



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/25/3359557

86 Hemmons Road, Manchester M12 5ST

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Zahid Butt against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref is 140963/FO/2024.
- The development proposed was originally described as change of use from residential (C3) to ground floor retail [E(c)(iii)] and first floor flat (C3).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in my banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has not changed, but a different wording has been entered, which is the same as that used on the decision notice. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. I have therefore used the description of development as it appears on the planning application form.
3. The Design and Access Statement indicates the proposed commercial use would be a beauty salon, but the decision notice refers to a hairdressing use. The appellant's submissions to the appeal refer to both a hairdressing use and a beauty salon use. Either use would fall to be considered under the Use Class sought.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. The further amendments made in February 2025 do not constitute a change to policy. The main parties have had an opportunity to consider this matter within the appeal timetable.
5. Certain policies of the development plan were not submitted to the appeal but are referred to in the evidence of the main parties. I have therefore accessed the on-line versions of development plan policies via the Council's website. I consider that no party is prejudiced by my doing so, as these are publicly available documents.
6. The operating hours on the application form are stated to be 10:00-17:00 Monday to Friday and 10:00-16:00 on Saturdays. However, I note that the appellant's statement of case suggests they would be 10:00-19:00 Monday to Saturday and 11:00-18:00 on Sundays. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the operating hours as stated on the application form.

Main Issues

7. Having regard to all the evidence before me, the main issues are:
- the effect of the proposal upon the supply of family housing;
 - whether the proposal would provide suitable arrangements for the storage and collection of waste and recycling; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character of the area and residential amenity.

Reasons

Family housing stock

8. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling. The proposal would result in a commercial use to the ground floor with access via the existing front elevation, with an ancillary kitchen and toilet in the existing rear extension. The duplex apartment would be a one-bedroomed unit of accommodation above to include the roof space, accessed via an existing entrance in the flank elevation, with a small hallway and staircase leading to the first floor.
9. Taken together, Policies SP1, H1 and H6 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester (CS) set out the spatial strategy for the city and its parts to ensure that development makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice. The appeal site is not located within a district or local centre, but is within the South Manchester area, where outside district centres, the priority is for housing which meets identified shortfalls, including family housing and provision that meets the needs of elderly people, with schemes adding to the stock of affordable housing. Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone 2024 (PfE) seeks to achieve sustainable places, having regard to key attributes of development including development that responds to the needs of all parts of society.
10. Due to its size and number of bedrooms, the existing property serves as a family sized unit of accommodation. As a result of the proposal, there would be no overall loss in the number of housing units and the proposed duplex flat would meet wider housing needs and choice such as those for smaller households and single persons. However, this would be at the expense of the loss of a family sized unit of accommodation, the need for which is a priority.
11. The appellant suggests that the property could be readily returned to a single dwelling house in the future. However, the proposal is not for a temporary period, and therefore this matter does not alter my findings.
12. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in the loss of a family sized unit of accommodation. It conflicts with CS Policies SP1, H1 and H6, and PfE Policy JP-P1, whose objectives I have set out above. I attach substantial weight to this conflict.
13. I note that the reason for refusal refers to CS Policy DM1 in relation to this main issue. However, it seems to me that this policy is concerned with detailed aspects of new development, rather than the effect of the proposal upon housing stock or the spatial strategy. For these reasons, I do not find conflict with this policy in relation to this main issue.

Waste and recycling

14. The proposed plans indicate that a bin would be provided within the small hallway on the ground floor serving the duplex flat, which would also provide one cycle space. This would result in future occupiers having a waste bin within a confined space, which would not permit adequate ventilation. It would also not be a convenient arrangement given the limited space available in conjunction with the manoeuvring of a cycle. The proposed plans indicate a commercial sized bin and two smaller domestic scale bins within the rear yard, which would also accommodate parking space for two cycles. It seems to me that the access from the rear yard might not be of a sufficient width to accommodate the indicated commercial bin.
15. The appellant suggests that the rear yard would provide waste bins for both proposed uses, and that this would eliminate the need for a bin within the hallway serving the duplex flat. However, this position is not demonstrated in the submitted plans, and the submitted waste management form indicates that the stores for residential and commercial waste are completely separate from each other. It is not clear whether the proposal relies upon a communal service operating within the gated alleyway to the rear of the terraced row, or whether the proposed arrangements would provide sufficient capacity for waste and recycling for the site as a whole. In such circumstances, I cannot be certain that the proposed arrangements would not cause a conflict with the proposed cycle parking in the rear yard. Consequently, I would not be content to leave this matter to a condition.
16. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal fails to demonstrate suitable arrangements for the storage and collection of waste and recycling. It conflicts with CS Policies SP1, DM1 and EN19; and PfE Policies JP-P1, JP-P6 and JP-S1. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that development makes suitable arrangements for waste management, including arrangements for refuse storage and collection. I attach substantial weight to this conflict.

Character of the area and residential amenity

17. The existing property is a two-storey dwelling at the end of a terraced row, and the terrace is sited at the back of the footway. The Longden Road Industrial Estate is directly opposite. However, the surrounding area is predominantly residential, with rows of terraced dwellings to the south and west towards Matthews Lane. The character of residential built form changes towards the north of the appeal site along Hemmons Road (after Olliers Road), where dwellings are largely semi-detached to include front gardens. Consequently, the appeal site has a residential character as part of a residential terraced row within a wider residential context, albeit opposite an industrial estate.
18. The proposed commercial use would alter the character of the property to include a commercial use within a terraced row of residential properties, which would result in the comings and goings of staff and customers. Such a use would therefore be incongruous within a residential terraced row, with the potential to generate parking demand from staff, customers and deliveries; and the potential to cause some degree of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, including future occupiers of the duplex flat above. This would alter the character of the appeal property from a residential one to a largely commercial one. Matters such as

signage and/or shutters to secure the premises could alter the character and appearance of the property, but the proposal does not include such elements.

19. The appellant suggests that the historic use of the ground floor of the property as a hot food takeaway with residential accommodation above weighs in favour of the proposal; and the proposed hairdressing/beauty salon use would not be incongruous in the context of the industrial estate opposite. However, the evidence indicates that planning permission was granted in May 2010 to form a single dwellinghouse, and the property was in single residential use one year later. Therefore, while the property may have once benefitted from such a use, that was some time ago and I must consider the proposal in light of current planning policy, and therefore this matter attracts little weight in my deliberations.
20. The industrial estate comprises commercial buildings of a larger scale, some with narrow frontages along Longden Road, and includes a car park accessed along Hemmons Road. The estate appears to be largely occupied by businesses such as motor vehicle repair, building supplies, pharmaceutical distribution, UVPC windows and doors suppliers. While there is a retail pharmacy along the Longden Road frontage, its presence does not detract from the overall character and appearance of an industrial estate, in contrast to the appeal site, which is within a residential terrace.
21. The appellant draws my attention to other retail/commercial units in the wider area. The circumstances which led to these uses are not before me, which limits the weight I can attach to these examples. The examples along Matthews Lane are at some distance from the appeal site, as this road runs south of and largely parallel to Longden Road. Matthews Lane links the A6 (Stockport Road) to the B6178 (Mount Road) and includes bus stops with a number of routes, as well as intermittent corner shops. The shops I saw along this road are intermittently sited at the corner of residential side streets, with many having an entrance way in a chamfered corner to the street, such that their character and appearance is of a traditional corner shop. However, I also saw some shops/examples which did not display a chamfered corner, and a residential property with a chamfered corner.
22. Aside from the industrial estate, I saw no other commercial properties along Longden Road until near to the A6 (Stockport Road). The premises on Hemmons Road were at some distance north of the appeal site. It seems to me that the intervening streets between Matthews Lane and Longden Road towards Stockport Road display a consistent residential character. Although Matthews Lane has a mixed-use character to include intermittent corner shops, this is at some distance from the appeal site on a public transport route. For these reasons, the examples do not alter my finding that the proposal would alter the character of a residential terrace to include a commercial use.
23. The Council draws my attention to CS Policy C 8 (Local Centres), which is not referenced in the reasons for refusal. This policy encourages the provision of new small scale retail facilities where they would provide for local everyday needs and would not be harmful to the vitality and diversity of nearby centres. The policy also states that careful consideration will be given to the impacts of new commercial development on residential amenity. The appeal site is not within a defined local centre, and thus in the Council's view, it would conflict with this policy. While the Council suggests that Class E uses should be located within an established shopping parade, there is nothing before me in this policy to indicate that such uses

are prohibited outside local centres or shopping parades, nor that such proposals are required to demonstrate viability in the long-term. However, it is also the case that there is no substantive or compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would not harm the vitality and diversity of any local centre.

24. Although levels of noise and disturbance arising from the comings and goings of staff and customers would not be significant in the context of the industrial estate opposite, they could be in relation to existing neighbouring residential uses, including future occupiers of the proposed duplex flat. Measures such as soundproofing could mitigate levels of noise and disturbance arising within the premises. Given the scale of the operation, the likely use of an appointment system, together with the proposed operating hours, which could all be controlled by condition, levels of noise and disturbance would likely be limited.
25. The proposal does not include off-street parking provision, but the site is accessible by public transport with nearby bus routes along Matthews Lane. The proposed duplex apartment could generate parking demand, but as a one bedroomed unit, this would likely be similar to the demand arising from the existing dwelling. The proposed commercial use could likely generate parking demand from customers and staff, given to be two full time and one part time staff (2.5 full time equivalent). A hairdressing/beauty salon business would likely receive deliveries of products/supplies, but this would not be of such a scale or frequency as to alter the character of the area, and such deliveries would not be significantly different to those for the industrial estate opposite. Moreover, there is no substantive evidence before me concerning any parking stress, and the local highway authority raises no objection on highways grounds, noting that it is not considered that the proposal would generate significant traffic or otherwise affect highway capacity. I find no reason to consider otherwise.
26. Given the scale and location of the proposed commercial use, it seems to me that customers would likely include local residents who could choose to walk to the premises. Cycle parking for two cycles is proposed in the rear yard, with a space in the hallway serving the duplex flat. Cycling provision could be secured by condition, but given my findings in the previous main issue, I cannot be certain that this would be a convenient and accessible arrangement. Nonetheless, the proposal seeks to encourage more sustainable forms of transport.
27. The appellant suggests that demographic changes including population increase have resulted in demand for hairdressers/beauty salons, and that such services are under-provided in the wider area. However, this matter is not robustly demonstrated. The appellant has submitted a letter of support to the appeal by local residents, who consider that there is a lack of such facilities within the local area, including those that specifically cater to the needs of women. It is suggested that this results in trips to Longsight or further afield, which may require trips by private vehicle. However, there are reasonably frequent public transport services to Longsight and other destinations within Manchester. Such support does not render the proposal acceptable.
28. Drawing all of the above together, I find that the proposal would alter the character of the appeal site and the residential area within which it is located. This harm would be limited, due to the scale of the proposed commercial use and the proximity to the industrial estate. The proposed commercial use would likely generate some degree of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, but this

would likely be limited. While the proposal would likely generate parking demand, this would not be so significant as to be unacceptable.

29. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character of the area and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. It conflicts with CS Policies SP1 and DM1; PfE Policies JP-P1, JP-P6 and JP-S1. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure sustainable development which (among other things) makes a positive contribution to the creation of neighbourhoods of choice, including creating well-designed places that enhance or create character and make a positive contribution to the health, safety and well-being of residents; has regard to the character of the surrounding area and the effects upon amenity, including noise and traffic generation; responds to the needs of all parts of society; and maximises positive contribution to health and well-being. I attach limited weight to this conflict.

Other Matters

30. The proposal would result in economic benefits through the establishment of a business with 2.5 full time equivalent staff. Although the Framework places significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity, such support is not unfettered and must be balanced against the need to ensure proposals achieve high standards of amenity for existing and future users. Temporary economic benefits would arise during construction works. While the proposal would result in expenditure arising from a household, this would be largely similar to the existing situation. Together, the economic benefits attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal. While the proposal would allow customers to attend to their appearance and thus support their personal health and well-being, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal, and in particular its location is the only way to achieve that objective. This matter therefore attracts very limited weight in favour of the proposal.
31. I appreciate that the appellant is a long-term resident of the area and a well-established member of the local community. However, as planning permission runs with the land, such matters do not have a bearing on my consideration of the appeal.

Conclusion

32. While the proposal would deliver benefits, it is clear that such benefits, individually or cumulatively would not outweigh the harms that I have found.
33. I therefore conclude that for the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan read as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR