outlined below:

- 1) The proposal is an overdevelopment for the site.
- 2) The massing of the new building extends too close to the boundary line to either side (i.e. no. 14 Elm Road and Parkfield Lodge) giving an almost "row" of housing or terracing appearance, which is not in character with this section of Elm Road.
- 3) The new building extends too far back. The original building, being single storey in this area, has a limited impact on the neighbouring rear gardens. The proposed building extends, to the rear, considerably beyond the norm of the other houses, and will impact the rear gardens to either side. This additional depth of the proposed building will also be very apparent from the street, in any view except the full frontal one.
- 4) The proposed building will be very close to the windows on the side of no. 14 Elm Rd. The current open aspect enjoyed by these windows, maintained by the single storey garage of no. 12 Elm Road, will be replaced with a brick wall.
- 5) There is significant under-provision of parking and garaging for either new property. Whilst there are a few houses nearby without garaging, these were built well before the present level of motor car ownership, and there is no justification to accept these standards for a new development. The parking of 2 or more cars will only be possible by sacrificing most of the front garden - again, something which is rare in the area.
- 6) No demolition of any house has ever been permitted in Blackburn Park since the establishment of the conservation area and this policy has been reinforced by the Planning Inspector in respect of 1 Pine Road.
- 7) The case for demolition has not been made. The existing property is in good repair, and although the property is not from the Victorian or Edwardian era that make up the majority of Blackburn Park, it's location and size is in keeping with its plot, and is sympathetic to the aspect of it's immediate neighbours.
- 8) The reason for the development is purely commercial and it will in no way preserve or enhance the conservation area, as it is required to do by conservation area planning law.
- 9) It is absolutely unacceptable that a perfectly habitable dwelling should be demolished in a conservation area except by reason of compelling public interest, as opposed to commercial benefit.
- 10) Though no. 12 Elm Road was not built in the early 20th century like most of the other properties in the area, it is a classic example of housing architecture of its era.

List No. 4

11) Demolition of property in a conservation area sends a dangerous signal to developers to demolish others to accommodate multiple properties in the same footprint, leading to the loss of character of the area.

12) The proposal would overshadow no. 14 Elm Road.

Twenty five letters of objection have been received in respect of the revised scheme, the main points of which are outlined below:

1) Even though the plans have been revised, it is entirely unacceptable to demolish a perfectly sound property in a conservation area for reasons other than compelling public interest. If approved this will set an appalling precedent opening the floodgates to other prospectors.

2) The Council will be failing in its legal duty to preserve the Blackburn Park Conservation Area if it allows a perfectly sound building to be demolished within it, except for reasons of public safety or in the public interest. The heart of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area is as much about principally an area of large family houses with spacious gardens in addition to the architectural style.

3) How can the building of two modern buildings to replace an established building be seen in any way as preservation? It simply cannot. The basis of this application is clearly capital gain for the developer and has absolutely nothing to do with preserving or enhancing the conservation area. Blackburn Park could turn into a 'Disneyland' of pastiche Victorian/Edwardian redevelopment.

4) No doubt the developer will be claiming that the application should be allowed on the basis that it would enhance the conservation area. If this was allowed, it would create a very dangerous precedent which would make a mockery of the planning laws concerning conservation, as it is entirely a matter of opinion as to what enhances an area and what does not. Such a precedent would have enormous consequences, both for the residents of conservation areas and for planning departments, as developers would acquire valuable sites within conservation areas and then seek to redevelop them on the grounds that they were enhancing the areas concerned.

5) The new proposal is not appropriate, is cramped on the site and will harm and not enhance the Conservation Area. The footprint is far too large for the land available and the property is not sympathetic with the rest of the properties in Blackburn Park.. There is little space for garages or garden and one of the beauties of this area is large gardens and housing for cars. This revision is a new variation to attempt backland development with the replacement properties using as much of the street frontage and extend far back into the rear gardens.

6) The new plans are not a significant change to the previous plan. The proposed properties have just been moved forward more to give a slightly bigger back garden. The two semis are still just too big for the plot of land and would be too overbearing. The proposal is higher than adjacent houses which are more overlooked with more side windows.

7) Though the present property is not in keeping with the many of the other properties in this Conservation area, it does represent architecture of housing of the 1960-70s. Thus, this is a good reason not to demolish it.

List No. 4

8) No demolition of any house has ever been permitted in Blackburn Park since the establishment of the conservation area and this policy has been reinforced by the inspector of the Secretary of State in respect of 1 Pine Road.

9) The reason for the development is purely commercial and it will in no way preserve or enhance the conservation area, as it is required to do by conservation area planning law.

A letter of support has been received from a local resident who is delighted that a developer wishes to enhance Didsbury with such a proposal and build family housing, rather than faceless flats that are ruining the area.

Councillor M. Clayton - The Councillor objects to the original proposal on the following grounds:

1) It is clear that the architects have approached this task with some sensitivity. Nevertheless the proposed building has a large footprint and is very close to its boundaries.

2) Although it is adjacent to two semi-detached properties (14&16 Elm Road), on its other side it is adjacent to Parkfield House, a substantial detached house in its own grounds. Many of the surrounding buildings are also detached houses in ample grounds. In this context it would be better if the existing house was replaced with a single detached house in similar in style to the surrounding Victorian and Edwardian villas and well separated from its neighbours. Anything more in this location is overdevelopment.

3) If the architects were to return with such a scheme it might be acceptable, but the proposed scheme is too big, too busy, and not quite good enough for this important conservation area. Indeed the main argument in favour of the proposal is sadly that redevelopment would get rid of a house that probably should never have been built and certainly would not have received planning permission now or anytime in the last two decades.

Any further comments will be reported.

John Leech MP - The Member of Parliament has sought clarification on a number of issues. The questions asked were in relation to the setting of a precedent for demolishing buildings in the conservation area, whether any other buildings have been demolished in this conservation area since it was designated, whether the house is protected as it is not an original building and if the Planning Department consider this proposal to be acceptable. It is also asked if the redevelopment of the existing building has been considered as an option and if this would be more or less acceptable than this proposal.

Blackburn Park Conservation Society - The Society have objected to the original proposal on the following grounds:

1) The proposal involves the demolition of a perfectly habitable dwellinghouse.

2) Demolition of the property would go against the principles of conservation area designation and set a frightening precedent.

List No. 4

- 3) An application to demolish and redevelop no. 1 Pine Road was refused by the Council, a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 4) The new design is not appropriate for this setting. It is cramped on the site and will harm and not enhance the conservation area.
- 5) To build 2 new, potentially 6 bedroomed houses without any garages will not enhance the area and result in the loss of front gardens, a feature of the conservation area.
- 6) The proposed dwellings are higher than the adjacent properties.
- 7) The neighbouring properties would be overlooked with more side windows.

The Conservation Society have objected to the revised proposal. To summarise, they believe that the existing house is typical of the conservation area, as it is a detached house in a good sized plot and should not be under threat. The new proposal is even less typical and is out of character with the character of Blackburn Park. The very crowded on the site appearance will remove the open garden aspect which will not enhance the conservation area. The proposal is contrary to PPG15 and Policy DC18.1 of the UDP. The prevention of demolition is fundamental and most important protection that Blackburn Park gets from its designation as a conservation area. This application should be robustly refused.

Didsbury Civic Society - The revised plans are only slightly different from the previous, but in an important way. The changes to the front gardens may secure the availability of car parking however it may result in clutter on the frontage or parked on the road. All other houses in the conservation area have garages and parked cars are rare. This arises from the overdevelopment of the site which is the other main problem. There will be a lack of privacy for the new occupants to the rear as it appears that the new houses will share a garden. The adjacent houses (14 & 16) were built in accordance with the Charles Blackburn conditions of plots and the proposal does not. The Society is strongly opposed to the proposal and endorses the comments of the Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings panel. We are sure that if a refusal resulted in an appeal that the inspector would also refuse it.

Manchester Conservation and Listed Buildings Panel - Whilst the panel did not object to the principle of the demolition of the existing building, it was felt that this should not be seen as a precedent for setting a trend for the demolition of non-listed post-war buildings in conservation areas. The panel did note, however, that the form of an individually designed detached single house is very much in keeping with the character of the conservation area.

The panel objected to the proposed replacement pair of semis. It was felt that the semis would represent an over-development of the site which in turn would have a negative impact on the character of the conservation area. It was felt that a much more modest footprint is needed and that a single detached property would be more appropriate.

The panel also observed that no car parking provision is proposed within the new built form and that the majority of the front garden would be given over to surface car parking. This was considered to be unacceptable.

List No. 4

The panel did not support the pastiche nature of the proposal, noting no materials had been specified. It was felt that a good contemporary design solution, appropriately scaled and over a ruled footprint would be more acceptable. They recommend that the application be refused or re-negotiated.

Landscape Practice Group - No objection to the proposal, though a detailed landscaping plan is required. The proposed paving units to the front of the semi-detached dwellings should be consistent with sustainable urban drainage principles in accordance with the Guide to Development in Manchester 2.

Environment and Operations Technical Services - The mature Horse Chestnut is in good condition and of high amenity value. The root protection area for this tree should be 7.2 metres and no root disturbance should occur within this area.

The young mature Prunus is in poor condition and is not worthy of retention, while the young mature Cypress though in fair condition is of low amenity value.

Head of Engineering Services - Pedestrian visibility splays should be provided at the entrances to the new driveways.

Greater Manchester Police (GMP), Architectural Liaison Officer - No objections.

Issues

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - There are no site specific policies. However when dealing with an application of this nature consideration is given to policies H1.2, H2.2, E2.6, E2.7 and E3.8 in Part 1 of the UDP and policies DC7, DC16.1 and DC 18.1 all of which are located in Part 2 of the UDP.

Policy H2.2 states that the Council will not normally allow development which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas. The matters which the Council will consider in coming to such decisions will include the scale and appearance of the development and its impact in terms of noise, vibration, traffic generation, road safety and air pollution.

Policy E2.6 states that the Council will prevent where possible the loss of existing trees and, in addition, will encourage extensive broadleaved tree planting schemes especially as a means to enhance informal recreational areas and to improve the appearance of built up areas.

Policy E2.7 states that the Council wishes to ensure that buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest are retained, maintained and, where necessary, restored. The policy continues further stating that it will seek to preserve and enhance the setting of such buildings and areas [¿] by the preservation of trees and landscape features.

Policy E3.8 states the Council wishes to enhance the appearance of its Conservation Areas and will where appropriate, designate further areas.

Policy H1.2 and Development Control Policy DC7 states that the Council will negotiate with developers to ensure that new housing is accessible at ground

List No. 4

floor level to disabled people, including those who use wheelchair, wherever this is practicable.

Development Control Policy DC16.1 states that in considering development proposals for any site, the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees within the public highway and along the public frontages of the site will be encouraged by the Council. The policy states further that the Council will not normally permit development proposals which involve the loss of significant trees and would thereby change the visual character of the street.

Development Control Policy DC 18.1 states that the Council will give particularly careful consideration to development proposals within conservation areas and in paragraph (a) that it will seek to preserve and enhance the character of its designated areas by considering the effect of major changes to the appearance of buildings and the desirability to retain existing features such as boundary walls and landscaping.

Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West - Formerly RPG13, this provides planning guidance for the North West region. Since 2004, the RSS has formed part of the development plans, as such the weight to be attached to its policies has increased. It contains policies that address core principles of development including the following:

_ Policy ER1 states that local planning authorities in their plans, policies and proposals should promote positive management of the Region's natural, built and historic environment and protect it from development likely to cause harm.

_ Policy ER3 states that local planning authorities in their plans, policies and proposals will identify, protect, conserve and where appropriate, enhance the built heritage of the Region, including those features and sites (and their settings) of historic significance to the North West such as listed buildings and conservation areas.

_ Policy DP3 states that new development must demonstrate good design quality and respect for its setting.

The North West Plan, draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) - Publicised in January 2006, this draft RSS document provides a framework for the physical development of the region over the next 15 to 20 years. Policy EM1 states that plans, strategies, proposals and schemes should identify, protect, maintain and where possible, enhance natural, man-made and historic features that contribute to the character and culture of landscapes, places and local distinctiveness within the North West.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 15, "Planning and the Historic Environment" - The guidance notes states in paragraph 4.14 that "...special attention shall be paid in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. "

Furthermore, it states in paragraph 4.19 "The Courts have recently confirmed that planning decisions in respect of development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area must give a high priority to the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. If any proposed

List No. 4

development would conflict with that objective, there will be a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission,..."

In addition, in paragraph 4.20 it states that "there is no requirement in the legislation that conservation areas should be protected from all development which does not enhance or positively preserve", continuing with "¿ the objective of preservation can be achieved either by development which makes a positive contribution to an area's character or appearance, or by development which leaves character and appearance unharmed."

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - Section 72 states that in respect of buildings in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Principle of the Proposal - The principle of erecting a pair of semi-detached dwellings on this residential site is considered acceptable. Notwithstanding this, consideration must be given to the proposal's impact upon the character of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area, i.e. whether the proposal preserves or enhances the conservation area.

Access for Disabled People - Accessible toilet and bathroom facilities are provided throughout both dwellinghouses.

Impact upon the Character of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area - Blackburn Park Conservation Area was designated a conservation area by the Council in December 1979 and comprises the area bounded by Barlow Moor Road, Palatine Road, Lapwing Lane and Wilmslow Road. This conservation area is principally an area of large family houses with spacious gardens, arranged along tree-lined roads which criss-cross the level ground of the park.

While it is acknowledged that a detached dwelling in large landscaped grounds, as currently exists at no. 12 Elm Road, is one of the characteristics of this conservation area, there are many examples of semi-detached dwellings throughout the conservation area. One such example occupies a site comparable in width and depth to the application site and is situated adjacent to it, i.e. nos. 14 and 16 Elm Road.

The Council believes that the erection of a pair of sympathetically designed semi-detached dwellings on this site, and the demolition of a dwelling that is out of character with the Victorian and Edwardian architecture that predominates throughout the conservation area, will both preserve and enhance the character of this conservation area. The design of the proposed dwellings is discussed below.

Design - Building materials and styles throughout the Blackburn Park Conservation Area are very varied. The older houses generally have textured light red or buff brick walls with blue slate roofs, and in some cases brick or stone dressings in contrasting colours are used even for window mullions. The later houses are predominantly smooth red brick, though render, half-timbering and decorative tile fringing are extensively used. Red tile and occasionally green slate are used for roofs and vertical cladding. All houses have pitched roofs, some of them steep, and there are a variety of gables, hips and half hips topped with interesting finials.

List No. 4

The existing dwelling at no. 12 Elm Road has few, if any of these qualities. It is constructed from red brick with buff brick panelling at 1st floor level. The windows at 1st floor level are grouped towards the right side, while the pitched roof is covered with grey concrete tiles. The dwelling has a long single storey projection to the front which incorporates a garage and covered walkway which links the garage to the dwelling. The front elevation of the garage is constructed of timber with glazing, while the garage door is the roller shutter type.

The proposed dwellings have been designed to reflect the Edwardian architecture of their surroundings:

The facing materials are to be of brick and render, render will be used on the upper floors, while brick will be used on the ground floor.

Half timbering is to be used on the front gables.

The roof will be pitched and covered with traditional materials, interest will be given to the roof by dropping the ridge at either side of the main roof and also by incorporating gables to accommodate the upper floors.

Windows will be casement with mullions, similar to those on the adjacent dwellings.

The front doors are to be panelled and surrounded by glazing, a canopy will cover the entrance.

A chimney stack will be located centrally to serve both dwellings.

Overall the design of the pair of semi-detached dwellings is considered sympathetic to and in keeping with the Blackburn Park Conservation Area. As a result it is felt that the design of the proposal would both preserve and enhance the character of this conservation area.

Siting - Though the single storey garage extension at the front of no. 12 Elm Road follows the building line established by no. 14 Elm Road, the main front elevation of no. 12 Elm Road is actually located to the rear of no. 14 Elm Road. This coupled with the fact that the rear single storey element of no. 12 Elm Road extends considerably into the rear of the site has resulted in a dwelling whose siting is not in character with the Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

The proposed scheme has been amended and brought forward by 1 metre (3.3 feet) to be comparable with the building line established by no. 14 Elm Road, plus the overall footprint of the development has been reduced in length by 2 metres (6.6 feet), from 19.8 metres (65 feet) to 17.8 metres (58.4 feet). These amendments have produced a development whose siting is now similar in character with the adjoining semi-detached dwellings and the other properties in the conservation area, i.e. sited closer to the highway, with smaller front gardens and larger rear gardens.

Overall the siting of the development is considered acceptable.

Height - The central part of the roof of the proposed dwelling is higher than no. 14 Elm Road and no. 13 Parkfield Road South by 0.4 metres and 0.35 metres (2.3 feet and 1 foot) respectively. Given this minor difference in the heights and the fact that it would be undistinguishable from the street, this difference is considered acceptable.

List No. 4

Residential Amenity - Concern has been raised about the impact the proposed side windows will have upon the levels of amenity currently enjoyed by neighbouring residents. These windows consist of a kitchen window on the ground floor, two bathroom windows on the 1st floor and a storeroom window on the 2nd floor. As the 2 bathroom windows will be obscurely glazed and the ground floor kitchen windows are non-habitable, it is not anticipated that their location in the side elevations would have a detrimental impact upon the current levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring residents. To ensure that the same can be said of the 2nd floor storeroom windows, and to ensure that the two bathroom windows on the 1st floor remain obscurely glazed, a condition requiring them to be fitted and maintained in obscure glazing is suggested.

Given the siting of the proposed development, it is not anticipated that it would severely overshadow the rear garden of no. 14 Elm Road. While there would be some overshadowing of the side elevation of no. 14 Elm Road, it is not considered that it would be of such a level as to warrant a refusal.

Sufficient private amenity space has been provided, in the form of the large rear gardens, for both of the proposed dwellings.

Trees - To facilitate the proposal the Prunus and the Cypress are proposed to be felled. As reported above these trees are considered to be not worthy of retention and of low amenity value respectively. Given that the applicants propose to plant 2 replacement trees in the front garden, along with establishing shrub/hedge planting to the side and front perimeters of the front garden, the removal of these 2 trees is considered acceptable in this instance.

Landscaping - A condition requiring the submission of a detailed landscaping plan, including details of the 2 replacement trees, will be attached to any approval granted. This landscaping scheme will also provide details of the perimeter planting and the materials to be used in the hardsurfacing works to the front.

Car Parking - No garaging facilities are proposed in this instance. Instead, similar to other properties in the vicinity of the site, the parking facilities take the form of hardsurfacing to the front of each dwelling. This is considered acceptable in this instance.

Highway Safety - Given the nature of Elm Road it is not considered that the provision of the suggested pedestrian visibility splays are required in this instance. Furthermore, the provision of these visibility splays would erode the level of landscaping in the front garden, potentially impacting upon the mature Horse Chestnut and reducing the amount of existing front perimeter wall to be retained.

Crime and Disorder - No objections have been raised by GMP's Architectural Liaison Officer.

Appeal Decision in Relation to no. 1 Pine Road - No. 1 Pine Road is a residential property in character with other properties situated throughout the Blackburn Park Conservation Area, for that reason its demolition was resisted by the Council, a decision that the Planning Inspectorate upheld on the grounds of the positive contribution it makes to the conservation area. It is not considered, for the reasons outlined above, that no. 12 Elm Road is in character

List No. 4

with the predominant architectural style throughout the conservation area, if it was, its demolition, as in the case of no. 1 Pine Road, would be resisted.

CONCLUSION

As no. 12 Elm Road is of little architectural merit in relation to the character of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area and the proposed dwellings have been designed and sited in such a fashion as to reflect this character, it is believed that the proposal would both preserve and enhance the character of this conservation area.

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 the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee 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 Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning has concluded that some rights conferred by these Articles on the applicant(s)/objectors/residents 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. He believes that any restriction on these rights posed by approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation **APPROVE**

on the basis that the proposal would preserve and enhance the character of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area and it is in accordance with the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, in particular policies H2.2 and DC18 and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

Conditions and/or Reasons

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 drawings numbered 6042(Su) 001 and 002; 6042 (PI) 100b, 101a, 102a, 200b, 201a, 202a, 203a, 400a and 401, stamped as received by the Local Planning Authority on 12th June and 7th August 2006, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

List No. 4

Reason

To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to Policies H2.2 and DC18 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

3) Construction of the development hereby approved by this permission shall not take place until samples and specifications of the materials to be used on all external elevations of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be constructed only using the approved materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason

To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, pursuant to Policies H2.2 and DC18 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) All trees within the site and/or trees whose root structure may extend within the site, which are to be retained as shown on the approved plan ref. 6042 (PI) 400a , shall be fenced off and a Root Protection System established, in accordance with a British Standard BS 5837:2005 scheme to be approved by the City Council as local planning authority, before any building or other operation approved by this permission is carried out. Thereafter, no excavation or other building or engineering operations shall take place and no plant, machinery or materials (including excavated material) shall be placed, deposited, stored or stacked within any such fence during the construction period.

Reason

In order avoid damage to trees adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area, pursuant to Policies E2.6 and DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5) A landscaping scheme, including the details of any hardsurfacing and walls/fencing, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The approved scheme shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date the buildings are first occupied. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying or becoming severely damaged or becoming severely diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size or species to those originally required to be planted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason

To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out, pursuant to Policies E2.6 and DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

List No. 4

6) The 1st and 2nd floor windows in the side elevations of the development hereby approved shall be fitted and maintained in obscure glazing, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason

In the interests of residential amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development, pursuant to Policy H2.2 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 079737/FO/2006/S2 held by Planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are all held by the Planning Division.

The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted on the application:

14 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
16 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
19 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
13 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 7 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 10 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 1 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 2 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 3 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 4 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 5 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 6 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Parkfield Lodge Flat 1 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 2 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 3 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 4 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 5 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 7 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 8 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge Flat 9 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DD
Elmwood Lodge Flat 8 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 9 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 11 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 12 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 13 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 14 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB

List No. 4

Elmwood Lodge Flat 15 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 16 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 17 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 18 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 19 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 20 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 21 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 22 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 23 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
Elmwood Lodge Flat 24 17 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
12 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
Elm Lodge Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
10 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XB
33 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
7 Belfield Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6BJ
9 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
322 Lapwing Lane Didsbury Manchester M20 6UW
37 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
23 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
25 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 0XD
326 Lapwing Lane Blackburn Park Didsbury Manchester M20 6UW
324 Lapwing Lane Blackburn Park Didsbury Manchester M20 6UW
10 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6UY
Blackburn Park Conservation Society 22 Pine Road Manchester M20 6UZ
39 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6UZ
5a Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DA
8 Parsonage Road Withington Manchester M20 4PQ
6 Stanton Gardens Stanton Avenue Manchester M20 2PT
5 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DA
33 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6UZ
5 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6UY
27 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6XD
12 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester M20 6DB
6 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester M20 6UY
9 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester M20
Underbank House Millgate Lane Didsbury Manchester
7 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
Blackburn Park Conservation Society 22 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester M20 0UZ
8 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
Rusholme Dental Practice 300 Great Western Street Rusholme Manchester M14 4LP

List No. 4

Representations were received from the following third parties:

R Wilkinson 14 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
P And M Rhodes 16 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
A Brahma 19 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
J Posci Elmwood Lodge Flat 4 17 Parkfield Road South
Colin And Carol Hardicre Parkfield Lodge Flat 7 Parkfield Road South
M Milner Elmwood Lodge Flat 14 17 Parkfield Road South
A Jenkins Elmwood Lodge Flat 17 17 Parkfield Road South
D Fitzgerald 10 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
M Thomas 33 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
F Armstrong Hall 7 Belfield Road Didsbury Manchester
P And D Preston 9 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
B Goodman 322 Lapwing Lane Didsbury Manchester
J Scott 37 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
R Potter 23 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
D Stanton 25 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
R Thorley 326 Lapwing Lane Blackburn Park Didsbury
The Occupier 324 Lapwing Lane Blackburn Park Didsbury
J Smith 10 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
D Whitaker Blackburn Park Conservation Society 22 Pine Road Manchester
R And S Williams 39 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
J Meeks 5a Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester
A Jenkins 8 Parsonage Road Withington Manchester
Cllr M Clayton 6 Stanton Gardens Stanton Avenue Manchester
T Gibson 5 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester
H KIFF 33 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
C Vickerman 5 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
John Leech MP
J Posci 27 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
R Kolbeck 12 Parkfield Road South Didsbury Manchester
E Carroll 6 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
S Shabetai 9 Pine Road Didsbury Manchester
T Webster Underbank House Millgate Lane Didsbury
B Wilson 7 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
D Whittaker Blackburn Park Conservation Society 22 Pine Road, Didsbury,
M Sutcliffe 8 Elm Road Didsbury Manchester
Dr S Hasnain Rusholme Dental Practice 300 Great Western Street Rusholme

Relevant Contact Officer: : David Lawless
Telephone No. : (0161) 234 4543
Email : d.lawless@manchester.gov.uk