

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
088667/FO/2008/S2	19th Dec 2008	12th Mar 2009	Didsbury West Ward

Proposal Erection of a 3 storey detached dwelling house, erection of detached garage, alterations to existing access to Holme Road, associated landscaping and boundary treatments

Location Land To The North Of Silkenstadt, Holme Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UP,

Applicant Mr Paul Bennett , Silkenstadt, Former Lodge, Holme Road, Manchester, M20 2UP,

Agent PZVi Architects And Designers Ltd, 21 Ralli Courts, West Riverside, Manchester, M3 5FT

Description

This application relates to a plot of land currently within the curtilage of *Silkenstadt*, formerly the park keepers cottage in Marie Louise Gardens. To the south and west of the site lies Marie Louise Gardens, while to the north stands Needham Hall which is being redeveloped for residential purposes. Holme Road lies to the east.

The applicant is proposing to erect a 5 bedroom 3 storey detached dwellinghouse on the site, along with a detached double garage which would have accommodation in the roofspace. Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site would be via the existing driveway currently used to access *Silkenstadt*, it is proposed to widen this access. Pedestrian access would also be possible via an existing right of way through the Gardens themselves.

The applicant has reduced the size of his proposal since his previous consent in 2007 (reference 081612/FO/2006/S2) on a larger plot which included Council owned land adjacent to this application site. The current application has a frontage of 10.2 metres in comparison with the previously approved dwelling which was 15.2 metres wide. In reducing the width of the proposed dwelling, the size of the footprint has also been reduced, the previous dwelling had a net ground floor area of 157m², while the current proposal has a net ground floor area of 108m²

The applicant is also proposing to erect of a part single/part 2 storey rear extension to *Silkenstadt*, in addition to a detached double garage with accommodation in the roofspace parallel with Holme Road and creation of a separate vehicular entrance to Holme Road. That application is also on this agenda (ref: 088668/FO/2008/S2).

Consultations

Local Residents – 74 letters of objection have been received, along with a petition of 13 signatures. The comments are outlined below

- Given the size of the proposed dwelling the development would represent an overdevelopment of the site.
- The design of the dwelling is a pastiche of real period architecture.
- The proposal would increase the overlooking of the Gardens, this would be contrary to the guidance in PPG17.
- The proposed works will impact upon the peace, tranquillity and character that the Gardens currently offer.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the levels of visual amenity enjoyed in the Gardens.
- The development would be contrary to UDP policy E2.7 which states that buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest should be retained, maintained and where necessary restored. The development of this site would impact upon this historic area.
- The alterations to the Holme Road entrance will increase vehicular traffic and the inherent risk of injury to the many children and elderly who use the Gardens.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the bid to obtain Green Flag status for the Gardens.
- The proposed detached garage is too large and has the potential to be used as a dwelling.
- The footprint of the dwelling, the hardstanding and the garage is excessive and leaves little amenity space.
- The dwelling is not needed to improve natural surveillance of the Gardens. Once the residents of Greystoke and Mersey Meadows are able to gain entry via the main gates natural surveillance and security will be restored.
- There is now a glut of luxury housing and a shortage of affordable housing, it is unlikely in the current economic climate that there will be a strong demand for a villa of this nature.

Ward Members – Cllrs Clayton and Williams have made the following comments:

- The proposal is to be built in what is supposed to be the back garden of *Silkenstadt* and as such contravenes the Council's policy against "garden grabbing" and backland developments in such locations.
- Given the size of the development, the extension to *Silkenstadt* and the erection of 2 detached garages, it is felt that the site is being overdeveloped in terms of bed spaces, massing, ground coverage, numbers and proximity of buildings.
- The proposed house is too close to *Silkenstadt* and as a result there will be a loss of privacy to the occupiers of both.
- The development will spoil the visual amenity of the Gardens and intrude upon the private enjoyment of its users.
- The garage should be an integral part of the dwelling, not detached.
- The rear elevation is a blank gable normally associated with industrial buildings. Furthermore this elevation will shade the adjoining private gardens in the Needham Hall development.
- The style of the house is too ostentatious, something more subdued would be more appropriate for this secluded location.

- The proposal does not share its entrance with *Silkenstadt*, this results in the requirement for a separate entrance which has resulted in too much of the site being hardsurfaced.
- At this end of Holme Road most of the houses are only 2 storeys in height, the new house will be much larger and out of keeping.

John Leech MP – Correspondence has been received from the Member of Parliament reiterating the objections of the local ward members.

Friends of Marie Louise Gardens – Object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the levels of visual amenity enjoyed in the Gardens.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the Gardens.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the peace and ambience of the Gardens.
- The proposal would increase the overlooking of the Gardens, this would be contrary to the guidance of Planning Policy Guidance no. 17 (PPG17).
- The new area of land recently integrated into the Gardens will be overlooked by the proposed dwelling.
- English Heritage have previously stated that the Gardens should be included within a conservation area, the proposal would damage the historic character of the Gardens and so be contrary to UDP policy E2.7.
- The double garage is too large and the extent of the hardsurfacing is too great.
- Having two vehicular entrances close together on Holme Road would have an impact upon pedestrian and highway safety.

West Didsbury Residents Association – The residents association object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- While the proposal is a good deal smaller than the dwelling previously approved it is still felt that the development would impact upon the recreational function of the Gardens due to the increased instances of overlooking. This would be contrary to the guidance in PPG17.
- The proposal would impact upon the levels of visual amenity enjoyed within the Gardens, an area considered by English Heritage to warrant inclusion within a conservation area.
- Given the proximity of *Silkenstadt*, it is considered that there will be a loss of privacy to the occupiers of both.
- Given the size of the development, the extension to *Silkenstadt* and the erection of 2 detached garages, it is felt that the site is being overdeveloped.
- The rights of access through the Gardens to *Silkenstadt* and the proposed dwelling may undermine park users' sense of public ownership and also place unwelcome obligations on Leisure Services and the Friends of Marie Louise Gardens when planning events in the Gardens.

Holme Road Residents Association – The residents association have made the following observations:

- The proposed garage is in front of the building line of *Silkenstadt* and the adjoining blocks at Needham Hall.
- The height of the garage makes it highly visible to local residents and visitors to the Gardens.
- The garage should be integrated into the proposed dwelling.
- The vehicular access should be shared with *Silkenstadt* in order to preserve the Holme Road vista.

Didsbury Civic Society – The civic society objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The visual impact of the proposal would be overwhelming and will be seen from all the central and northwest corners of the park, especially in winter when trees are bare. No amount of screening could alleviate this disamenity. As a result the proposal would be contrary to PPG17 and the Regional Spatial Strategy for the Northwest..
- Current and future users of the Gardens will suffer a loss of amenity and privacy by being overlooked by a large private house, this would be contrary to policy DP2 in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the Northwest.

Northenden Civic Society – The civic society objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The proposal would be contrary to UDP policy E2.7 as it would have a detrimental impact upon the historic area of the Gardens.
- The proposal represent overdevelopment given the area of the site and the size of the dwelling and the number of dwellings that are planned on the site.
- There are concerns about the rights of access given to the applicant, it could lead to a blurring of security responsibilities and place additional restrictions and obligations on the Council.

The Cheshire Gardens Trust – Marie Louise Gardens constitute a rare example of a well preserved Arts and Crafts garden in an area considered by English Heritage to warrant inclusion within a conservation area. This proposal would impact upon the character of the gardens and also upon the levels of visual amenity enjoyed within. In addition there is serious concerns about the impact the development would have upon the existing mature trees. Overall it is considered that the proposal is contrary to national and local planning guidance and policies.

The Historic Gardens Foundation – reiterates the comments of the Cheshire Gardens Trust.

Greater Manchester Police (GMP) – GMP does not object to the proposal but makes the following comments:

- The house must be built to Secured by Design standards in order to reduce the risk of victimisation at the property.
- A visually permeable gate on Holme Road boundary is preferable so that there is a visual link between the property and the street.
- Remotely operated access controls will be necessary at the front gate.

Landscape Practice – Request the introduction of tree planting, particularly to the northwest of the site, full details of boundary treatments and the submission of a full and detailed landscaping plan.

Environment and Operations Technical Services – Any comments will be reported at the committee.

Head of Sport and Leisure – Any comments will be reported at the Committee.

Head of Highway Services – Any comments will be reported at the Committee.

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 H2.2, H2.7, L1.5 and E2.6 in Part 1 of the UDP and policy DC16 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 H2.7 states that new housing schemes will be expected to be of a high standard of design and make a positive contribution towards improving the City's environment.

Policy L1.5 states that the Council will seek to upgrade other parks and recreation areas, wherever possible making use of private sector finance, to provide safe, secure and attractive areas accessible to all which provide a range of recreational activities to suit different groups of people. In considering proposals for improving facilities or extending their range, the Council will ensure that the main function of the city's parks in providing open spaces for informal recreation is fully protected.

Policy E2.6 states that the Council will prevent wherever 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 DC16, "Street Landscapes", 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. Except where trees are shown to be in poor health or are individually of little amenity value, or where a satisfactory replanting scheme is more desirable, the Council will not normally permit development proposals which would involve the loss of significant trees and would thereby change the visual character of the street.

North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) to 2021 (adopted September 2008) – The following policies are considered to be of relevance:

Policy DP1, 'Regional Development Principles', states that proposals and schemes should be located so as to make effective use of land, buildings and infrastructure and a sequential approach to development should be adopted to meet development needs.

Policy DP2, "Promote Sustainable Communities", states that sustainable communities should meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, promote community cohesion and equality and diversity, be sensitive to the environment and contribute to a high quality of life, particularly by:

- taking into account the economic, environmental, social and cultural implications of development

and

- improving the built and natural environment and conserving the regions heritage.

Policy DP7, "Promote Environmental Quality", states that environmental quality should be protected and enhanced, especially by the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and promoting good quality design in new development and ensuring that development respects its settings.

PPG17 "Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation" – The guidance note states that the recreational quality of open spaces can be eroded by insensitive development or incremental loss of the site. In considering planning applications - either within or adjoining open space - local authorities should weigh any benefits being offered to the community against the loss of open space that will occur. Furthermore, it states that local authorities should avoid any erosion of recreational function, maintain or enhance the character of open spaces and ensure that open spaces do not suffer from increased overlooking, traffic flows or other encroachment;

The guidance notes also states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements. As the proposed dwelling will not be erected within the Gardens themselves but within the curtilage of *Silkenstadt*, it is not appropriate in this instance to require the submission of a PPG17 assessment.

Principle of the Proposal – The principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, especially given the approval of a larger detached dwelling on part of this application site in 2007. Notwithstanding this, consideration must be given to the proposal's impact upon the existing levels of residential and visual amenity enjoyed in the locality of the site.

Future Use of Garage – A condition, preventing the use of the proposed double garage as additional bedroom space for the proposed dwelling and also preventing its use as separate living accommodation, will be attached to any approval granted in order to prevent the overdevelopment of the site.

Access for Disabled People – The proposed dwelling would be accessible throughout, this level of provision is considered acceptable.

Design – The proposed dwelling has been designed in the Edwardian style to reflect the era of the gardens, along with the design of *Silkenstadt* itself. It would be constructed from matching brick, with stone features and topped with rosemary tiles. Original features such as sash windows, stained glass and chimneys are also proposed. The use of low brick walls, topped with stone copings and railings are proposed along the perimeters of site.

The design of the double garage has also been informed by *Silkenstadt* and as such is considered acceptable.

Overall the design of the proposal is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity – It is not considered that the siting of the property in the location proposed would have a detrimental impact upon the levels of residential amenity that would be enjoyed by the occupants of the nearest dwellings, i.e. *Silkenstadt* and those in the adjoining Needham Hall development.

Siting – The proposed dwelling would be sited approximately 6 metres from the boundary of the site with the Gardens and to the northwest of *Silkenstadt*, as a result the siting of the proposal is considered acceptable.

Impact Upon the Enjoyment of Marie Louise Gardens – As the application does not involve work to or further loss of land within Marie Louise Gardens, it is not considered that the proposal would impact upon the layout of the gardens as they were originally planned at the beginning of the 20th Century.

It is acknowledged that the dwellinghouse will bring with it a degree of overlooking to a section of the Gardens that currently does not exist. However, it is not considered that this limited overlooking will have an unduly detrimental impact upon the users of the Gardens.

Visual Amenity – Given the design and siting of the proposed dwelling and the fact that it has been reduced in size to that previously approved, it is not considered that it would have a detrimental impact upon the levels of visual amenity enjoyed in the area.

Amenity Space – Sufficient private amenity space would be provided for the future occupants of the proposed dwelling.

Landscaping – A condition, requiring the submission of a detailed landscaping plan, would be attached to any approval granted.

The applicant will be entering into an agreement with the Head of Sport and Leisure to implement a series of landscape improvements to the Gardens in the vicinity of the proposed dwelling in order to compliment proposed improvements works to the Gardens and also minimise the proposal's impact.

Trees – New perimeter fencing is proposed to be built in proximity to the horse chestnut tree which is located to the front of the proposed dwellings. Trial holes were dug at the location of the foundations and despite the excavations were within the Root Protection Zone no roots to a metre in depth were found. To ensure that disturbance to the tree is kept to a minimum, a condition requiring the excavations within the Root Protection Zone to be carried out by hand is suggested in this instance.

No trees are proposed to be felled as part of the proposal.

Crime and Disorder – It is believed that the siting of a dwelling in this location will improve the level of natural surveillance that currently exists in Marie Louise Gardens.

The comments of GMP are noted and as a result the standard *Secured by Design* condition is suggested in this instance.

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)/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. He believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the 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 is in accordance with the City Council's Unitary Development Plan, in particular the following policies and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise:

Policy H2.2 states that the City Council will not normally allow development which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas. It is not believed that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact in terms of noise, vibration, traffic generation, road safety and air pollution or through its scale and appearance.

Policy H2.7 states that new housing schemes will be expected to be of a high standard of design and make a positive contribution towards improving the City's environment. It is considered that the proposal complies with this policy.

Policy L1.5 states that the Council will seek to upgrade other parks and recreation areas, wherever possible making use of private sector finance, to provide safe, secure and attractive areas accessible to all which provide a range of recreational activities to suit different groups of people. In considering proposals for improving facilities or extending their range, the Council will ensure that the main function of the city's parks in providing open spaces for informal recreation is fully protected. It is not considered that the proposal will impact upon Marie Louise Gardens as an informal recreation space.

Policy E2.6 states that the Council will prevent wherever 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. No trees are proposed to be felled.

Policy DC16 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 proposal does not result in the felling of any trees.

Conditions

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

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

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority: NN292/PL/102, 103A, 104, 105 and 106.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policy H2.2 and policy H2.7 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

3) No development that is hereby approved shall commence unless and until samples and specifications of all materials to be used for all boundary treatments and 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, as specified in policy H2.2 and Policy H2.7 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) No development shall commence until a hard and soft landscaping treatment scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date the buildings are first occupied. If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless otherwise agree in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out that respects the character and visual amenities of the area, in accordance with policy E2.6 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub and hedge which is to be retained as shown on the approved plans ref. 1482-01 and 02; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 1 year from the date of the last building on site is occupied.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed. No retained tree shall be topped or lopped without the written approval of the local planning authority and any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5387:2005

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

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

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area, pursuant to Policies DC16 and E2.6 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

6) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a method statement for the construction of the boundary walls and any excavation within any Root Protection Zones, shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The boundary walls shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved method statement prior to the occupation of the building.

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 DC16 and E2.6 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

7) No development shall commence until details of the measures to be incorporated into the development (or phase thereof) to demonstrate how Secured by Design accreditation will be achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with these approved details. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied or used until the Council as local planning authority has acknowledged in writing that it has received written confirmation of a secure by design accreditation.

Reason - To reduce the risk of crime pursuant to Policy E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan of the City of Manchester and to reflect the guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement "Delivering Sustainable Development".

8) The garage hereby approved and shown on plan no. NN292/PL/102 shall only be used as ancillary to the dwelling hereby approved. The garage shall not be used as a bedroom or bedrooms or as a separate dwelling.

Reason – In the interests of residential amenity and to prevent the overdevelopment of the site, pursuant to Policy H2.2 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

9) The development hereby approved shall achieve at least a four star sustainability rating under the Code for Sustainable Homes. A post construction review certificate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the dwelling hereby approved is first occupied.

Reason - In order to minimise the environmental impact of the development pursuant to policies E1.5 and E1.6 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies ER13 and DP3 of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) and the principles contained within The Guide to Development in Manchester 2 SPD and Planning Policy Statement 1.

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: 088667/FO/2008/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 held by the Planning Division.

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

Greater Manchester Police
West Didsbury Residents Association
Holme Road Resident Association
Didsbury Civic Society
Friends Of Marie Louise Gardens
Holme Road Resident Association
The Cheshire Gardens Trust
The Historic Gardens Foundation

5 Walsingham Avenue, West Didsbury,
16 Spath Road, Didsbury
Apartment 1-12, 7 Larke Rise, Didsbury
Apartment 1-7, 18 Larke Rise, Didsbury
Apartment 1-4, 20 Larke Rise, Didsbury
22 Larke Rise, Didsbury
2-4 Samlesbury Close, Didsbury
2b, Adamson Gardens, Didsbury
2a, Adamson Gardens, Didsbury
1-15 Birley Park, Didsbury
182-184 Palatine Road, Didsbury
Flat 1-16, Cairncroft, Holme Road, Didsbury
Silkenstadt, Marie Louise Gardens, Holme Road, Didsbury
1-3 Canterbury Park, Didsbury
Flat 1-12, Beechwood Court, Holme Road, Didsbury
23-31 Holme Road, Didsbury
Needham Hall, Holme Road, Didsbury
1-2 Winchester Park, Didsbury
2-10 Canterbury Park, Didsbury
37 Humberstone Avenue, Hulme,

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Greater Manchester Police
West Didsbury Residents Association
Holme Road Resident Association
Didsbury Civic Society
Friends Of Marie Louise Gardens
Holme Road Resident Association
The Cheshire Gardens Trust
The Historic Gardens Foundation

K. Heywood, 14 Blackburn Gardens, Didsbury
Julia Coulton, 5 Walsingham Avenue, West Didsbury,
Damien Mahoney, 37 Humberstone Avenue, Hulme,
John Churcher, 36 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury,
Mr A Doyle, 1 Winchester Park, Dene Rd West, Didsbury,
Steve Seddon, 64 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury,
Pam Siddons, 24 Old Lansdowne Rd, West Didsbury
Clare Howarth, 64 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury,
Robert Lock, 15 Austin Drive, Didsbury
Alexander Marsland, 24 Austin Drive, Didsbury
Personal details withheld at the request of individual
The Residents, Beechwood Court, Holme Road, Didsbury,
J L Mycock, address not supplied
Pat Devine, 15 Hesketh Avenue, Didsbury,
Pauline Hocking, 77 Dennison Avenue
Alison Hunt, 7 Stratford Avenue, West Didsbury,
David Ellison, 27 Mersey Meadows, Didsbury,
Karen Clarke, 36 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury,
Frank Clements, 35 Cresswell Grove,
Claire Mitchell, address not supplied
Jonathan Booty, 7 Stratford Avenue, West Didsbury,
Personal details withheld at the request of individual
Mrs Loretta Howell, 23 Arnot Way, Higher Bebington, Wirral
Dr Louise Smail, 2 Bamford Grove, Didsbury,
Roger Platford, 59 Dene Road, Didsbury,
Andrew Simcock, address not supplied
Derek & Margaret Crowther, 52 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury,
Kate Swainson, address not supplied
David Lane, No. 26 Montmano, Didsbury Point, West Didsbury,
Dr Catherine McDade, 5 Mersey Meadows,
Arun Brahma, 19 Elm Road, Didsbury,
Robert Owen, 9 Palatine Crescent, Didsbury,
Leo C Pickford, Flat 3, 25 Petworth Close, Sharston,
Simon Greenwood, address not supplied
299 Yew Tree Road, Withington,
L.G. Prime, 69 Briarfield Road, Withington,
Miss A. Beazley, Bramley Wood Cottage, 2G Adamson Gardens, Didsbury,
Rev Richard Hindley, The Gatehouse, 15 Twyford Close, Didsbury,
Mr & Mrs A. Thompson, 21A Spath Road, Didsbury,
Dr D.H. Buyer, 1 Ashfield Lodge, 229 Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Patricia Shakleton, 12 Walsingham Avenue, West Didsbury,
17 Brooklawn Drive, East Didsbury,
Mrs E Robinson, 81 Old Moat Lane, Withington,
Alison Hunt, 7 Stratford Avenue, West Didsbury,
13 Matton Avenue, Chorlton-cum-Hardy,
Tim Fairs, 23 Spath Road, Didsbury
Henry Mayor, 57 Hill Street, Didsbury
Alan Newton, 14 Beaver Road, Didsbury,
Miss A.F. Hamilton, 'Pinfold', 3 Stow Gardens, Withington,
Anthony Collier, address not supplied
Dr Mark Graham, address not supplied
Gary Donely, 19 Wingate Drive, Didsbury,
Matthew Platford, 59 Dene Road, Didsbury,

Tony & Shelagh Howell, 14 Linden Road, Didsbury,
Mr Philip Thomas, 9 Twyford Close, Didsbury,
Paul A Jones, 32 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury,
2 Bamford Grove, Didsbury,
Paul Thompson, 78 Langham Court, Mersey Rd, Didsbury,

Personal details withheld at the request of individual
Professor Ivan Leudar, 10 St Aldwyn's Rd., Didsbury
S. Knight, 8 Leamington Avenue, West Didsbury
B. Asbridge, 14 Berkeley Court, Mersey Road, Didsbury
J. Jones, Flat 2, 25 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury
Alex Siddons, 24 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury
Ryan Woodward, 8 Cae Bychan, Flint
Simon Townsend, address not supplied
M. Kinder, 195 Burton Road, West Didsbury
B. Randall, 16 Barlow Road, Didsbury
C. Reed, 20 Mersey Meadows, Didsbury
N and G. Sassoon, 5 Dene Park, Didsbury
Prof and Mrs M. Elstein, 25 Spath Road, Didsbury
D. M. Bean, address not supplied
Graham Davies, Flat 3 Spath Holme, Holme Road, Didsbury

Relevant Contact Officer : David Lawless
Telephone number : 0161 234 4543
Email : d.lawless@manchester.gov.uk