

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
077757/FO/2005/S2	30th May 2008	12th March 2009	Didsbury West Ward

Proposal Erection of new building 10.3 metres high at the ridge to accommodate 3 indoor tennis courts with associated landscaping following demolition of existing indoor court building

Location Northern Lawn Tennis Club, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA

Applicant The Northern Lawn Tennis Club, Palatine Road , West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA

Agent Ludlam Associates The Bank, 99 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JQ

Update

This application was deferred from the February Agenda for a Site Visit.

Previously this application was withdrawn from the December Agenda to allow for further information to be obtained in relation to Fire Safety and Need.

Fire Safety

Representations received drew the attention of the Local Planning Authority to concerns relating to Fire Safety. Whilst these issues are usually addressed at Building Regulations stage it was felt appropriate to ensure that the building would be practicable and could not give rise to an adverse impact upon residential amenities with regards to Fire Safety issues, having special regard to the proximity of 5a Parkfield Road South. This is dealt with within the body of the report.

Need

We have now received further information from Leisure Services and from the applicant to offer justification for the need for the building. The information submitted also offers more details of the Community Use proposed. This is dealt with within the body of the report, and the Heads of Terms of a proposed Section 106 Agreement are set out.

Description

The application site is at the Northern Lawn Tennis Club, which is located at the junction of Palatine Road and Lapwing Lane in a predominantly residential area of West Didsbury. The site lies within the Blackburn Park Conservation Area which was designated in December 1979.

The proposed development would see the demolition of an existing red brick building which is covered in ivy and stands to the south west of the Northern Lawn Tennis Club site, housing one indoor double tennis court and some changing facilities.

The properties nearest to the development lie on Parkfield Road South, Blackburn Gardens and Elm Road.

The existing building on site measures 11.5m high to the ridge (9.6m to eaves). The footprint measures 17.9m depth by 43.6m width (780.44m²), the gable of 5a Parkfield Road South is c. 1.7m from the existing building.

The proposed building would measure 10.3m high to the ridge, the footprint of the building would be larger than the existing building measuring 40.4m depth by 47.5m width (1,919m²), bringing the building to within 5m of the boundary with properties to the north side of Elm Road and within 7.75m with the shared boundary with properties on Blackburn Gardens to the north east.

The proposed three court building would be constructed using red brindled clay facing bricks, with green metal cladding, translucent cladding panels used at the gable apex and a sedum type green roof system.

The main entrance into the proposed building would be off the existing service/access area. However the proposal is to gate the existing vehicular entrance from Parkfield Road South, allowing only access for emergency vehicles (those capable of using this access, larger emergency vehicles gaining access from Elm Road), making the access for the users of the facilities from the main club building accessed off Palatine Road.

This application has been revised and reconsulted upon following a number of changes. Namely, in this instance, a reduction in the height of the building by 1m (building sunk 1m into the ground), a movement from the shared boundary with 5a Parkfield Road South by 0.5m, alterations to the landscaping scheme and a more meaningful Community Use Agreement drawn up in conjunction with the Leisure Department (original Community Use Agreement submitted to accompany this application drawn up in conjunction with Tennis Development Officer in isolation of other Leisure Department input). This has been further bolstered by the further information submitted.

There is also an application 077756/CC/2005/S2 for CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT for the demolition of the existing indoor court building to facilitate the erection of new building 10.3 metres high at the ridge to accommodate 3 indoor tennis courts with associated landscaping.

No issues have been raised with regards to the loss of the existing building in terms of its contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, which is considered to be neutral, with the benefit of age and the presence of the ivy which screens the building. However, no Conservation Area Consent has been granted since the submission on 1st February 2006 as there has been no permission in place to secure the redevelopment of the site.

Were committee minded to approve this application, the Head of Planning could exercise his delegated powers to allow the demolition of the building. A condition would be appended to any such approval ensuring that the demolition was tied to the redevelopment of the site.

Consultations

The planning application has been advertised as affecting the Blackburn Park Conservation Area. Site notices have been displayed.

Local Residents -

98 Objections were received from 88 different addresses

Objections are on the grounds that the development proposed:

- Constitutes overdevelopment of the site, larger footprint
- Is inappropriate with regards to the character of the Conservation Area e.g. Industrial style building, the existing building could be refurbished
- Does not have a meaningful Community Use Agreement
- Is not required, lack of justification, existing facilities under-utilised
- Would be overbearing to neighbouring properties e.g. 5a Parkfield Road South
- Sedum roof does not make sense, funding may mean it is left out of the scheme
- Loss of mature leylandii trees
- Loss of outlook
- Creation of precedent
- Reduced sense of openness
- Loss of habitat for nesting birds and bats (presently in ivy on existing building)
- Increase in traffic generation
- Concerns expressed that the Northern cannot enter into a Section 106 (have been adequately rebutted by the submission of a letter from Chairman of the Northern Lawn Tennis Club dated November 10 2008)
- Impact on house value (not a material planning consideration)
- Suggested additional landscaping to be located in the gardens of residents surrounding the site to ensure the building is adequately screened. (Whilst the Head of Planning considers the landscaping proposed to be acceptable subject to condition, enquiries could be made of the applicant to explore whether or not they were amenable to such a suggestion.)
- Suggested committee site visit

Objections have also been received having regard to the granting of consent for a development in 1995 (048071/FO/SOUTH1/95 - Two storey extension to existing club house, single storey building to form two indoor courts with a link corridor, first floor extension to squash courts and additional car parking) where a landscaping scheme was initially unsuccessful and a Community Use Agreement was not detailed enough to tie the club into meaningful Community Use provision. The Community Use Agreement being tied by covenant rather than an enforceable Section 106 agreement. This has led to concern with regards to the current proposals.

A letter from an independent fire safety consultant secured by local residents was submitted. Whilst the residents acknowledge that such issues are normally subject to the Building Regulation process we asked Greater Manchester Fire Service and the Building Control Officer to comment on the application, please see later on in this report.

78 Letters of Support were received from 74 different addresses

Support on the grounds that the development proposed:

- Will be beneficial to sports provision
- Would benefit local youngsters who attend community programmes (help with child obesity and anti-social behaviour)
- Supporting tennis
- Is ecologically “cutting edge”, the Living roof represent environmental awareness
- Replaces eyesore of old court in Conservation Area, enhancing the appearance of the area
- Is an innovative and well planned beneficial development with negotiated improvements

34 Statements of Support were signed and submitted, however, they did not have full postal addresses.

Councillor Mark Clayton made representations on the 17th July 2008 stating that:

“Obviously this application is to replace an existing large and frankly unpleasant indoor court built around 35 years ago prior to the creation of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area. Its appearance has mellowed slightly by growth of ivy, but it is still very stark.

Normally one would not contemplate the construction of even the existing court on a Conservation Area, but in this case we have to consider whether the proposal would improve matters by replacing a poor building with a slightly less poor one.

The proposal is only marginally altered from the previous plans. It was pleasing to note that the club had heeded my suggestion of constructing the new courts partially underground. Unfortunately the club has only sunk the courts merely one metre underground, which although it does reduce the above ground volume by nearly 2,000 cubic metres, is still more than 50% more than the original at nearly 12,000 cubic metres – an increase roughly equivalent to a block of over twenty flats.

As can be seen from the attached spreadsheet, (not attached) prepared once hard copy drawings were available, the building would need to have 3.33m underground before it was smaller than the existing building, and even allowing for modern construction and the reduction in ridge height, my opinion is that it would need to be depressed by at least 2m before it could possibly be thought acceptable.

As proposed the building remains too large and overbearing in relation to its neighbours (especially 5a Parkfield Road South), out of keeping with conservation area and represents substantial over development.

There has to be question marks over the sustainability of the landscaping, particularly as landscaping on a previous large double court elsewhere on the site is so clearly just not working. I certainly think the committee should see the previous courts in context before considering this application – i.e. a site visit.

The proposed s.106 agreement appears to offer little to the immediate community who will suffer loss of amenity as a result. Indeed I understand that many of the community beneficiaries of the previous double court now use the facilities in Eastlands because they are nearer to them and not all the court time available is even taken up.

I trust therefore that you will recommend refusal of this application to the committee.

The NLTC need to make substantial concession (at least another metre down) in relation to the amount of building to be accommodated undergrounds before it should be seriously considered.”

John Leech MP had made the comment that the building should be sunk a further metre into the ground as he feels that this would make a significant difference to improving the visual impact of the development. He has also commented separately that the community use arrangements should be explicit, to ensure that they are fulfilled.

Didsbury Civic Society have been in attendance at a number of meetings between the local residents and the local planning authority. Their comments are as follows: “This is a late representation from Didsbury Civic society following our comments of 14th July 2008 and as stated then prior to the receiving of further information.

Although the NLTC have met several of the requirements that were asked for it is believed they could go further to meeting the needs of the local residents and wider community

- The building could still be lowered further
- The proposed conditions state that the landscaping should commence following the occupation or the completion of the development. We believe a substantial part of this should be done before the occupation. This can be done without being subject to seasons.
- The 106 agreement should include the past voluntary agreement in order that the NLTC has to abide by previous non-contractual conditions and not use the new agreement to relinquish responsibility for the old agreement. Furthermore although it is admirable that there is provision for Manchester schoolchildren, there should have been local gain for Didsbury Schools but there seems to be no indication of consultation with them.

A site visit could be highly informative for the committee and we believe that this would place the building more clearly in its context.”

The Didsbury Civic Society have now had the benefit of seeing the February Planning and Highways Committee report which had further information with regards to Need and Community Use, no further representations have been received.

West Didsbury Residents Association have also attended meetings between local residents and the local planning authority. Their last comments were received on the 4 August 2008 prior to the submission of further information.

At that time their comments were that:

“Impact on Neighbour Amenity – Whilst the above-ground volume of this indoor court is smaller than the one previously submitted, the proposed building is still far too large and of unsuitable design; indeed, many of our members have likened it to a huge aircraft hangar. Given its size and stark, dominating appearance, it would seriously compromise the visual amenity of neighbouring residents, particularly those living at 5a Parkfield Road South.

Impact on Conservation Area – The existing court was built many years ago, before the area was given conservation status, and is clearly unworthy of Blackburn Park; for any replacement building to be acceptable, it must surely reflect the area’s conservation status or, at least, represent an improvement. A building of this nature, which is totally out of keeping with its surrounding in terms of design, size and materials, would, in our view, have a detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area.

Section 106 agreement – There is no evidence to suggest a need for the coaching facilities offered under the proposed agreement; even if there were, these would hardly provide neighbouring residents with adequate compensation for the loss of amenity resulting from the development.

A smaller, more sympathetic development would probably be acceptable. The applicants could perhaps be persuaded to revise their proposal further; if not, we would strongly urge you to recommend this application for refusal.”

Blackburn Park Conservation Society have retained David Manley QC, who has submitted a 47 page letter of objection. In summary his concerns relate to issues already referred to above, individual residential amenity issues on a property specific basis and expressing concern about the legitimacy of any permission granted in the circumstances which he maintains involve there being little difference materially between the current proposal and previous incarnations. Of paramount concern to Blackburn Park Conservation Society is the demonstration of the need for the Community Use Agreement, which they do not believe has been provided by Leisure Services. Without this evidence they believe that the permission would be legally flawed and could be the subject of a High Court application to quash any consent.

Further to his original letter of objection David Manley QC then submitted a response to the December Committee Report to members. It has been requested that the full details of that response be included within this report.

“I) This commentary is for inclusion in member information packs and hence takes a “bullet point” format.

II) S72 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a duty on a planning committee to pay “special attention” to the desirability of preserving or enhancing a Conservation Area. This is therefore the pre-eminent consideration.

III) The report to committee makes no reference to “Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas” published by English Heritage and PAS Section 7.8 states: “When considering proposals for new development [in CAs] the LPA’s principal concern should be the appropriateness of the overall mass or volume of the building, its scale ... and its relationship to its context. A

new building should be in harmony with or complementary to its neighbours” (my underlining). This building has the scale and appearance of an industrial shed. If the Tennis Club’s requirements cannot be satisfied in a manner that harmonises with the CA then the Tennis Club must either curb its ambitions or move. To permit harm to the CA is inconsistent with law and good practice advice.

IV) The report to the committee commits a fundamental error in concluding enhancement of the CA by the proposal (page 7) ie. It is wrong to reason enhancement by comprising a very poor and unimaginative building (the proposal) to an even poorer building (the existing building) because (a) it ignores the vast increase in scale and massing and (b) the real question to ask is whether the proposal itself will preserve or enhance the CA - clearly it will not

V) The report in its “Conclusions” seems to acknowledge that some local residents’ Human Rights may be compromised but then states that this is proportionate to the wider benefits of the proposal. The following points are made:

(a) This crude generalisation glosses over the fact that 5A Parkfield Road South will have a massive blank gable dominating its whole boundary; the building will be within 3.6m of the boundary of properties on the north side of Elm Road (not 5m as stated in the report); while Nos 5 and 7 Parkfield Road South and 20-24 Blackburn Gardens will be totally overwhelmed by the proposal. This level of compromise to legitimate domestic amenities cannot be justified.

(b) The whole justification for recommending in favour of the scheme seems to be based upon alleged need/community benefits. The primary concern however, see above, should be the appropriateness of the building itself. Nonetheless the need/benefits case is not made out. It is noted that the LTA, Sport England and Manchester Leisure support the proposal but these bodies have single issue interests namely the promotion of sport (not Conservation Areas). However the objective of promoting sport should not be confused with need. In this case there is no clear evidence of unmet need or demand by reference to the catchment area of the Club; no evidence that the Club cannot better manage community access now, so as to increase it by reference to its existing facilities; no certainty that any new community access scheme will provide materially increased access over and above the Club’s existing community access scheme. While increased sports provision is in principle a good idea it should not be encouraged at the cost of clear and undoubtedly significant levels of harm to both a Conservation Area and residential amenities.

This is the fourth attempt to place a facility in this location by the Club. Officers made it clear to the Club that they could not support the 2005, 2006 and 2007 proposals by reference to harm to the Conservation Area. This scheme (2008) is only 1m lower than the 2007 scheme and only 50cms further away from the boundary of 5 Parkfield Road South. In all other respects the building presents the same scale and massing. These most recent changes are so small as to be properly regarded as very minor in the scale of things.

The proposal should be refused.

D E MANLEY QC.”

Further to his original letter of objection and the late representation to the report to Planning and Highways Committee in December David Manley QC then

submitted a response to the February Committee Report to be reported as a late representation to members. The full details of which are as follows (simulated views have not been incorporated into this report as visualisations have been submitted to accompany this planning application).

“This commentary is for inclusion in members’ information packs and takes a “bullet point” format. The reader is respectfully referred to the commentary submitted by the Blackburn Park Conservation Society in response to the report prepared by Officers for the committee of 18/12/08.

- The proposal is to erect a large industrial type shed having dimensions of 40.4m x 47.5m and 10.3m to the ridge within the heart of a Conservation Area which is characterised by domestic scale residential development. Unsurprisingly it has attracted widespread objection from local people and conservation groups.

- The current applications mark the fourth attempt by the Tennis Club to erect a three court indoor facility in this location. The three earlier applications were characterised as being excessive into scale and mass and harmful to the Conservation Area by Officers. The current proposal is of the same scale but sunk 1m into the ground and moved 0.5m from the boundary with 5A Parkfield Road. The current proposal includes a sedum roof whereas the others did not. It is the Society’s views that these changes are marginal and cannot justify the building. The Officers’ expressed view in the report, namely that the building is acceptable in its own right cannot stand either with the planning history or with the fact that the proposal was removed from the agenda of 18/12/08 to investigate community use issues. If the building is truly acceptable, in its own right, then the matter could have been determined with community use issues to be negotiated by Officers as part of the S106 negotiations.

- The principal concern in a conservation area is, “the appropriateness of the overall mass and volume of the building ... A new building should be in harmony with or complementary to its neighbours” (Guidance in the Management of Conservation Areas - English Heritage). The building plainly offends that advice.

- Members are asked by Officers and NLTC to conclude a need for the proposed facility and to attach significance to the proposed community use agreement. In fact no clear case of need is established for the following reasons:

- (1) Sport England’s support is only to be expected given their particular remit;

- (2) The Leisure Services’ case is “broad-brush” only. It relies upon the national target of increasing recreational participation by 1% year on year which is a broad strategic aim that in itself cannot justify a particular scheme in a particular location. In more specific terms it alleges that Manchester has only 0.023 indoor courts per 1,000 population. However, the Sport England Active Places database reveals that the national average per 1000 persons is 0.025 and hence the Manchester figure is in line with the national average. This does not therefore demonstrate a clear need. Moreover insofar as any marginal shortfall does exist the answer is not to address it by way of additional provision

of courts in a location which has facilities for tennis but to address it in a part of the city with poor provision.

(3) Leisure Services also draw attention to an LTA aim of 1 indoor court per 200 tennis players and by looking at provision in places within ½ hour drive time including Warrington, Bolton, Cheadle and Trafford, conclude a shortfall of 71 courts. The choice of a ½ hour isochrone is not explained but more significantly to the extent that the sub-region has a shortfall against an LTA aspirational target there is no evidence that allows the conclusion that here is the best place to meet it. Certainly no alternative sites are considered. L1.1 of UDP looks to meet the needs of Manchester's population by a distribution of facilities accessible by public transport. There is no evidence at all that the proposal satisfies a particular test. Causing significant harm to a Conservation Area and the amenity of its residents to address alleged needs beyond Manchester is totally unacceptable.

(4) An increased capacity for community use of the NLT Club facilities is offered but no clear evidence of any demand for that increased capacity is offered - indeed it would appear that the existing community use agreement has spare capacity.

In all these circumstances the benefits of the scheme as articulate by the Club in addressing needs and meeting demand can only have very limited weight. No doubt the Club's members would derive benefit from these facilities but above and beyond that is difficult to see where the benefit lies.

▪ The report to committee glosses over the detriment to residential amenities which are dealt with in our comments for the committee of 18/12/08. A site visit would readily reveal the problem. Of particular concern is the position of No. 5A Parkfield Road South which the report addresses only by reference to the availability of light. This completely ignores two matters:

- (1) The un-neighbourly proximity of the building to the house which completely overwhelms it (see the visualisations attached); and
- (2) The fact that the roof, at only 3m away from 5A, is acknowledged in the Officer report to be such a fire hazard that it has to be constantly irrigated by way of a condition. What if the irrigation fails through poor maintenance, human error or vandalism? The fear of fire hazard felt by the family at No. 5A substantially diminishes their legitimate amenities and is a planning matter which once again weighs against the scheme.

In conclusion the scheme is wholly out of character with the Conservation Area and damaging to its residents' amenities. There is no significant public benefit which can outweigh this harm and the application should be refused.

DAVID MANLEY QC"

Ballbrook Conservation Area Group "Firstly I would like to commend the positive steps that have been made by the planners and applicants in refining this application since its inception.

However whilst an attempt has been made to hide this building the fact remains that the proposed structure is significantly larger than the structure already in place and this constitutes the main objection.

The conservation group agrees that the existing building is of no benefit or significance to the area and there are no objections to its demolition and replacement with an environmentally sound building of similar proportions. The vast proposed building is as the application states to attract new members to the club and is therefore a commercial exercise which has had scant regard for impact on the area or neighbours....”

Manchester Conservation Area and Historic Buildings Panel considered the unrevised larger version of this scheme at their meeting on Tuesday 13 March 2007. The minutes state that, “The Panel offered no strong views or objections to the proposals and generally supported the ‘greening’ of the proposed large building. The Panel suggested that the impact could be further reduced by breaking up the large panels on elevation into a series of smaller units between piers together with a general ‘softening’ of the angular expression. The Panel expressed concern regarding the large translucent panels to the building and the problems this may cause to neighbours with light shedding outwards from within the building at night. The Panel also felt that a key to the success or otherwise of this proposal would be the quality of the planting specification and the technical solution to the ‘greening’ of the building.”

Landscape Practice have been working with the local planning authority and liaising with local residents, having regard to landscaping statements prepared by local residents (Vinsun Landscape prepared August 26 2008), to secure a feasible solution to landscaping of the building. (See later in report)

Sport England state that the “new facility represents a significant investment in sport in a facility which will allow more intensive use throughout the year and where the Lawn Tennis Association have identified a strategic demand for such a facility. The new facility will also allow the club to both retain and attract new members and help sustain the long term viability of the tennis club. Consequently, given the significant benefits to Sport which will arise from the proposal, Sport England supports the application.”

This support is conditional on the ground that the Community Use Agreement should be agreed and in place prior to the commencement of development.

Leisure Services state that “Sport England has set a challenging target for all areas of the country to grow the number of people participating in Sport and Physical Activity. Currently 22% of the population is participating in 3 times 30 minutes of moderate intensity exercise per week (the government bench mark for a healthy lifestyle). Manchester is currently performing at 19.1%, which is well below the national average.

Government has challenged providers of sport and physical activity to grow participation by 1% year on year in order to address health concerns and spiralling levels of obesity. To meet this challenge both the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) and the Tennis Foundation has acknowledged in the document “Tennis Hot Spot Strategy” the need to increase the number of quality Tennis facilities.

Information obtained from Sport England's Active Places Database (see appendix attached) demonstrates that nationally there are 1,282 indoor playable courts available for a population of approximately 49.1 million, this equates to 1

court per 38,330. Manchester currently offers 9 courts (6 in North Manchester, 3 in South Manchester) for a population estimated to be 458,136 (General Population Estimate Mid-2007 for Manchester City Council), this equates to 1 court per 50,904 residents, which is significantly lower than the national average.

There is a clear shortfall in the number of indoor courts within the City of Manchester and there are no other proposals for such facilities, which are being developed by any other tennis providers within the City.

In addition LTA have set a minimum recommendation to have 1 indoor court per 200 tennis players. The Northern Lawn Tennis Club has a population catchment within a 30 minute drive of 1.38 million. LTA participation statistics demonstrate that 2% of the population play tennis regularly, which gives a player catchment of 27,600. Therefore 138 courts are required to facilitate the needs of these players. The following clubs currently offer indoor tennis provision within a 30 minute drive time of the Northern Lawn Tennis Club:

David Lloyd (Cheadle) - 9 permanent & 2 temporary indoor courts

David Lloyd (Trafford) - 8

Manchester Tennis Centre - 6

Middleton (Sporta) - 9 permanent & 5 temporary indoor courts

Bolton Arena - 8

David Lloyd (Bolton) - 5 permanent & 2 temporary indoor courts

David Lloyd (Warrington) - 6

Warrington ITI - 4

Consequently, this catchment is still 71 courts short of the requirement detailed by the LTA. There is therefore a demonstrable need for additional indoor tennis courts within the catchment area of the Northern Lawn Tennis Club."

Fire Safety Officer states that "the Fire Service are not normally consulted unless the application affects access to other premises, the issues being raised would be addressed at the submission stage after building control have made their observations in line with ADB."

Building Control Officer prepared further advice in response to a Fire Safety Report appended to the late representations the February Planning and Highways Committee Report. The following is set out as a paragraph of the Fire Safety Report in Italics and the response from the Building Control Officer.

RE: Planning application - 07775757/FO/2005/S2 - Northern Lawn Tennis Club

This report has been prepared in response to the Committee Report dated 12/02/2009. More detailed information can be found in my full report, dated 7 February 2009.

INADEQUATE ACCESS FOR FIRE APPLIANCES

Approved national guidance recommends minimum access requirements for fire appliances and in this case access is required to 15% of the perimeter of the building. The maximum available width from Parkfield Road South is less than the

recommended minimum width. A standard fire service pumping appliance would be unable to gain access direct to the building which would increase the time required to begin to deal with a fire or other incident. A further recommendation is that turning facilities should be provided in any dead-end access route that is more than 20m long – this is not possible in this case.

*The proposed access point from Elm Road is **totally unsuitable** for fire appliance, without a permanent road being constructed through the existing tennis courts which would be strong enough to take the weight of a fire appliance, have sufficient width and be kept permanently clear.*

I concur with the above comments.

In my earlier response to my colleagues in the Planning section I indicated that, to satisfy Building Regulation B5, the new building should be serviced by a suitable access road for fire brigade appliances.

Building Control has not been provided with detailed information relating to either the existing or new roadways to the new building and, as such, could only provide theoretical advice as to how compliance could be achieved. The advice offered was as follows:

Fire appliance access:

- If the building is over 280sq/m in FA a hydrant will be required if one is not available within 100m. It's not clear from the proposals if the new building is within 100m of an existing fire hydrant, if not then one will be required to be installed within 90m of the new building. Alternatively a 45000L charged static water tank would be required, or access to a canal, river or other suitable watercourse - capable of storing 45000L of water, or another suitable source of supplying water - considered suitable by GMCF&RS.
- Additionally, for buildings less than 2000sq/m in FA there should be fire appliance access to at least 15% of the perimeter of the building; or to within 45m of any point of the buildings footprint. As such I feel that vehicle access will need to be much closer than anticipated and roadway design etc would need to be treated accordingly.
- Insofar as fire appliance access is concerned and with the benefit of the dimensions contained in your report description, I can advise that access would be required along approx 26.5m of the perimeter, within which a personnel door should be located to allow fire fighters to enter the building.
- Moreover any access adjacent to the building should permit an appliance to either, drive in and out, in one direction; or drive in and reverse out for not more than 20m; or create a turning area within the site suitable for a fire appliance to manoeuvre (hammer-head or similar).
- Any such access routes would need to be suitable for a GMC pump appliance in terms of width and construction.

I'm uncertain as to how the existing roadway will facilitate the above features and would require more information to consider this matter further. I understand – from Planning colleagues – that a suitable through route can be provided

across the site for fire appliances and that this should, within the site confines, achieve compliance with the Building Regulations requirement.

UNACCEPTABLE FIRE RISK ARISING FROM INSUFFICIENT SPACE SEPARATION

To prevent the spread of fire from one building to another, the guidance provides details of the distances that buildings should be from each other, depending on the construction of the buildings concerned. The distance of 2.35m of the proposed building from 5a Parkfield Road South is totally inadequate and whilst the distance of the building from the boundary with Elm Road properties is greater, although less than that recommended, it is planned to fill the space with trees which will allow the spread of fire and thus negate the fire separation.

The boundary separation distance of 2.35m has been suggested as being totally inadequate. The fire consultant has not, however, explained why this is the case.

Building Control's opinion is that the building could be designed to be within 1m of the boundary to any neighbouring property – subject to their being an appropriate design of any boundary-facing wall to resist fire for the requisite period of time; in this case for at least 60-minutes (1-hour).

Building Control is of the opinion that, insofar as the boundary separation distance to 5a Parkfield Road is concerned (2.35m), the wall would satisfy Building Regulation requirement B4(1) without the need to be wholly fire resisting. Upto 8% of the wall – by reference to the guidance associated with meeting the requirement – could be wholly unprotected. Moreover, should the separation distance be extended to 2.5m the area of non-fire resisting construction could be extended to as much as 20% (1/5th) of the area of the boundary facing wall.

The fire consultant makes reference to the introduction of arbor between the building and other boundaries. This is not a material consideration of the Building Regulations.

Building Control have advised that the green roof should be not less than 12m from any part of an adjacent boundary which is clearly not the case. It is stated that this can be ignored if the roof is irrigated. No evidence is supplied as to what this decision has been based on. It is a dangerous assumption that water will always be available for irrigations. What happens when there are restrictions on water use during drought conditions – when the danger from fire is greater! Or in the event of vandalism or maintenance problems?

The fire consultant states that the 12m-boundary distance can be ignored. However, that is not what Building Control have suggested.

The documents that support the regulatory requirements are known as Approved Documents and are treated as guidance. It is not essential that this guidance be followed, but if it is not it is necessary that the spirit of the requirement can be satisfied in some other way and offer an equivalent level of protection.

Building Control is aware that there is, currently, a conflict between safety and sustainability in many aspects of building design.

In attempting to address this Building Control has sought to refer to similar cases and advice from the Sustainable Buildings Division of the Communities and Local Government (CLG) Dept. who draft both the regulations, associated guidance and determine questions concerning the application of the guidance or interpretation of the regulations.

As a consequence Building Control offered Planning colleagues the following advice:

Green Roof - Proximity to boundaries with other premises:

- There is little data/research/fire test evidence to support green roof construction in the UK. Whilst an irrigated green roof is of little concern - since it can always be guaranteed as being moist/unlikely to be dry and catch fire, the same is not so clear for non-irrigated green roofs.
- I have had conversation's with both CLG and BRE and they are of the opinion that the risk of a tinder dry green roof, during periods of hot, dry weather is a concern that needs to be fully considered.
- I have discussed this with the sustainable buildings officer and explained the issues involved and that we would always assess each roof on its own merits. As such we have a few instances of such roofs being accepted, however, in these cases boundary distances were considered within reasonable limits and access to the roof - for fire fighting was good. Moreover, there was limited risk of fire spread to adjacent structures whose construction was surveyed as being of limited combustibility.
- In this particular case boundary distances, to adjacent residential premises, are closer and there is a greater risk of fire spread - should the roof become tinder dry.
- As such we have taken the view that such roofs should - without satisfactory evidence to the contrary - be treated similar to untested thatch etc. As a result this would limit the distance of the green roof to not less than 12m from any part of an adjacent boundary.
- I'm also conscious that the access for fire appliances to the perimeter of the building appears somewhat limited.
- Reference has been made to the determination, by CLG, of a similar situation and documented on the CLG website. The case is referenced 45/1/146.

In this case an entrance building, to a zoo facility, incorporated a sedum roof over a non-combustible substructure. The distance to the boundary was less than that recommended for thatch/wood shingles. The zoo proposed to irrigate the roof and maintain the sedum covering to prevent overgrowth.

The outcome of the case was that the proposal was considered acceptable – given the undertakings of the applicant to provide irrigation and maintenance.

- Whilst each case must always be treated on its own merits it is reasonable to consider similarities that might exist with other cases.
- Building Control is of the opinion that, in this case, the following features have relevance to this case:
 - The building is a large volume space for sport and recreational tennis. As such it would appear that there is limited fire load or fire hazards from the activities/contents of the building.
 - The substructure of the roof is to be non-combustible – insulated steel cladding or similar – and the likelihood of a fire breaking through from outside to inside is much reduced. Similarly the same is the case for a fire breaking out from within the building to the outside.
 - It is my understanding, from sustainability advisors, that it requires substantial drought to create tinder dry conditions of sedum (succulents that retain moisture similar to cacti). As such, Building Control is of the opinion that, should the roof be irrigated, there is a substantially reduced likelihood of the surface (sedum) material becoming sufficiently dry to allow fire ignition or sustain fire spread.
 - Building Control is of the opinion that, having regard to the construction of the roof/walls to 5a Parkfield and adjacent residential buildings, there is limited risk of fire spread propagating from the tennis building to create conflagration conditions (many buildings involved by fire simultaneously).
 - It is Building Controls opinion that there would be a greater risk of fire, from without the tennis building, to cause a fire on the tennis buildings roof, than there is from the building itself.
 - Fire engineers within GMC fire service inform us that prolonged fire – of non-irrigated sedum roofs – is unlikely.
 - The roof is between 4.5 and 9.8m above surrounding ground levels. As such Building Control feels that should fire occur the infinite volume of ventilation will permit any such fire/heat to dissipate upwards and above the level of 5a Parkfield Road.
 - Building Control recommends that, in association with the above opinions, there should be an appropriate maintenance programme for the roof, the building should be fitted with a comprehensive fire detection and alarm system to provide substantial early warning of a fire within the building, effective management systems should be in place to ensure the roof can be effectively monitored from the exterior, by way of security inspections etc.
 - There should be appropriate fire service appliance to the building – in line with the comments made above.

Building Control also recognises that by way of a comparison, roof constructions of substantial combustible construction could be constructed with

unlimited restriction on distance to the boundary. In particular Building Control notes that a roof comprising of a layer of stone chippings laid on a bitumen base, on top of bitumen-impregnated felt, on plywood sheet decking or compressed straw slabs, would be considered to be a suitable option to build without restriction.

CONCERNS AROUND MEANS OF ESCAPE, IMPACTING LANDSCAPING FEASIBILITY

There are issues for the means of escape from the building and whilst these may be overcome by modifications in the design, they may have an impact on the final design of the building as they could affect the landscaping and will have to be constructed to reflect the varying height of the surrounding land.

Without detailed information on the location and disposition of fire escapes, Building Control is unable to offer any effective guidance. However, from my experience, it is my opinion that it is unlikely that the location of fire exits/routes would have a significant impact upon landscaping

BUILDING TOO LARGE TO ACCOMMODATE FIRE SAFETY AND LANDSCAPING NEEDS

It is therefore my opinion that the proposed building is too large for the available land space and that the issues that I have highlighted above cannot be addressed to satisfy both the fire safety and landscaping requirements and therefore the proposals are unacceptable. The only option to address these issues is to construct a building that is significantly smaller than the proposed one. This would allow sufficient space to accommodate the means of escape, space separation and landscaping requirements. The proposals in relation to fire safety clearly do not comply with national approved standards and to allow the proposals in their submitted form would set a dangerous precedent. If there was an incident the issue would be raised and questions would be asked why the standards were disregarded.

Building Control acknowledges the opinion of the fire consultant. However, it is not a matter for the Building Regulations to dictate design. It is, however, appropriate that buildings are designed having due regard to the requirements of the regulations and ensuring that a suitable balance between aesthetic and safety is provided.

The consultant states that the... *proposals in relation to fire safety clearly do not comply with national approved standards.*

As previously mentioned the 'national approved standards' are guidance. The guidance is not prescription and does not need to be followed. It is however, a reasonable benchmark against which to measure the appropriateness of design solutions to meet compliance with the requirements of the regulations.

Accordingly Building Control agrees with the consultant in respect of fire appliance access, but considers that – in respect of the provision of a well-maintained and fully irrigated sedum roof – the risk of fire ignition, growth and spread is equivalent to that of a non-sedum roof of traditional construction using substantially greater volumes of combustible material, which would have greater fire load and intensity.”

The views of **United Utilities** have been sought with regards to the issue that was raised in relation to drought and whether or not this would impact upon water available to the Green Roof.

“Hosepipe Ban - How is a ban implemented - Publishing a newspaper notice in the area affected after consultation with the Environment Agency. The implementation of a ban is covered under Section 76 of the Water Industry Act 1991. A hosepipe ban can remain in force indefinitely. The notice remains effective until we publish notice of lifting.

For a non essential use ban we have to get the Secretary of State to make an ordinary drought order of the appropriate scope. We must advertise our application, get the right local newspapers and make sure we serve it on the right district councils. A hearing of inquiry before an Inspector from the Department of the Environment Planning Inspectorate. If application is approved and order made we then publish local notice of non-essential users we are prohibiting or limiting and where. The order is in force for a maximum of 6 months unless renewed which would involve a further hearing or inquiry. There is intensive consultation with the Environment Agency at every stage.

The last hosepipe ban was in force from 17/8/95 - 22/10/96.”

United Utilities have stated verbally that if the irrigation was a requirement to satisfy fire safety concerns, this would be **essential** and would not be subject to any water restriction.

Arboricultural Officer visited the site and confirmed that tree works were acceptable and that a condition ought to be imposed with regard to working to British Standard 3998 Recommendations for Tree Works.

Environmental Health requested that conditions be placed on any permission that controlled external lighting, acoustic insulation and the installation of any externally mounted ancillary equipment to protect the residential amenity of any surrounding property.

Greater Manchester Police Architectural Liaison had no comments to make on this occasion.

Issues

Law

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, when considering development within a conservation area, “special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area”

Policy

With regards to advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15, the PPG states at Paragraph 4.19 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.

In addition, at paragraph 4.20: “the objective of preservation can be achieved either by a development which makes a positive contribution to the area’s character or appearance, ”

Policy DC18.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester states that the Council will give particularly careful consideration to development proposals within Conservation Areas, specifically stating that:

a. The Council will seek to preserve and enhance the character of its designated conservation areas by carefully considering the following issues:

i) the relationship of new structures to neighbouring buildings and spaces;

ii) the effect of major changes to the appearance of existing buildings;

iii) the desirability of retaining existing features, such as boundary walls, gardens, trees, (including street trees);

iv) the effect of signs and advertisements;

v) any further guidance on specific areas which has been approved by the Council.

b. The Council will not normally grant outline planning permission for development within Conservation Areas.

c. Consent to demolish a building in a conservation area will be granted only where it can be shown that it is wholly beyond repair, incapable of reasonably beneficial use, or where its removal or replacement would benefit the appearance of character of the area.

d. Where demolition is to be followed by redevelopment, demolition will be permitted only where there are approved detailed plans for that redevelopment and where the Council has been furnished with evidence that the development will be undertaken.

e. Development proposals adjacent to Conservation Areas will be granted only where it can be shown that they will not harm the appearance or character of the area. This will include the protection of views into and out of Conservation Areas.

Demolition is not normally encouraged and when considering applications for demolition the main issue is the preserving or enhancing of the character and appearance of the area in question and the wider effects of the demolition on the buildings surroundings and on the Conservation Area as a whole. When demolition is being considered the new development of the site is also important and should be of at least comparable quality to that which was therefore before.

The local planning authority have had regard to the documentation submitted with both the Planning Application and the Conservation Area Consent, responses from consultees and residents and have conducted a site inspection.

It is considered that the development proposed would enhance the appearance of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area, having regard to the condition of the current building on site (which had already been constructed at the time of the

Conservation Area being designated), which at best makes a neutral contribute to the character of the conservation area and having regard to the design, scale, mass and materials to be used in the proposed scheme.

Every effort has been made to bed the proposed building into the environment, the building being lowered in height, set into the ground, moved away from the shared boundary, landscaped and furnished with a sedum roof.

With regards to the comments made by David Manley QC querying the legality of the Section 106 agreement, it is considered that the building is acceptable in its own right with regards to its impact upon the character of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area. The Community Use referred to later in this report would be secured as additional benefit and in no way offers mitigation for the development proposed.

Residential Amenity

As stated in the objections received, concerns have been expressed with regards to the impact of the proposed development upon residential amenity.

Policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester states that the Council will not allow development, which will have an unacceptable impact upon residential areas. Issues to be considered include the scale and appearance of the development.

It is considered that the development would represent an improvement over the presence of the existing building to most residents, the proposed building having a lower green roof (albeit over a larger footprint) with landscaping in place to screen the building, subject to appropriate and enforceable conditions.

Information has been submitted to accompany the application, which shows the Shadow Projections and passage of light throughout the year available to the property known as No. 5a Parkfield Road South. It is not considered that the development proposed would have an adverse impact upon the light available to the property.

It is not considered that the facility would lead to a perceptible increase in traffic, users of the building using the existing access at the corner of Palatine Road and Lapwing Lane, where an ample car parking facility exists.

The applicants have agreed to ensure the impact of both demolition and construction are limited as far as possible through agreeing routes for vehicles, wheel washing, road sweeping and hours of working.

Landscaping

Green Roof

The proposal involves the installation of a green roof to the whole of the building to reduce the perceived scale and mass of the building and make the building appropriate within the context of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

The Landscape Architect wholly supports the principle of the green roof, subject to a bespoke condition that the development accords with FFL standards (Forschungsgesellschaft Landschaftsentwicklung Landschaftsbau). These are standards set out in Germany, where this approach to large scale green roof treatment has had success.

Concerns were expressed by residents in relation to Fire Safety issues in regards to the Green Roof. The Building Control Officer shared these concerns. As a result the Green Roof proposed has been altered, it would be irrigated to prevent Fire and Fire Spread to adjoining residential properties. It is not felt appropriate to impose a condition with regards to the fire hydrants and fire detection and alarm systems, as this would be a matter for Building Control.

Whilst this does affect the sustainability credentials of the proposed building, the water running off into the drainage system, the aim of the Green Roof in this instance was to ameliorate the impact of the building upon the visual amenities of the Conservation Area. Whilst it is regrettable that the roof will not be as sustainable as previously hoped, fire safety was of paramount consideration.

Some concern has been expressed by residents in relation to the loss of habitat for bats and nesting birds, which currently use the ivy covering the existing building, however, those species that exist at present can be protected by condition. The green roof proposed will offer an alternative habitat opportunity for wildlife.

Trees

With regards to the native tree planting proposed, the applicant has taken on board the suggestion that whilst native tree planting is usually desirable, in this instance medium size trees with intervening evergreen species would be more appropriate with regards to screening the building. Consideration has been given to the fact that the current building is entirely screened from properties on Elm Road by an existing bund of evergreen trees measuring some 16m in height.

Through the process of assessing the landscaping scheme it became apparent that insufficient space was available for landscaping to mature to the shared boundary with 5a Parkfield Road South and properties to the north of Elm Road. However, a fire escape and landscaped pathway that was to run around the building have been relocated and removed to enable landscaping sufficient space to mature. Revised plans have been received to this effect. A condition is attached to this permission that ensures the altered fire escapes will be fully accessible in line with DfA2.

Enforcement

With regards to comments received from residents about landscaping to the building approved in 1995, the applicant has agreed as part of this application to the imposition of a Grampian Condition that would see the introduction of planting boxes to successfully complete the screening of the 1995 building. Agreed in a letter dated 24 July 2008 from the applicant's agent.

Community Use

Work has been undertaken to agree a Community Use Agreement between the Northern Lawn Tennis Club and Leisure services.

Historically, as referred to earlier in this report, consent was granted for a development in 1995 for a two storey extension to existing club house, single storey building to form two indoor courts with a link corridor, first floor extension to squash courts and additional car parking. A Community Use Agreement was drawn up however it was not detailed enough to tie the club into meaningful Community Use provision. The Community Use Agreement being tied by covenant rather than an enforceable Section 106 agreement. This has led to concern with regards to the current proposals.

The opportunity has been taken in this instance to draw up a meaningful Section 106 agreement relating to the use of the whole site.

Community Use Details (In Summary)

The unenforceable covenant agreement referred to above required 12 free hours and 74 hours at an agreed charge each week (86 hours in total not specified peak or none peak).

The new Section 106 agreement would see:

- Increased hours by 33 hours (to 119 average per week), a 38% increase
- 12 hours of which would be free peak use hours on top of the existing 12 free hours (24 free hours in total)
- The community use (38% increase) would be proportionally greater than the increase in capacity (number of hours of use gained by the introduction of the new development) which would see an 11% increase.
- Specific targeting to encourage participation by non-traditional groups of Manchester residents, who would normally not take part in tennis related activities. For example, local schools have previously benefited from outreach sessions, both at the schools and the club, and this will be extended. These programmes will be developed in conjunction with the Council's Sports Development Team. Other groups include: - Positive Futures groups, health referral groups, special schools and local tennis clubs as identified by Manchester Leisure.

Need

Queries had been raised by residents about the need for three indoor courts, and the suitability of the size of those courts with regards to Lawn Tennis Association standards.

We have received support for the scheme in the form of a letter from the Head of Leisure dated 4th November stating that:

"Manchester Leisure have a long and well established partnership with the Northern over the past eight years since phase 1 development. This is a good example of how a traditional sports club and local authority can work together.

Not only have the club an excellent track record in tennis development and performance. They have ensured an open door policy with regards to community use. An excellent example of this is the partnership with Manchester City Tennis Club, based in Wythenshawe Park.

The Northern is part of our five-year tennis strategy for Manchester Leisure. The club have been targeted as one of two key performance centres for the City. The club's success in producing junior players, up to international standard, has been recognised by the LTA with Performance Accreditation.

Finally, due to ongoing success achieved since phase one, in order to provide more playing, coaching and competitive opportunities for both the growing membership and the local community / school links, it is essential that the club provides more all year round facilities. As one of the premier tennis clubs in the country, it is vitally important for both the City of Manchester and the club, that the Northern stays in the forefront of British Tennis."

Further to the abovementioned letter, the consultation response from Leisure included earlier in this report makes it clear that the development proposed would be instrumental in meeting a shortfall for indoor tennis provision.

Notwithstanding the comments above from Leisure, we have also received two letters from the Lawn Tennis Association dated 22nd October 2008 and 11th November 2005 (when the application was originally submitted) stating that the "layout will allow the courts to fit within the proposed footprint and provide a court dedicated to junior play" which "would meet the Lawn Tennis Association size criteria with regard to the footprint of the building" and that " if the project was to be reduced to 2 indoor courts then the project would have to be approved by the Lawn Tennis Association Funding Committee, and could prove difficult to achieve the approval criteria."

The number of courts being applied for therefore seems justified in the eyes of the Leisure Service, the Lawn Tennis Association and is supported by Sports England.

The residents have furnished the Planning Service with a letter from the Lawn Tennis Association dated 21 November 2008 that states they would "not be able to make a funding commitment to either of the proposed projects (a two court scheme / a three court scheme) at this time as we have not had a formal funding application."

Policy L1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester states that, the Council will work with the private sector, Central Government and other institutions to facilitate the provision of a range of high quality multi-purpose indoor sporting facilities, which meet the needs of all people in the City, including some facilities of international standard. These should be located to provide a distribution which is accessible by public transport to all the communities of Manchester.

It is considered that the approval of this application would meet the terms of adopted policy.

Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Agreement

- A community use agreement relating to the whole of the Northern Lawn Tennis Club site, as set out in this report under Community Use Details.
- The taking out of a bond by the Northern Lawn Tennis Club to guarantee the cost of the Green Roof and Landscaping and ensure its delivery.

Conclusion

A recommendation of Minded to Approve is made subject to appropriate conditions and the signing of a Section 106 agreement committing the Northern Lawn Tennis Club to a Community Use Agreement that will meaningfully provide Community Use for residents of Manchester City, and ensure the implication of the Green Roof and Landscaping.

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 of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement that would secure Community Use for residents of Manchester City.

The proposed development by virtue of its design, Green Roof and Landscaping would enhance the visual amenities of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area of which the site forms part and would not materially harm residential amenity in the locality, in accordance with Policies DC18.1 and H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and National Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment.

Conditions and/or Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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:

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

4. No development shall commence until there has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include a planting plan and schedule of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities. In addition, all existing trees and hedgerows on the land shall be indicated including details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development. The scheme shall include seeding with a Native British Wildflower Flora mix appropriate to the soil and climate of the site.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development, and in order to ensure compliance with policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development and in order to ensure compliance with policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

6. No development, including site works of any description, shall commence on the site (and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site) until all the existing trees or hedges to be retained on the site have been protected by a fence, to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, erected around each tree or group of vegetation at a radius from the bole or boles of 5 metres or such distance as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This fencing shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery, surplus materials and soil have been removed from the site. Within the areas so fenced off the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. If any trenches for services are required in the fenced off areas they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25 mm or more shall be left unsevered.

Reason - To ensure the retention and maintenance of trees and vegetation which is an important feature of the area, to ensure compliance with policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

7. In this condition "retained tree means an existing tree or hedge which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (i) and (ii) below shall have effect until the expiration of five years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.
- i) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with BS3998 Tree Work).
- ii) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, replacement tree shall be planted at the same place, or as agreed with the local planning authority, and the trees 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.
- iii) Prior to the commencement of any demolition or construction operations on site (including operations associated with the provision of approved drainage details) an arboriculture method statement that accords with the principles and recommendations within BS 5837(2005):'Trees in relation to construction Recommendations" and current best arboricultural practice shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This method statement shall detail the methods relevant and necessary to ensure the protection, retention and long-term health of the retained trees. To ensure the efficacy of the

arboricultural method statement, details relating to on-site supervision and monitoring of tree protection methods shall also be included.

The approved scheme shall be implemented on site prior to the commencement of works and retained for the duration of the works.

Reason - In the interests of amenities and of the environment of the development.

8. Notwithstanding the approved plans, full details of the Green Roof to be installed (including details of irrigation) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to commencement of development. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason - To ensure that the Green Roof is successful, safeguarding the amenities of the area.

9. No development shall commence until there has been submitted to, agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme to augment the existing landscaping for the existing indoor court building on site, which shall include details of planting boxes to be mounted on the west elevation, a planting plan and schedule of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development, and in order to ensure compliance with policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

10. External lighting shall be designed and installed so as to control glare and overspill onto nearby residential properties.

Reason – To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.

11. Before the development hereby approved commences, the building, together with any externally mounted ancillary equipment, shall be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the site/property.

Externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing shall be acoustically treated in accordance with a scheme designed so as to achieve a noise level of 5Db below the existing background (LA90) in each octave band at the nearest noise sensitive location.

Reason – To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation.

12. No works which are audible at the site boundary relating to the construction of the development hereby approved, including works of demolition and site clearance shall take place except between the hours of 7.30 to 19:30 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 16:30 on Saturdays. No construction (including demolition works) shall be carried out on Sundays or recognised public holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties during the demolition and construction period.

13. No part of the development hereby granted permission shall be commenced unless and until a survey of the site in a form and carried out by a person previously approved in writing by the local planning authority has been carried out and demonstrates to the local planning authorities written satisfaction that no protected species inhabit the site. Should the survey reveal the presence of any protected species, a scheme for the protection of their habitat or the provision of alternative habitat, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the development commences, and implemented in full in accordance with the approved details and to a timetable agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Details submitted shall also provide for the protection of nesting birds.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with Policies E2.2, E2.3 and E2.4 of the adopted Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

14. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a scheme showing the provision to be made for disabled people to gain access to the building; and including route widths, levels and gradients, shall have been submitted to and approved by the City Council as local planning authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented before the development hereby permitted is brought into use.

Reason - To ensure that satisfactory disabled access is provided by reference to the provisions of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester Policies and The Guide to Development in Manchester.

15. The details of an emergency telephone contact number for the site contractor shall be displayed in a publicly accessible location on the site from the commencement of development until construction works are complete unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To prevent detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby residents and in the interests of local amenity in order to comply with Policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

16. The wheels of construction contractor's vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned and the access roads leading to the site swept daily in

accordance with a management scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to any works commencing on site.

Reason - In the interest of pedestrian and highway safety, as specified in policy H2.2 of 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: 077757/FO/2005/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:

Manchester Leisure
Environment & Operations (Trees)
Network Rail Fao Ms Kay Uka
Didsbury Civic Society
Head of Environmental Health
Greater Manchester Police
Chief Executive's Landscape Practice Group
Sport England (NW Region)
GMC Fire Service

27 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
Sandford, 320 Lapwing Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UW
322 Lapwing Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UW
7 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
1 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
29 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
6 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
5 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
9 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Parkfield Lodge, Flat 9, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge, Flat 8, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
7 Parkfield Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Flat 5 Parkfield Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge, Flat 4, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge, Flat 3, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge, Flat 2, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Parkfield Lodge, Flat 1, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
5a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
The Coach House, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
7a, Flat 1, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
7a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Landsmere Rear Of 1, Garden Flat 2, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DA
Landsmere Rear Of 1, Garden Flat 1, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,

Manchester, M20 6DA
27a, Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
21a, Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
31 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
5 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
3 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
33 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
29 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
27 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
25 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
23 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
21 And 21a Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
19 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
Doctors Surgery, 135 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Clear Presentations Ltd, 121 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Northern Lawn Tennis Club, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
15 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
14 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
12 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
11 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
10 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
9 Trafalgar Place , Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
8 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
7 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
6 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
5 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
28 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
26 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
24 Blackburn Gardens, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
22 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
20 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
18 Blackburn Gardens, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
16 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
14 Blackburn Gardens , Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
12 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
10 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
Flat 1, 5 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Flat 3, 5 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
18 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
12 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
4a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
33 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Flat 12, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20
6DB
Flat 8, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20
6DB
6 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
18 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
14 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
119a-119c, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
119 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 14, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 13, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA

The Rossett, Flat 12, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 11, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 10, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 9, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 8, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 7, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 6, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 5, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 4, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 3, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 2, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
7 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
8 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
6 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
4 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
2 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
29 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
27 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
25 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
23 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
21 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
19 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
17 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
15 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
13 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
11 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
9 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
7 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
5 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
3 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
1 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
Brooklawn, Flat 9, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 8, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 7, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 6, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 5, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 4, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 3, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 2, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 16, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 15, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 14, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 13, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 12, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 1, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 11, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
Brooklawn, Flat 10, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
137 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
The Rossett, Flat 1, 123 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YA
10 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester
326 Lapwing Lane, Blackburn Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UW
7 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
16 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD

2 Stonecroft, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
8 Annerley Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2DJ
33 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
35 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
7 Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
22 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
67 Park Road, Westhoughton, Bolton, B15 3DA
12 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
20 St. Catherine's Court, Bryer Street, Lancaster, Lancs, LA1 1RW
2 Elm Park Court, Lapwing Lane, Didsbury, M20 6UX
7a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
24 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2NU
13 Bickerton Road, Altrincham, Trafford, WA14 4LA
287 Yew Tree Road, Withington, Manchester, M20 3FP
42 Scott Avenue, Baxenden, Accrington, BB5 2XA
5 Fairfax Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6AJ
2 Field Place, Off Crossway, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6TF
29 Rathen Road, Withington, Manchester, M20 4QJ
2 St Aldwyns Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JF
17 Chapel Road, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4JN
41 Queenston, Didsbury, M20 2NX
Flat 6, 638 Wilmslow Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6AH
Flat 3,, 23 Parkfield Road South, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Apartment 5, The Beeches, 15 Heald Road, Bowdon, Altrincham, Cheshire,
WA14 2HZ
8 Low Wood Close, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 3NT
Didsbury Civic Society, 2 Willowbank Court, 570 Parrs Wood Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 5QT
6 Oakfield Road, Manchester, M20 6XA
21 Blackburn Gardens, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
4 Trafalgar Place, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
660 Wilmslow Road, Blackburn Conservation Area, Didsbury, Manchester, M20
2DN
50 Shakespeare Drive, Cheadle, Stockport, SK8 2DA
Kingslea, Nantwich, Cheshire
64 Vicarage Avenue, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire, SK8 7JP
41 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
7 Birtlespool Road, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire, SK8 5JZ
14 Brighton Ave, Reddish, Stockport, SK5 6LS
52 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TR
35 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
32 Sandleigh Ave, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3LW
7 Wolseley Place, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3LR
2 The Boatsteps, Barton Road, Worsley, M28 2PB
Flat 5 Stonecroft, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
54 Cundiff Road, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 8FW
17 Chapel Road, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4JN
2 Merehaven Close, Pickmere, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 0LP
6 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
15 Victoria Garage, 119 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TS
7 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3TF
330 Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 6UW
25 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat A, 1 Goulden Road, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
9 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
24 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DH
Appartment 1, Block 5 Larke Rise, Mersey Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UL
31 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Flat 3, Stonecroft, Elm Road, Didsbury, M20 6XD
Flat 9 , Parkfield Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, M20 6DD
22 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
2 Victoria Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2GZ
2 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
Parkfield House, 13 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
29 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
29 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
21 Elm Road, Manchester, M20 6XD
2 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
Highbank, Stenner Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2RQ
27 Mersey Meadows,, Didsbury,, Manchester, M20 2GB
23 Holme Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UP
Flat 6, Block 22, Larke Rise, Greystokes, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UL
16 Allan Court, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 9FR
West Didsbury Residents' Association, 1 Old Lansdowne Road, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2PB

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Environment & Operations (Trees)

Didsbury Civic Society

Greater Manchester Police

Chief Executive's Landscape Practice Group

Head of Environmental Health

June Posci, 27 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD

Emeritus Professor Kenneth Richards, 48 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2GT

Gordon Jayson FRCP PhD, Cancer Research UK Department, Medical Oncology, Christie Hospital, Wilmslow Road, Withington, M20 4BX

Mr Peter D Eckersley, Sandford, 320 Lapwing Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UW

Emeritus Professor Derek Crowther And Mrs Margaret Crowther, 52 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TR

Mr And Mrs Hartley, 35 Danesmoor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JT

Barbara R. Goodwin MBE, 322 Lapwing Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UW

Sean Hasnain BDS, Rusholme Dental Practice, 300 Great Western Street, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4LP

Mr And Mrs Murray, 10 Marlowe Drive, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DE

Sanda Downes, 29 Danesmoor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JT

Mrs Sheila Hunt, 12 Lyndhurst Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JU

Sheila And Neil Simpson, 5 Danesmoor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JT

Mark Clayton, 6 Stanton Gardens, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2PT

Dr C H Buckley & Dr P Dubé, 7 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB

Bill Docherty, 1 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB

Mr And Mrs L Jacobs, 30 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
Mrs Maureen Hart, 29 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
John E Scott, 37 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
Professor Margaret Bunce, 26 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
Steve And Jane Hawes, 35 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
H Bertfield, 45 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
Yvonne And John Smith, 10 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Elisabeth And Raymund Carroll, 6 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Colin Vickerman, 5 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Ann Nandra, 12 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
D & Sira Shabetai, 9 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
David Hulme And Sue Ritchie, 13 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Mr W Foyle And Miss J Foyle, Parkfield Lodge, Flat 9, Parkfield Road South,
Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DD
Roger Alexander, Parkfield Lodge, Flat 8, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DD
Colin & Carol Hardicre, 7 Parkfield Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DD
John Beckett, Flat 5 Parkfield Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DD
Penny J Evenson, Parkfield Lodge, Flat 4, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DD
Nicola Rix, Parkfield Lodge, Flat 3, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DD
Mr Robert Skilbeck, Parkfield Lodge, Flat 1, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DD
Mr & Mrs Meeks, 5a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Dr Russell Drakeley, The Coach House, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6DA
Diana Simon, 7a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
J Miller, 5 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Dagmar And M Thomas, 33 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
T H Wallbank, 29 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
D L Stanton, 25 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
Mr And Mrs Potter, 23 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
Frances De Rome And Stuart Moss, 21 And 21a Elm Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 6XD
Arun Brahma & Dr Anne Trumper, 19 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20
6XD
Dr M Ball And Ms D Zaman, 10 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 3TF
Ian And Janet Wiseman, 9 Trafalgar Place , Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 3TF
Verity Collett, 7 Trafalgar Place Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
Amelia And Paul Lomas, 28 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 3YH
Dr Swaminathan Raja, 24 Blackburn Gardens, Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 3YH
Jennifer Warner, 20 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester,
M20 3YH
Margaret Barrow, 18 Blackburn Gardens, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester,
M20 3YH
Katie A Heywood, 14 Blackburn Gardens , Palatine Road, Didsbury,

Manchester, M20 3YH
John Townsend, 10 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
Dr Hugh Battenbo, Flat 11, Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6D
Andrew Hodgson, Flat 3, 23 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Dr M Martin & Dr E M Humphries, Flat 1, 5 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Anna McGloin & John Miller, Flat 3, 5 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Karen Knowles, 18 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Elizabeth And Rainer Kolbeck, 12 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Bridget And Paul Kik, 10 Stonecroft, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Mrs Audrey B. Insley, 4a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Dr Simon And Mrs Pamela Horner, 6 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
John Sankey, 29 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Johnathan Hallewell, 39 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Mrs Marcelle Samuels, 33 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Helen Wilkins, 25 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Sophie And Mike Carter, 23 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Miss B Wallace, Flat 12, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Paul Lucas, Flat 24, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
R Brian Clark, Flat 8, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
J Ali-Khan, Flat 18, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
J Solomon, Flat 10, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Max Milner, Flat 14, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Mrs D Khodadad, Flat 2, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Mrs Rosine Brass, Flat 22, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Dorothy A Wilson, Flat 7, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Anita McSorley, Flat 6, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
H And S Hira And L Hyde, 1c Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Maggie Sutcliffe, 8 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
Dr David Fitzgerald, 10 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
Chris & Helen Pearse, 6 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
Mr And Mrs E P P Hill, 4 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB

Evelyn And Peter Russell, 18 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
Richard And Dorothy Wilkinson, 14 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
Mr And Mrs Shaw,
Dr F Jooyandeh, 7 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Dr And Mrs Coyne And Mr S Macauley, 23 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road,
Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
Alex Poole, 21 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20
3YH
Diane Horobin, 19 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester,
M20 3YH
Emil Haye And P Smith, 17 Blackburn Gardens Palatine Road, Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 3YH
M Tawil, Brooklawn, Flat 4, 131 Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20
3YA
Dr Mark Ball, 10 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester
Dr Mark Ball, 10 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester
Raymond And Josephine Thorley, 326 Lapwing Lane, Blackburn Park,
Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UW
Bernice Wilson, 7 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
A Szofinska, 37 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury , Manchester, M20 6HD
C Neary, 11 Deneway Mews, Heaton Norris, Stockport, Sk4 2JA
L O'Toole, Flat 20, Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20
6DB
Dame Kathleen Ollerenshaw, 2 Pine Road, Manchester, M20 6UY
Peter Rhodes, 16 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
H Quinn, 22 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
J Kershaw, Garden House, 27a Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
C O Carroll, Indigo Planning, 23 King Street, Manchester, M2 6AN
Mr Timothy Shearer, 2 Stonecroft, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester,
M20 6DA
J Mutch, 32 Sandleigh Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3LW
Mr & Mrs Coates, 29 Mersey Meadows,, West Didsbury, Manchester
M Wilkinson, 8 Annerley Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2DJ
Anne Arber, 51 Kingsley Green, Northwich, Cheshire, Wa6 6YA
S And G Gent, 8 Brentwood Drive, Gatley, Cheshire, SK8 AR
L Kelly, 44 Broadlea Drive, Burnage, Manchester, M19 1BZ
Dr Vogel, Flat 3, Stonecroft, Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
P And D Donnai, 24 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
M And R Rhind, 26 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
M & D Thomas, 33 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XD
K Mano, 40 Fog Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6AL
N Perrin-Trent, Flat 102, Merlin Court, The Quadrant, Fog Lane, Didsbury,
Manchester, M19 1UD
A Swainbank, Flat A, 1 Goulden Road, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 4ZU
J Doris, Flat 6, Block 22, Larke Rise, Greystokes, West Didsbury, Manchester,
M20 2UL
A Clegg, 5 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
H Ball, 8 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
K Barlow, 7 Marlowe Drive, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DE
K Bullen, 22 Old Broadway, Withington, Manchester, M20 3DF
L Wu, Flat 9, Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB
D Lande, Flat 15, Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20
6DB

James Burns, 35 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
J And J Krawrecki, 13 Stonecroft Court, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
D Williams, 16 Ballbrook Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6AB
Anne Strachan, 7 Gordon Place, Withington, Manchester, M20 3LD
D Roberts, 15 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Mrs Dorothy Wilson, 7 Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
E Hakim, 22 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
J Wilkinson, 40 East Road, Longsight, Manchester, M12 5QZ
L Au, 50 Shakespeare Drive, Cheadle, Stockport
M Makin, 28 Cecil Road, Blackley, Manchester, M9 6RQ
Dr Phil Bullen, St Mary's Hospital, Manchester, M13 9WH
D Morley, 67 Park Road, Westhoughton, Bolton, BI5 3DA
J Pair, 67 Bowerfold Lane, Heaton Moor, Stockport, Sk4 2LU
Audrey Insley,
Dr Moatamedi, 2a Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
Dr D Whitaker, 22 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
C Aroskin, Flat 19, Elmwood Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB
Chris Venables, 9 Georgia Ave, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 1LY
A & V Collier, 12 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
Mr And Mrs P Bunting, 21 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UY
Mark Quainoo, 20 St. Catherine's Court, Bryer Street, Lancaster, Lancs, LA1 1RW
Peter Carroll, 2 Elm Park Court, Lapwing Lane, Didsbury, M20 6UX
James Agar, 7a Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Pam Siddons, 24 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2NU
Mr & Mrs W Thompson, 13 Bickerton Road, Altrincham, Trafford, WA14 4LA
Dr Adam Dangoor & Ms Alex Ross, 287 Yew Tree Road, Withington, Manchester, M20 3FP
Nicole Perrin-Trent, 42 Scott Avenue, Baxenden, Accrington, BB5 2XA
P Lorimer, 5 Fairfax Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6AJ
Noel Mears, 2 Field Place, Off Crossway, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6TF
Colleen Scott, 29 Rathen Road, Withington, Manchester, M20 4QJ
Mike & Eileen Eeckelaers, 2 St Aldwyns Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3JF
Hanna Wilson, 17 Chapel Road, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4JN
Andrew G Jackson, 41 Queenston, Didsbury, M20 2NX
Chris Paramore, Flat 6, 638 Wilmslow Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6AH
Mr Andrew Hodgson, Flat 3., 23 Parkfield Road South, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
J M Gracie, Apartment 5, The Beeches, 15 Heald Road, Bowdon, Altrincham, Cheshire, WA14 2HZ
Mr Simon Dowse, 8 Low Wood Close, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 3NT
Steve Parle, Didsbury Civic Society, 2 Willowbank Court, 570 Parris Wood Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 5QT
Peter Folkman, 6 Oakfield Road, Manchester, M20 6XA
Alexander Poole, 21 Blackburn Gardens, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3YH
James Burns, 35 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester
Mr Howard Cooke, 4 Trafalgar Place, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
Dr Gerhard Bockeler, 660 Wilmslow Road, Blackburn Conservation Area, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2DN
Leon Au, 50 Shakespeare Drive, Cheadle, Stockport, SK8 2DA

Anne Arbour, Kingslea, Nantwich, Cheshire
Jonathan Lang, 64 Vicarage Avenue, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire, SK8 7JP
Ian Murray, 41 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
Jeff Lomas, 7 Birtlespool Road, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire, SK8 5JZ
Tim Lynas, 14 Brighton Ave, Reddish, Stockport, SK5 6LS
Derek Crowther & Margaret F. Crowther, 52 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TR
Jane Hawes, 35 Pine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UZ
Jim Mutch (Convener of Ballbrook Conservation Area Group), 32 Sandleigh Ave, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3LW
Janet Wiseman, 7 Wolseley Place, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3LR
Anne Cook, 2 The Boatsteps, Barton Road, Worsley, M28 2PB
Janet Penny, Flat 5 Stonecroft, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DA
Mr Robert Alderson, 54 Cundiff Road, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 8FW
Nikki Sills, 17 Chapel Road, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4JN
Aloisia Oldland, 2 Merehaven Close, Pickmere, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 0LP
Simon & Pamela Horner, 6 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Sydney Downs, 15 Victoria Garage, 119 Barlow Moor Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TS
Verity Collett, 7 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3TF
Mrs Christine Sandiford, 330 Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 6UW
Dr H Wilkins, 25 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Abi Swainbank, Flat A, 1 Goulden Road, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
James Paterson, 9 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3TF
Dr Sean Hasain BDS, 24 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DH
Mr A Jalil, Apartment 1, Block 5 Larke Rise, Mersey Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UL
31 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Dr Vogel, Flat 3, Stonecroft, Elm Road, Didsbury, M20 6XD
Justine Foyle, Flat 9 , Parkfield Lodge, Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, M20 6DD
Richard & Bidy Schilizzi, 22 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Felipe Dhawahir-Scala, 2 Victoria Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2GZ
H Rosenblum, 2 Linden Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QJ
Dr. Mohammed S. Umar & Mrs. U Umar, Parkfield House, 13 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DB
Pam Newbury, 29 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Mr Andrew Newbury, 29 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6DH
Mr Stuart Moss, 21 Elm Road, Manchester, M20 6XD
F J Maguire, 2 Elm Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6XB
Mrs KJ Vokes & Mr PA Vokes, Highbank, Stenner Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2RQ
David Ellison, 27 Mersey Meadows,, Didsbury,, Manchester, M20 2GB
Dr & Mrs S A Dalton, 23 Holme Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UP
John P Doris, Flat 6, Block 22, Larke Rise, Greystokes, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UL
Keith Trumper,
Bernadette Cunnane, 16 Allan Court, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 9FR

Anne Trumper,
Barry Aelion, West Didsbury Residents' Association, 1 Old Lansdowne Road,
West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2PB
Barry Gillespie, 15 Chatfield Road, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 8UR
Jeremy Coleman, 8 Trafalgar Place, Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3TF
Mr and Mrs Ullah, 37 Old Broadway, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 3DH
Alison Durham, 9 Whitehaven Gardens, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2SY
Mark Chiarotti, 5 Littler Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 7WA
Vicky Matthews, 24 Hartington, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 8UY
Carol Megram, 9 Princes Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6SE
Dr Godfrey Wilson and Dr Alison Wood, 26 Moorfield Road, West Didsbury,
Manchester, M20 2UY
J Wood, 31 Moorland Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6BB
Dr Jun Zhang, 44 Spath Road, Didsbury, M20 2GT
Sean Berry, 60 Kirkmanshulme Lane, Longsight, Manchester, M12 4WA
Shama Goyal, 4 Redcourt Avenue, Didsbury, M20 3QL
Mark Gral, 22 Austin Drive, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6EG
Graham Pheby, 5 Lanark Avenue, Northenden, M22 4NJ
Laura Linkomies, 8 Canterbury Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2UQ
Alister Manhilligin, 3 Heritage Gardens, Didsbury, M20 5HJ
Pete Mann, 3 The Circuit, Withington, Manchester, M20 3RP
M Garcia Alvarez, 27 Sandleigh Avenue, Manchester, M20 3LN
Mrs Victoria Rankin, 37 High Lane, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 9DL
C Lam, 9 Dene Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2GF
Lesley Russell, 12 Rathen Road, Withington, M20 4GH
Dominic Paul, 28 Green Walk, Whalley Range, M16 9RF
Mr P Porf, 18 Winchester Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TN
Mr and Mrs Plunier, 70 Hurstmead Walk, Brunswick, Manchester, M13 9UT
Sarah Hussain, 18 Ballbrook Avenue, Manchester, M20 3JG
Thomas McGinley, 7 Fielden Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 9QB
T Kirwin, 7 Fielden Avenue, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 9QB
Dr Judith Richardson, 38 Clothorn Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6BP
Ghulam M Khan, 17 Smalldale Avenue, Moss Side, M16 7JH
Iwona Wdowin, 14 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
Mrs Bilkisu Hassan, 113 Fog Lane, Didsbury, M20 6SN
Sarah Davies, 15 Claremont Grove, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2QL
S Wolet, 24 Mersey Meadow, Manchester, M20 2GB
Andrew Barley, 8 Veronica Road, Didsbury, M20 6SU
Brenda Chadwick, 3 Bamford Road, Didsbury, M20 2QP
Carol Thompson, 13 Birley Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2TL
Dr Thulasidasan, 81 Sqjuster Road, Rusholme, M14 5LX
Sarah Holmes, 16 Grenfell Road, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6TQ
Paul Corlett, 3 Lindum Avenue, Old Trafford, Manchester, M16 9NQ
Mr R Carter, 14 Clyde Road, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2WH
Linda Bardai, Ravenswood, 1 Parkfield Road South, Didsbury, M20 6DA
Lianne Williams, 10 Crossway, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6TT

Relevant Contact Officer : Jennifer Connor
Telephone number : 0161 234 4545
Email : j.connor3@manchester.gov.uk