

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142874/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 29 May 2025
Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation
Address: 108 Mornington Crescent, Manchester, M14 6DD
Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: Mr Aaron Shirley
Agent (if any): Mr Peter Hoole, PJH Architectural Services
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 13th August 2025



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder
Date of site visit: 17 June 2025
Standard consultations:
Printed: 10 June 2025 Expired: 1 July 2025
Neighbour notifications
Printed: 5 June 2025 Expired: 26 June 2025
Site notice
No site notice has been produced
Press advert
No press advert had been published
Departure from Development Plan: No
Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The site/building relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Old Moat ward area of Manchester. The property lies at the head of a Cul de sac surrounded by similar style properties, some of which have been altered or enlarged previously. The property features a two storey rear extension with hardstanding to the front which provides off road car parking, access along the side with small rear shed along the shared boundary with no. 49 Mornington Crescent and large garden to the rear. The application site is unique as the land to the rear measures approximately 65m in length from the rear extension.



Listed building: Not applicable
Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 - no comments or objections have been received in relation to this proposal.

United Utilities - No comments received as a result of this proposal

FRM - No objections, however, suggest EA consulted due to location of watercourse to site.

Environment Agency – objected to the proposal due to insufficient information.

Policy and Issues

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.

JP-S1: Sustainable Development

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment;

and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History relating to 108 Mornington Crescent

Planning reference 139563/FH/2024 - for erection of a single storey side and rear extension This application was approved on 08.05.2024.

Planning reference number: 138981/FH/2024 - for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension. This application was Withdrawn on 12.03.2024.

Residential amenity

The application would see the erection of a single storey side and rear extension which would provide additional living space for the occupants. This is a resubmission of a previously approved application, changes which relate to window and door arrangement.

The proposed extension would be set back from the front wall of the dwelling and would extend rearwards along the side elevation, maintaining a 1.0m gap to the boundary with the adjacent property at No. 49 Mornington Crescent. Due to the angled nature of the site boundary, the side projection would increase in width as it extends rearwards, following the boundary line. The extension would also project beyond the rear wall of the host dwelling, wrapping around the property and extending towards the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property at No. 106 Mornington Crescent. The rearward projection would measure approximately 6.0m and would incorporate an angled design that responds to the orientation of the neighbouring property at No. 49.

The proposed extension would feature a flat roof incorporating three roof lights, with store doors positioned on the front elevation. A window is proposed along the side elevation facing No. 49 Mornington Crescent, while the west elevation would include two windows. The rear elevation would comprise two sets of sliding doors and an additional window.

Given the distance to neighbouring properties, the angled design of the extension, and its overall siting, it is not anticipated that the proposed fenestration, particularly on the side and west elevations, would result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.

While the proposal represents a unique design that occupies a substantial area to the side and rear of the property, the proportions of the extension are considered acceptable. Taking into account the relationship with neighbouring properties, the overall footprint is not regarded as creating a bulky or disproportionate addition. As such, the extension is considered to be comfortably accommodated within the site.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

Although the proposed extension is considered to have an unusual layout which is unique to the site, the size and footprint of the proposed extension not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and are considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing and surrounding properties. The use of matching materials, including brick and render finishes as specified in the application form, ensures visual consistency with the local context.

The level of detail in the design is typical for this type of structure and is not expected to have any adverse impact on residential amenity or the overall character of the area. On balance, the design and appearance of the proposal are deemed acceptable and in accordance with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1.

Environment Agency and Flood Risk

The resubmitted planning application involves only minor alterations to the original approved scheme, specifically the repositioning of windows and a door. Although the Environment Agency (EA) has raised objections due to the proximity of a nearby watercourse, it had not objected to the original proposal. Flood Risk Management has no objections, and the City Council acknowledges that the applicants retain the right to implement the previously approved version. Given this context and the fact that the current proposal is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, the Council is satisfied that the development can proceed in accordance with the submitted FRA.

Bins

The storage of refuse bins are not affected by the proposal as there would be continued access along the side which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy

Parking

Off street car parking space would be retained to the site and therefore it is considered that car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

Conclusion

Although the proposal would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene, the character of the area is still retained. The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the existing property and is considered acceptable in this location, in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, or the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

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 a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority 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 Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing 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. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given 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: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Positive and proactive working Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the policies within the Development Plan.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

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

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

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Received 6th May 2025 numbered 2025-1919-P-102 Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Received 6th May 2025 numbered 2025-1919-P-103 Proposed Elevations

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those as stated on the Householder Application Form in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment received on 16th May and 29th May 2025 and the following mitigation measures it details:

o Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than those of the existing building.

Reason - To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development pursuant to policy EN14 of the Core Strategy

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management
United Utilities Water PLC

45 Mornington Crescent, Manchester, M14 6DB
106 Mornington Crescent, Manchester, M14 6DD
49 Mornington Crescent, Manchester, M14 6DB
47 Mornington Crescent, Manchester, M14 6DB

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Flood Zones Type 3 (high risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (More) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA