

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Date of Appln</b>	<b>Committee Date</b>	<b>Ward</b>
091188/FU/2009/S2	24th Sep 2009	17 <sup>th</sup> Dec 2009	Baguley Ward

**Proposal** Change of use of vacant land to hand car wash (sui generis) together with 2 ancillary storage containers

**Location** Land At 693-697 Altrincham Road, Baguley, Manchester, M23 9AA,

**Applicant** Mr Nahim Daud, C/o Agent,

**Agent** Mr Anthony Forrester,

Anthony Forrester Design Ltd, 32 Whitfield Avenue, Paddington, Warrington, WA1 3NF,

## **Background**

The application was reported to the Wythenshawe Area Committee on the 19<sup>th</sup> November 2009. Members endorsed the recommendation of the Head of Planning and accordingly recommend the refuse and enforcement of planning application with an instruction to the City Solicitor to take the necessary enforcement action under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to enable the tarmac and drains being removed and the open space returned and properly maintained by the owner until the long-term future of the site can be secured.

Prior to the reporting of the application to the Wythenshawe Area Committee, the applicant supplied an amended site layout and additional supporting statement in respect of their application.

The layout located the valeting area at the rear of the site, adjacent to the gardens of 23 and 21 Brookcot Road. The washing and drying areas remained around the edges of the site, adjacent to the residential properties of 689-691 and 699 Altrincham Road.

The entrance to the site had also been widened and a 'keep clear' hatched area introduced at the entrance.

A 2.5 metre high Perspex barrier had also been introduced around the perimeter of the site and a galvanised steel fence to the front boundary. The Perspex barrier is intended to prevent spray from exiting the site.

The 'portacabin' has been omitted from the proposal, however, the storage container remained. This is a rectangle box, 2.5 metres in height, 3 metre in length and 2.5 metres in width.

Within their supporting statement the applicant anticipates that there will be six vehicles per hour Monday to Friday and eight to ten vehicles per hour on Saturday and Sunday. A typical wash and dry should take approximately 10 minutes.

The applicant also states that there is sufficient capacity for around 18 vehicles to be on site at peak times. In situations where the site is full, staff will place notice boards around the entrance to prevent further vehicles queuing onto the highway and causing congestion.

In terms of noise reduction measures, the applicant intends to install the equipment e.g. vacuum cleaners and jet washers, in the container in order to reduce the noise outbreak. They also state that no music will be played.

The applicant concludes that the noise levels from the site will be minimal in comparison to the busy main road.

### **Description**

The application site is approximately 0.07 hectares and fronts onto Altrincham Road, a major road corridor. The site is currently vacant and has been so for over a decade. Up until recently, the site had become heavily overgrown. However, the applicant has carried out an engineering operation to facilitate the use namely the laying out of drains and Tarmac. The prominent location of the site means it is highly visible from the road.

The application site is considered to be in a highly visible location with Altrincham Road providing a busy commuter route to Wythenshawe Hospital, Roundthorn Industrial Estate and the M56.

The section of Altrincham Road to which the application site relates is characterised by a mixture of residential and commercial businesses i.e. the Shell petrol filling station, Tesco and the other retail uses at Brookway Retail Park. The site is also in close proximity to Southmoor Road which provides direct access to Roundthorn Industrial Estate and Wythenshawe Hospital. That said, it is residential properties which abut the site on three sides, namely, 21 & 23 Brookcot Road and 689 to 699 Altrincham Road.

This application seeks full planning permission for the redevelopment of the site for a hand car wash together with 2 ancillary storage containers and valeting and washing areas. The applicant intends to operate the site Monday to Saturday 09:00 to 18:00 and Sunday 11:00 to 16:00.

This application is being reported to the Wythenshawe Area Committee on the basis of the strong objections/concerns from a number of statutory consultees. In addition, Members are requested, when making their decision, that consideration be given to these concerns as well as the previous decision of the City Council to allow a hand car wash at the site in 1997.

### **Consultations**

Local residents

One letter of objection has been received. The comments can be summarised as follows:

1. The section of Altrincham Road to which the application site relates is particularly busy at most times of the day and the construction of a car wash facility would add to the congestion causing even more traffic pollution on the road;
2. The traffic lights close by are at the junction of Southmoor Road which the main route for ambulances to the hospital. Ambulances are often hindered at the moment and queuing traffic into the car wash could hinder the emergency vehicles;
3. Serious accidents already occur with vehicles turning out of properties onto Altrincham Road. This would increase as part of the proposal;
4. This is primarily a residential area and the noise that would be created as a consequence of this proposal would cause distress;
5. The site will look like an industrial wasteland;
6. There is a problem with flooding in the area and the car wash will increase the issue;
7. Building work has commenced without planning permission;
8. The removal of trees on the land has made the residential properties very exposed resulting in a loss of privacy.

#### Head of Highway Services

- Altrincham Road has two lanes in both directions in the vicinity of the site. With just one access point proposed and no right-turning facility into the site, this has potential to be a dangerous arrangement. The road itself is a main commuter route connecting Altrincham and South Trafford with the M56 and the A5103 and has a high throughput of vehicles, especially in the peak hours. Right turning vehicles, without adequate ghost island markings will be more vulnerable to rear-end shunts, whilst vehicles exiting the site will be required to turn across two lanes of opposing traffic, this heightens risk of driver judgment errors.
- There are a number of accidents in the vicinity to the application site. Of particular interest is the number of accidents at the exit of the adjacent petrol filling station (PFS) which is a left out only with no scope for right turn exits. This gives an idea of the minimum safety risk without allowing all movements from the access as is the case with this application.

- Due to the nature of the proposed development, it is likely that an interceptor tank will be required to handle the excess run-off of water and detergent. Consultation with United Utilities is recommended.
- The existing access to the site would require widening to accommodate new traffic into the site.
  - Estimates of the maximum number of vehicles on-site and when they are likely to occur would be helpful, to ensure that there is sufficient capacity within the boundary and there is no obstruction on the adopted highway
- A marshalling/management strategy will need to be in place prior to occupation to minimise impact on the highway if approval is granted.

Following the receipt of additional information from the applicant, the Head of Highway Services has the following comments and observations

The revised layout plans are considered to be satisfactory, however, it is necessary to provide a greater depth of information in respect of number of vehicles at peak times etc i.e. a marshalling strategy. In addition, it will be necessary to provide details of tactile paving and dropped kerbs for pedestrians. Keep clear markings will also be required rather than the yellow box as indicated.

The applicant should contact the site team via Environment on Call to carry out any works on the highway.

The above matters would be able to be dealt with through the imposition of conditions.

#### Wythenshawe Regeneration Team

This is not an appropriate use for a prominent road frontage and it would detract from the local environment. As part of the West Wythenshawe Local Plan, approved at executive in March 2009, the Royal Oak area was subject to a high level master plan. This identified the site as a possible development opportunity to compliment the masterplan which will be developed by Parkway Green and the City Council. Initial discussions, on how to take this forward, are due to take place. As such, we would not want to see the development potential of this site compromised by an inappropriate use (even on a temporary basis).

#### Head of Environmental Health

There are serious concerns about this development and the serious impact on the local residential amenity. In coming to such a conclusion, account has been given to the very close proximity to the residential properties and external amenity space to the development site. The development in the location proposed would cause unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance for local residents and interfere with the use of their homes and external amenity space.

This department has considerable experience of noise problems associated with hand car washes/valeting services and in some cases this has led to enforcement action being taken against them in relation to noise pollution. In some of these situations the hand car wash/valeting service has been further away from residential properties than this application.

The noise issues of concern relate to the potential noise and disturbance caused by cars arriving and leaving, car doors slamming, car radios playing, music possibly played on the forecourt, noise from spray washers, vacuum and other associated equipment.

Given the proximity of the residential properties we are also concerned that spray from the car washing activities would cross the perimeter of the site and come into contact with local residents properties, residents vehicles or local residents themselves and this would also cause some level of annoyance, inconvenience or interference with the use of their properties.

Design for security consultants

Robust boundary treatment should be used and access to the site restricted when the site is closed. In addition, the portable cabins and storage containers should be of robust construction, locked securely and consideration should be given to installing appropriate alarms.

## **Issues**

### The Development Plan

*North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) to 2021*

Policy DP2 – provides guidance on creating sustainable communities. In particular, taking account of the economic, environmental, social and cultural implications of development.

Policy DP4 – Development should accord with the sequential approach to reuse previously developed land within settlements first.

Policy DP7 – Environmental quality should be protected and enhanced by promoting good design and maximising opportunities for regeneration of derelict or dilapidated sites.

*The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995)*

The application site is unallocated within the UDP. However, the application is located on a major road corridor where the City Council seeks to improve the local environment and appearance of these routes for the people living and working close to these major routes.

The policies which are applicable to the consideration of this planning application include:

Policy H2.1 states that the Council will encourage environmental improvements to make residential areas safer and more attractive.

Policy H2.2 is also relevant and states that the City Council will not allow development that will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas. The matters which the Council will take into consideration include the scale and appearance of the development and its impact in terms of noise, vibration traffic generation, road safety and air pollution.

Policy E3.5 The Council will promote measures which will lead to a safer and environment for all people living in an using the City. These measures will include:

- a) Ensuring that the layout of new development is designed with safety in mind and does not lead to the creation of isolated areas;
- b) Improving road safety.

Policy E3.3 the Council will upgrade the appearance of the City's major radial routes and orbital roads and rail routes. This will include improvements to the appearance of adjacent premises; encouraging new development of the highest quality and ensuring landscape scheme are designed to minimise litter problems.

In terms of road safety, policy T3.1 states that the Council will ensure that the particular needs of both pedestrians and cyclists are catered for in the design of new developments.

Policies contained in part 2 which are applicable are as follows:

DC22 states that in considering development proposals, the Council will have regard to the effect on existing pedestrian routes and will not normally allow development which would result in unacceptable inconvenience to local pedestrian movement.

DC26.1 – The Council intends to use the development control process to reduce the impact of noise on people living in and working in, or visiting the City. In giving effect to this intention, the Council will consider both:

- a) The effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise; and
- b) The implications of new development being exposed to existing noise sources which are effectively outside planning control.

DC26.3 – Developments likely to result in unacceptably high level of noises will not be permitted

- a) In residential areas.

DC26.4 – Where the Council believes a new proposal might generate potentially unacceptable levels of noise an assessment of likely impact should be provided and measures to deal with it satisfactorily. Such measures will include the following:

- a. Engineering solutions, including reduction of noise at source, improving sound insulation of sensitive buildings or screening by purpose built barriers;
- b. Layout solutions, including consideration of the distance between the source of the noise and the buildings or land affected by it and screening natural barriers or other buildings or non-critical rooms within a building; and
- c. Administrative steps, including limiting the operating times of the noise source, restricting activities allowed on the site or specifying an acceptable noise limit. Any or all these factors will be considered appropriate for inclusion in conditions on any planning permission.

DC26.5 – The Council will control noise levels by requiring, where necessary, high level of noise insulation in new development as well as noise barriers where this is appropriate.

DC26.6 – exceptions to the general policy will be considered on their merits. Any such proposal will be considered in the light of consultation with local residents and others, and the practicability of appropriate conditions on any approval.

#### Other relevant planning guidance

##### *West Wythenshawe Local Plan*

This document was approved for development control purposes in March 2009. This document provide the most up-to-date guidance for the long term regeneration of the area.

The application site falls within the Royal Oak Estate area where the City Council will seek to enhance the residential environment including a better range of house types to meet local needs and improved north – south and east- west linkages.

##### *Wythenshawe Strategic Regeneration Framework (published 2004)*

Policy NC1 – Protect and build upon the garden theme which makes Wythenshawe distinctive.

Principle – The site is currently a vacant piece of land and has been so for over a decade. It is unclear what the previous use of the land and up until recently was severely overgrown.

The applicant has recently removed the trees and shrubbery from the site and laid Tarmac and drains in order to facilitate the use. The applicant was instructed by officers to stop all development until the determination of this planning application. At the time of writing this report, no further work had taken place.

Planning permission has previously been granted for the use of this site as a hand car wash in February 1997 (050784/FO/SOUTH3/96). The planning permission was never implemented. However, the approval indicates that a proposal of this nature was acceptable to the City Council at that time. This proposal saw the installation of

a building at the centre of the site with waiting areas and valet parking around the edges of the site.

Planning permission was granted in May 2005 for the redevelopment of the site for a for the erection of a 3 storey block of 6 apartments with associated landscaping and car parking (074125/FO/2004/S2). The owner of the site recently indicated that they do not intend to implement this planning permission. Subsequently, the City Council has returned the Section 106 monies obtained for the proposal.

In light of the history associated with the application site, the proposal to create a hand car wash is acceptable in principle. The proposal will see the re-use of this vacant site, in line with policy DP4 of the RSS, which is advantageous particularly given the length of time it has been vacant and the precarious economic climate which has seen many sites suitable for residential redevelopment stall.

It should be noted that Wythenshawe Regeneration Team do not support the principle of the redevelopment of the site for a hand car wash, particularly against the context of the West Wythenshawe Local Plan. As indicated above, the sites potential for redevelopment for other uses is not currently viable. Whilst this application is for full planning permission, should the proposal satisfy other planning criteria, consideration should be given to temporary planning permission to in order not to hinder the sites long term redevelopment potential.

Whilst the principle of the application proposal is considered to be acceptable, matters, which require further consideration, are as follows:

1. Layout;
2. Appearance/visual amenity of the proposal in the street scene;
3. Highway/pedestrian safety; and
4. Residential amenity.

Each matter will be addressed in turn.

### **Layout**

The layout and internal arrangement of the site include the installation of a storage container. There will be a staff parking area at the southwestern section of the site. The existing drop kerb, at the northeastern section of the site off Altrincham Road, is proposed to serve as the entrance and exit to the hand car wash. Once in the site, vehicles will manoeuvre in a clockwise direction.

Whilst there are no particular comments about the layout of car parking spaces, or manner in which the vehicles will move around the site, it should be noted that the application site is not particularly large and the arrangement feels cramped which raises concerns about its overall capacity i.e. in terms of the number of vehicles it can accommodate. These matters will be addressed further within the highway section of this report.

In addition, the position of the container and proximity of the use to residential properties is also of concern which will also be addressed later on in this report.

### **Appearance/visual amenity**

Altrincham Road is a priority road corridor as identified within policy E3.3 of the UDP. This states that the Council will seek to upgrade and improve the appearance of this major radial road routes by only encouraging development of the highest quality.

The application site is currently vacant. Its prominent position fronting onto Altrincham Road has meant the visual appearance of the site has been unsightly over the past years and has been a problem particularly in terms of tipping and misuse.

The clearance of the vegetation at the site has removed the above issues in the short term. That said, the extent to which the creation of a hand car wash as a '*high quality*' development on this major road corridor is debatable.

Whilst the surfacing of the site with Tarmac gives a more open appearance it is the inclusion of low quality buildings and boundary treatment which is of concern.

The applicant intends to install a container, which by its very nature would be low quality buildings, at the southeastern corner of the site. Whilst this is the furthest position from Altrincham Road, the buildings will still be visible from the street scene. The applicant has not provided any elevations of the structure with their planning submission, however, the description in the design and access statement suggests that the container is a '*shipping container*' measuring 3.05 metres by 2.44 metres. The container will not be modest in scale and thus will be highly visible in the street scene which is unacceptable on this important road corridor.

The applicant has also already installed a red barrier to the front of the site onto Altrincham Road. Given this is a highly visible location; the quality of the barrier is considered to be limited.

Whilst originally the applicant had not provided any other details of boundary treatment further information has been received whereby they intend to install a plastic barrier around the perimeter of the application site. This is for acoustic purposes only and will have no aesthetic value.

This will be highly visible from with the gardens of the surrounding properties i.e. 21 & 23 Brookcot Road and 689 to 699 Altrincham Road. There are also no landscaping improvements suggested as part of the proposal which would soften the view from the street scene.

Further information from the applicant indicates that they intend to install a galvanized steel fence to the front boundary facing Altrincham Road. This is not attractive and not the recommended specification of the City Council or secure by design.

The use of the site itself is not a development which will improve the appearance of the area due to the amount of equipment required on site and the excessive and inappropriately styled boundary treatment. The visual amenity of the site and the street scene (in residential area) will be affected by this development.

Overall, the proposal will fail to provide an attractive development in its appearance on this major corridor this failing to comply with policies H2.1, H2.2 and E3.3 and the aspirations outlined within the West Wythenshawe Local Plan and Wythenshawe Strategic Regeneration Framework. As such, it is recommended that the proposal be recommended for refusal for this reason.

### **Highway and pedestrian safety**

As indicated above, the application intends to utilise the existing dropped kerb at the north-eastern section of the site where an access will be created for vehicles to enter and exit the site.

It should be noted that Altrincham Road is a busy commuter route, especially at peak times, and has two lanes of traffic east and west bound.

The Head of Highway Services initial assessment of the proposal raised a number of specific concerns. However, principally the main areas of concern are about the proposal in terms of:

1. The safety of the right turn into the site;
2. The width of the access; and
3. Overall capacity of the site.

Since the submission of the additional information the concerns of the Head of Highway Services has altered, particularly if the use of the site was temporary.

Accordingly, it is recommended that had the application been for approval, matters such as junction design and marshalling could have been dealt with by means of condition.

### Residential amenity

The application site is bounded on three sides by residential properties. To the west by 699 Altrincham Road, to the east by 689 & 691 Altrincham Road and to the south by 21 and 23 Brookcot Road. Policy H2.2 requires consideration of development proposals in terms of their impact on residential properties, particularly in terms of noise as does policy DC26.1 which requires consideration of proposal which are likely to be noise generators.

The Head of Environmental Health has considered the proposal and has strongly objected to the scheme due to '*serious impact on local residential amenity*'. This concern has been raised due to the very close proximity of the proposed development to the above named properties and the resulting noise and disturbance that would be created by a hand car wash and its operations.

The properties proximity, to the application site, varies (689 -691 1.6 metres; 699 5.5 metres; 23 Brookcot Road 10.5 metres and 21 Brookcot Road 17 metres), however, in all cases the distance is considered close. The applicant has indicated that commercial pressure washers will be used along with high powdered vacuum cleaners. These pieces of equipment cause considerable noise. This would be

coupled with the noise from car doors slamming, engines being revved, car radios playing in cars as well as in the forecourt. These are all characteristics of hand car wash sites.

The location of the container, washing and valeting areas, so close to the residential properties, confirms that the noises and disturbances from the comings and goings will easily transmit to these properties. Given it is not unreasonable for residential properties to have their windows open, particularly at weekends, the constant drown of noise could potential be harmful to these properties and the occupants amenity.

The revised layout actually makes the situation worse i.e. the positioning of the valeting area at the rear of the site, will actually makes the incidence of residential disamenity for the properties along Brookcot Road worse.

In addition, the inclusion of the container and the Perspex screen, will not only be unattractive and obtrusive in the street scene and from the residential properties, but will only prevent spray from affecting residential properties. Noise and disturbance from the car engines, raised voices, and the equipment will still be heard. It is not acceptable to state that the noise from the road will drown out the sound. The close proximity of the proposed car wash and its operations are too close to residential properties and this in turn will affect their amenity.

In respect of the applicants intention to house equipment inside the container this is both not practical or enforceable. The container will have no acoustic treatment and will actually amplify the sound.

Given the emphasis given to the noise that will be generated by this proposal by the Head of Environmental Health and due to the proximity to the residential properties it is considered that the proposal will not comply with policy DC26.3 which states that noise generating proposal will not be permitted in residential areas.

Policy DC26.4 requires consideration to be given to whether measures can be used to prevent noise. It is considered that such measures will not be effective or appropriate in this case.

In terms of engineering solutions, acoustic barriers will not be acceptable as they will be oppressive to the residential properties and given the small size of the application site will largely be redundant. Re-arranging the layout will do little to solve the noise problems. Given there are residential properties on three sides, moving the buildings and cleaning areas will still impact on the properties.

In terms of any administrative steps, the operating hours are already at a minimum, in terms of viability, and restricting them further will not reduce the noise potential at the site.

In light of the comments from the Head of Environmental Health, and the key characteristics of the application site in terms of proximity to residential properties, it is considered the potential for noise from the operation of the site and its equipment, is considerable. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies H2.2 and DC26 of the UDP.

This also reiterates the view of a local resident who has objected to the application.

It is important to note that the previous approval for the car wash at the site did not result in any objection from the Assistant Director (Environmental Health). They recommend instead appropriate screening, noise insulation and restriction of operating hours. The Head of Environmental Health now considers that this proposal is more intense in its operations and the nature of the equipment used.

### Designing out crime

The design for security consultants have not raised any specific concerns with the proposal apart from the cabin, container and boundary treatment being robust. Had the recommendation been to approve this application, then conditions/negotiations would have taken place to secure such matters.

### Enforcement

As outlined above the applicant has carried out an engineering operation at the site in the form of laying of drains and tarmac. Should the recommendation of the Head of Planning be accepted, it is advised that the City Solicitor is instructed to take enforcement action so these features are removed in order to prevent any future unlawful use of the site in the future.

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

### **Recommendation REFUSE AND ENFORCE**

**Wythenshawe Area Committee**      **REFUSE AND ENFORCE AND** Instruct the City Solicitor to take the necessary Enforcement Action under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to enable the tarmac and drains being removed and the open space returned and properly maintained by the owner until the long-term future of the site can be secured.

### **Conditions and/or Reasons**

1. The proposed hand car wash, on a prominent site on Altrincham Road, will be detrimental to the appearance and visual amenity of the area on this major road corridor due to the quality of the buildings proposed and the nature of the use. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies H2.2 and E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD (2007), PPS1, Wythenshawe Strategic Regeneration Framework (2004) and the Wythenshawe Regeneration Framework and the West Wythenshawe Local Plan.
2. The use of land, as a hand car wash, would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation (particularly by 699 Altrincham Road, 689 & 691 Altrincham Road, 21 and 23 Brookcot Road) by reason of the noise and disturbance generated, in particular, from the hand jets, valetting equipment, car engines, door slamming and radio equipment. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies H2.2 and DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995).

### **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: 091188/FU/2009/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:**

Engineering Services  
Environmental Health  
Wythenshawe Regeneration Team  
Greater Manchester Police  
Steve Hobson, Crime Reduction Officer  
25 Yarwood Avenue, Manchester, M23 0QD  
23 Yarwood Avenue, Manchester, M23 0QD  
21 Yarwood Avenue, Manchester, M23 0QD  
27 Yarwood Avenue, Manchester, M23 0QD  
11a, Wellesbourne Drive, Manchester, M23 0QL  
11 Wellesbourne Drive, Manchester, M23 0QL  
17 Wellesbourne Drive, Manchester, M23 0QL  
15 Wellesbourne Drive, Manchester, M23 0QL  
16 Wellesbourne Drive, Manchester, M23 0QL  
9 Pitfield Gardens, Manchester, M23 1EA  
3 Pitfield Gardens, Manchester, M23 1EA  
1 Pitfield Gardens, Manchester, M23 1EA  
5 Pitfield Gardens, Manchester, M23 1EA  
701 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
699 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA

19 Brookcot Road, Manchester, M23 1DT  
21 Brookcot Road, Manchester, M23 1DT  
23 Brookcot Road, Manchester, M23 1DT  
689 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
691 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
25 Brookcot Road, Manchester, M23 1DT  
685 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
687 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
681 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
683 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
679 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
677 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M23 9AA  
17 Brookcot Road, Manchester, M23 1DT  
7 Pitfield Gardens, Manchester, M23 1EA  
11 Pitfield Gardens, Manchester, M23 1EA  
9 Rookwood Avenue, Manchester, M23 0GJ

**Representations were received from the following third parties:**

Mr Stephen Lloyd 699 Altrincham Road Manchester M23 9AA

**Relevant Contact Officer :** Jennifer Atkinson  
**Telephone number :** 0161 234 4517  
**Email :** j.atkinson@manchester.gov.uk