

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
088668/FH/2008/S2	19th Dec 2008	12th Mar 2009	Didsbury West Ward

Proposal Erection of a part single/part 2 storey rear extension to former lodge; elevational alterations to former lodge; erection of detached garage; creation of new vehicular entrance to Holme Road; erection of new boundary treatment including wall and railings

Location 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

Silkenstadt, formerly known as *The Lodge* is a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse, dating from the early 20th Century, which is located within the north-eastern corner of Marie Louise Gardens. To the rear of the site lies the access road to the former depot site which adjoins *Silkenstadt* and beyond that access road stands the grounds of Needham Hall which is being redeveloped for residential purposes.

The applicant is proposing to erect of a part single/part 2 storey rear extension to *Silkenstadt* to form additional living accommodation. This extension will result in the overall height of the dwelling being raised by approximately 0.5 metres resulting in the insertion of 3 dormer windows and 8 roof lights. In addition to the extension, the applicant is proposing to undertake a number of elevation alterations to the dwelling which involves primarily the removal of the front porch and the replacement of existing windows. Furthermore, the applicant proposes to erect a detached double garage, with accommodation in the roofspace, parallel with Holme Road, create a new vehicular entrance to Holme Road and erect new boundary treatment in the forms of walls and walls/railings to the Holme Road and Marie Louise Gardens frontages respectively. The net ground floor area of the proposed extension has been reduced from that previously approved in 2007, i.e. from 156m² to 110 m².

The applicant has previously obtained planning permission in 1999, 2000, 2005 and 2007 (under references 056868/FH/SOUTH1/99, 060102/FH/SOUTH2/00, 076900/JO/2005/S2 and 081609/FH/2006/S2 respectively) to erect a 2 storey extension to the side of *Silkenstadt*. The applicant has also obtained planning permission to erect a detached double garage, again with accommodation in the roofspace, to the front of the dwelling in 2006 under reference 079096/FH/2006/S2.

The applicant has also applied to erect a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse to the side of *Silkenstadt*, that application is also on this agenda (ref: 088667/FO/2008/S2).

Consultations

Local Residents – 43 letters of objection have been received, along with a petition of 13 signatures, the comments of which are outlined below:

- The proposed extension would result in the overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposed extension is too large and bulky and as a result would be contrary to UDP Policy DC1.
- The proportions of the original park keepers lodge were carefully designed to harmonise with and enhance the garden landscape, the proposed extension damages the appearance of the dwelling and gives it a cumbersome and top heavy demeanour.
- The proposed vehicular to Holme Road is not safe as emerging drivers are unable to view on-coming traffic.
- 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 and tranquillity the Gardens currently offer.
- The proposed double garage so close to Holme Road will impact upon visual amenity, furthermore it has the potential to be converted into further residential accommodation in the future.
- The increase in the height of the Holme Road boundary wall to 2.2 metres high would disrupt the harmony of the existing boundary treatments along Holme Road, which are approximately 1.3 metres in height.
- The proposed wall/railings between the Gardens and the dwelling are an inappropriate feature and should be replaced by a hedge.
- The group of trees between Holme Road and the lodge should be protected from the development.
- 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.

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

- The reduced scale of the alterations to the property are to a certain extent preferable to the previously approved extension, although this is in the context of a much smaller overall site.
- Unfortunately moving the garage from the basement to a large separate detached building is unacceptable for the following reasons:
 - i. The garage is oversized and well in front of the Holm Road building line, it should be at least 10 metres back from the road.
 - ii. The garage causes overdevelopment on the site, too large a proportion of the site is given over to buildings.
 - iii. The garage is too high and appears little more than a ruse to create a mews or coach house style cottage.
 - iv. A separate garage is unnecessary and the garage could be part of the house or underground as in the previous permission.
 - v. The creation of additional accommodation in the roofspace of the dwelling constitutes overdevelopment.

- vi. The new access onto Holme Road represents a potential traffic problem.
- The proposal might be acceptable if the garage were a simple single storey building positioned behind the Holme Road elevation of the existing dwellinghouse.

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 visual amenity
- The proposed extension is too large and not subservient to the original building, it alters the appearance of the original building and makes it appear top heavy.
- The proposal would increase the overlooking of the Gardens, this would be contrary to the guidance of PPG17.
- 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.
- The additional vehicular entrance onto Holme Road would have an impact upon pedestrian and highway safety.
- The boundary treatment on the northwest and southwest elevations, walls surmounted by railings, is too high and intrudes upon the visual amenity of the Gardens. The boundary treatment on the Holme Road frontage is too high and does not match the height of the neighbouring walls.
- A full and detailed landscaping plan should be submitted.
- Any trees adjoining the development must be protected during construction.
- The applicant has stated that the development would improve security within the Gardens, the Friends feel that the increased usage of the Gardens by residents of the Greystoke and Needham Halls would improve natural surveillance.

West Didsbury Residents Association – Though not opposed in principle to an extension to the lodge, the residents association object to this proposal on the following grounds:

- The sheer size of the proposed extension, which it would seem would more than double the gross floor area, would constitute overdevelopment.
- The increase in the number of windows overlooking the Gardens would significantly increase overlooking and as a result make park users ill at ease, this would be contrary to PPG17 and UDP policy L1.5.
- The proposed reconstruction of the southwest and northwest elevations, including the addition of a second floor, would irreversibly damage the architectural integrity and proportions of the building which has been carefully designed to harmonise with and enhance the Gardens.

- The Gardens is an area of special historic interest, extending the lodge as proposed would erode this character.
- It is understood that the Council intend to nominate the Gardens for a Green Flag Award, in light of this and given the criteria required for this award it would seem even more imperative that we preserve the character of the lodge.

A revised application with a more modest extension with fewer windows on the southwest and northwest elevations and fewer roof lights, along with a smaller garage and lower boundary treatment might be acceptable.

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

- The double garage is excessive in size and located too close to Holme Road, making it highly visible to local residents and visitors to the Gardens. The preferred option would be for the garage to be in the basement as with the previous approval.
- Holme Road is subject to high levels of through traffic, the creation of an additional vehicular access would impact upon traffic safety.
- The proposed boundary wall to Holme Road should be built at the same height as the surrounding boundary walls. The proposed commemorative plaque in this wall is totally inappropriate and unnecessary.

Didsbury Civic Society – The Civic Society have stated that the proposal is a much improved version of the previous approval and now represents a less overbearing aspect towards Marie Louise Gardens. However, it feels that there is no need for the velux windows in the roof of the south west elevation as this seems out of keeping with the rest of the frontage.

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 has no objections to the proposal, though does make the following comments:

- The proposal would benefit from the use of *Secured by Design* products in order to reduce the risk of victimisation.
- It would be preferable to see a visually permeable gate on the Holme Road frontage so that there is a visual link between the property and the street.
- Remotely operated access controls will be necessary at the front gate in order to vet visitors. The front gate would effectively become the front door.

Landscape Practice – Have made the following comments in relation to the landscaping scheme:

- Tree planting should be introduced along the Holme Road boundary.
- Full details of the proposed planting scheme and boundary treatments are required.
- Proposals for the protection of existing trees and shrubs are required.

Environment and Operations Technical Services – The proposed works do not appear to be within the Root Protection Area of any trees and as such there is no objection to the proposal.

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, L1.5 and E2.6 in Part 1 of the UDP and policies DC1 and 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 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.

Development Control Policy DC1, "Residential Extension", states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. the general character of the property;
- b. the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;

c. the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;

d. the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene;

and

e. the effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

The policy states further that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the UDP and the following criteria:

a. they are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of the original buildings);

b. they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;

c. they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details;

and

d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

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. Though *Silkenstadt* is a recognisable feature of Marie Louise Gardens, the extension will not be erected within the gardens themselves but within the curtilage of the property. Given this, 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 extension on the property 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 *Silkenstadt* 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 renovation and extension of the property would enable it to be fully accessible throughout and the size of the bathrooms and bedrooms are acceptable. Overall the level of provision is considered acceptable.

Design – The design of the extension has been informed by *Silkenstadt*. The ground floor would be constructed from red brick with the first floor comprising of rendering and timber in the Tudor style. Headers and cills would match those in existence, as would a chimney stack proposed for the rear elevation of the extension. Overall the design of the extension is considered acceptable.

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

Visual Amenity – As the design of the extension and the detached garage is considered acceptable it is not felt that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the levels of visual amenity enjoyed within the vicinity of the site, both from Holme Road and from within Marie Louise Gardens themselves.

Residential Amenity – The proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon the levels of residential amenity currently enjoyed by the occupants of the nearby dwellings on Holme Road, given the distances between the respective properties.

Overlooking of the Gardens – Presently, 7 windows in *Silkenstadt* would allow the overlooking of the Gardens, 6 of these are habitable room windows.

The proposal would increase the number of windows in the northwest and southwest elevations, i.e. those overlooking the Gardens, to 15. Of these 15 windows, 3 would be obscurely glazed as they are bathroom/w.c. windows and 3 would be either hall or landing windows. Of the remaining 9 windows, 6 would be to bedrooms/lounge areas, while 1 would be to the dining room and 2 would be to the second floor study.

Given the above, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to the excessive overlooking of the Gardens.

Boundary Treatment – The use of stone for the boundary wall to the gardens, topped with Edwardian style railings, is considered acceptable. Regarding the Holme Road elevation, the existing timber boarding on top of the existing stone wall will be removed and replaced with stone to the same height. Samples of the stone, any new coping stones and the railings used in the boundary treatment will be required to be submitted for approval by condition no. 3 below.

Parking – The level of parking proposed is acceptable.

Pedestrian and Highway Safety – While the comments of the Head of Highway Services are awaited it is not anticipated that an additional vehicular access to Holme Road, which would serve a single dwelling, would have a detrimental impact upon the current levels of pedestrian and highway safety enjoyed on this part of Holme Road.

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

Trees – No trees are proposed to be felled as part of the proposal. Furthermore, the City Arborist has confirmed that no element of the proposed development would be within the Root Protection Area of any of the existing trees.

Crime and Disorder – The property would not impact upon the current levels of crime and safety in the gardens, in fact it is anticipated that the occupation of *Silkenstadt* would contribute towards increasing the levels of natural surveillance that currently exist in the 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 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 believed that bringing the dwelling back into use and improving boundary treatment will improve the level of visual amenity in the Gardens. Furthermore, 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.

The proposal complies with Policy DC1 as it is not considered that the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the general character of the property; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; the visual amenity of the street scene and will not lead to the loss of any off-street car parking.

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 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 following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority: NN292/PL/201, 202, 203a, 204, 205, 206, and 207.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policy H2.2 and policy DC1 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 DC1 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 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 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) 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 City 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".

6) The garage hereby approved and shown on plan no. NN292/PL/202 shall only be used as ancillary to Silkenstadt (being the dwelling formerly known as The Lodge and adjacent to the northern boundary with Marie Louise Gardens). 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.

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: 088668/FH/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:

Didsbury Civic Society
Holme Road Resident Association
West Didsbury Residents Association
Greater Manchester Police

Friends Of Marie Louise Gardens
The Lodge, Marie Louise Gardens, Holme Road,
Flat 1-12, Beechwood Court, Holme Road,
23-25 Holme Road,
Needham Hall, Holme Road,

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Friends of Marie Louise Gardens
West Didsbury Residents Association
Holme Road Residents Association
Didsbury Civic Society
The Historic Gardens Foundation
Greater Manchester Police

Petition of 13 signatures, Beechwood Court, Holme Road, Didsbury,

K. Heywood, 14 Blackburn Gardens, Didsbury
Frank Clements, 35 Cresswell Grove,
Claire Mitchell, address not supplied
Pat Devine, 15 Hesketh Avenue, Didsbury,
Robert Benjamin, 5 Beechwood Court, Holme Road, Didsbury
Alison Hunt, 7 Stratford Avenue, West Didsbury,
L.G. Prime, 69 Briarfield Road, Withington,
Ms Lingle, 299 Yew Tree Road, Withington,
J. Slee, 13 Malton Avenue, Chorlton-cum-Hardy,
Mr & Mrs A. Thompson, 21A Spath Road, Didsbury,
Mrs D.H. Buyer, 1 Ashfield Lodge, 229 Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Patricia Shackleton, 12 Walsingham Avenue, West Didsbury,
Name not supplied, 17 Brooklawn Drive, East Didsbury,
Roland Fairbrother, 81 Old Moat Lane, Withington,
Residents of 23 Spath Road, Didsbury
Anne M. Fryer & John Fryer, 59 Victoria Avenue, Didsbury,
Tim Fairs, 231 Queenston Road, West Didsbury,
Henry Mayor, 57 Hill Street, Didsbury
Peter C Pickup, 32 Brooklawn Drive, Didsbury,
Dr Mark Graham, address not supplied
Anthony Collier, 12 Linden Road, Didsbury
Gary Donely, 19 Wingate Drive, Didsbury
Matthew Platford, 59 Dene Road, Didsbury,
Pam Siddons, 24 Old Lansdowne Rd, West Didsbury
Alex Siddons, 24 Old Lansdowne Rd, West Didsbury
B. Randall, 16 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury
Sarah Loader, 86 Palatine Road, West Didsbury,
Paul Thompson, 78 Langham Court, Mersey Rd, Didsbury

R. Sacaloff, 12 Beechwood Court, Holme Road, Didsbury
R. Fairbrother, 88 Atwood Road, Didsbury
C. Reed, 20 Mersey Meadows, Didsbury
N and G Sassoon, 5 Dene Park, Didsbury
D. Bean, address not supplied
Prof. and Mrs M. Elstein, 25 Spath Road, Didsbury
Miss A. Beazley, Bramley Wood Cottage, 2g Adamson Gardens, Didsbury

C. Poyner, 16 Palatine Crescent, Didsbury
S. Knight, 8 Leamington Avenue, West Didsbury
J. Jones, Flat 2, 25 Old Landsdowne Road, West Didsbury
C. Hardwick, Flat 2, 25 Old Landsdowne Road, West Didsbury
R. Woodward, 8 Cae Bychan, Flint
S. Townsend, address not supplied
M. Kinder, 195 Burton Road, West Didsbury

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