MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	140881/FH/2024
Date registered valid:	25 June 2025
Proposal:	Erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and works to rear terrace including the new stepped access and installation of balustrade.
Address:	43 Wilson Road, Manchester, M9 8BQ
Ward(s):	Harpurhey Ward
Applicant:	Mr N Lowrey
Agent (if any):	Mr Andrew Chapman Synergy Design Concepts Ltd
Case officer:	Katie Raw Tel: 0161 234 4164 Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date of recommendation:	**13 August 2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 14 July 2025

Standard consultations:
Printed: 10 July 2025 Expired: 31 July 2025

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 14 July 2025 Expired: 4 August 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 43 Wilson Road within the north Manchester ward of Harpurhey. The application site relates to a semi-detached, red brick, two storey dwellinghouse characterised with a hipped roof and set back from the highway. Amenity space is available to the front and side in the form of hardstanding and amenity space to the rear is split over two levels- one top level on decking and the lower level related to hardstanding with an overgrown garden. There is an approximate 3.3 metre distance between the upper decking to the rear boundary of the site. There is an approximate 6.4 metre gap between the rear building line of the property and the rear boundary of the site.

Description of area

The immediate area is residential in nature. Boggart Hole Brook sits further north east of the applicant site.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and works to rear terrace including the new stepped access and installation of balustrade.

At ground floor level, the development to the front and side would take the form of a new front porch and side extension which extends approximately 1 metre beyond the existing primary building line of the applicant site. The first floor side extension is set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 0.4 metres and extends the length of the host property.

The single storey rear extension would wrap into the proposed side extension and would run the width of the host property and extension, although would be sited off the shared boundary with the adjoining property by 0.6 metres. The single storey rear extension would have a projection of 2.5 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of a door, garage door and window to the front elevation, and two doors and a window within the rear elevation.

Works to the rear terrace would include a new stepped access and installation of balustrade. The upper decking area would be extended with a 1.7 metre projection beyond the existing decking at the site. The decking would have a height of 1.7 metres and would leave an approximate 1.7 metre gap to the rear boundary of the site.

Materials throughout the proposal have been listed as:
-tiles to match existing
-UPVC windows
-sand cement render
-facing brick work to match existing
-SS handrail/ frame glazing guarding
-deck by specialist

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The scheme gave rise to concern to the LPA.

The proposed side extension was not considered compliant with Policy DC1.4 of the UDP given an inadequate set back at first floor level.

Concern was raised as to the accuracy of the drawings and the measurements of the proposal- for both the submitted proposed drawings and the proposed site plan.

Concern was raised as to the rear terrace giving rise to adverse privacy implications.

Clarification of off street parking provision was requested from the agent.

Information was requested in relation to bin storage.

Whilst the agent provided an amended proposed drawing with the scale changed to ensure accurate measurements could be made, no revised site plan or no revised proposal was received during the course of the application.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and no responses were received.

MCC Environmental Health

Environmental Health were consulted who responded confirming they had no comments to make on the application.

Issues

POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):
a) an economic objective
b) a social objective and
c) an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:
i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
ii. Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:
Policy DM1 (Development Management),
Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) (Deletions replaced by PfE Policy JP-S1)
Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

a. The general character of the property;
b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:
a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:
a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:
a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABE as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

Places for Everyone (2022-2039)

Places for Everyone is a long-term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth. It has been published by the GMCA on behalf of the nine districts and took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

The Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:
i.JP- S1- Sustainable development.

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and works to rear terrace including the new stepped access and installation of balustrade. Whilst the agent provided an amended proposed drawing with measurements corrected, no revised site plan with corrected measurements or no acceptable proposal was received during the course of the application. As such, the principle of development is not acceptable, as the benefits to the applicant do not outweigh the potential harm in relation to residential amenity. Such issues will now be discussed.

Visual/Residential Amenity

The proposed two storey side extension, rear extension and front extension is not considered to give rise to any adverse amenity implications in isolation in regard of overbearing, loss of light nor adverse privacy implications.

Proposed decking area:
As existing, the site experiences a raised decked area which allows the residents to sit/ enjoy an elevated position in comparison to the lower garden. However, it is noted such piece of development does not benefit from consent and cannot be considered permitted development as it sits approximately 3.7 metres above the lower ground level. As is currently the case, boundary treatment has been designed to minimise overlooking opportunities to the neighbours with a variation in boundary treatment to match such changes in levels and it is presumed to not exceed the 2 metres in height that would fall within permitted development rights. It is noted that as existing, the properties to the rear, primarily no.44 Hertford Road, are sited in close proximity to the raised decked area of the applicant site (see Figure 1 for existing circumstances to the rear). There is an approximate 3.3 metre distance between the upper decking to the rear boundary of the site. The neighbouring property no.44 Hertford Road sits 6 metres away from the shared boundary with the applicant site. No.44 Hertford Road sits at a lower topographic position than the applicant’s existing upper decking.



Figure 1, Existing circumstances to rear of the applicant site

As a result of the proposal, the upper garden decked level would increase in depth and have a projection of 1.6 metres further into the rear garden. The decking would have a height of 1.7 metres. A glass balustrade is proposed to both sides of the applicant site.

Such structure would be sited against the boundary with no.45 Wilson Road and would be sited 0.6 metres from no.41 Wilson Road. Concern is raised that the increased decking would give rise to adverse privacy implications to both the immediate neighbours. No boundary treatment above that already existing has been proposed within the application proposals to mitigate such harm. As such it is considered that the proposed addition to the decking would allow additional opportunities for overlooking of the two neighbouring properties and would reduce the level of privacy such neighbours could reasonably expect to enjoy.

However, even if the boundary treatment was raised in height to mitigate overlooking opportunities to the two adjacent properties, the decking would be sited only 1.7 metres from the rear boundary of the site. Such structure would come closer to the boundary of the properties on Hertford Road, primarily no.44 and exacerbate an already cramped relationship with that property. The increase in the decking would exaggerate and worsen the existing cramped form of development and the real and perceived overlooking of the neighbouring private amenity space. Although high boundary treatment is in place as existing, such level would not be adequate to ensure the proposal does not result in direct overlooking and loss of privacy. As such, this element is considered to be harmful to protecting the amenities of surrounding neighbours.

In short, the scheme is considered to give rise to impacts to the surrounding neighbours which are not outweighed by the benefits of the additional accommodation for the application property.

As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design and Scale

The proposed rear extension is not considered to give rise to concern in relation to design and scale. However, there are other elements of the proposal that are not considered to be acceptable on such grounds.

Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front extension:
At ground floor level, the development to the front and side would take the form of a new front porch and side extension which extends approximately 1 metre beyond the existing primary building line of the applicant site. The first floor side extension is set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 0.4 metres and extends the length of the host property.

Policy DC1.4 of the UDP states that in the case of two storey side extensions the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. In this instance, a side extension would be set up to the boundary and a side extension with a 1.52 metre gap to the side boundary would not be feasible. The side extension would come forwards of the primary building line to wrap into the proposed front porch. In such instances where a suitable gap is not retained to the boundary then side extensions would be expected to have a suitable set back from the front/principle elevation and have a roof set down from the ridge of the main element of the roof to the property to ensure subservience and prevent the potential for a terracing effect to take place if the neighbouring property were to seek a similar side extension in the future and to ensure that the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned, as is required by saved UDP policy DC1.4.
. In this case, only a 0.4 metre setback is proposed which is not considered to be adequate to achieve subservience or to prevent the gap between properties to be shared equally or avoid the potential for a terracing effect to take place. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions as set out within Policy DC1.4 of the UDP. The proposal does not create a subservient feature due to the lack of setback, minimal lowering of the roof form and the extension beyond the primary building line which emphasises the lack of subservience and creates a large feature in the streetscene. This element of development is wholly contrary to Policy DC1.4 of the UDP.

Works to rear terrace including the new stepped access and installation of balustrade:
The scale of the rear terrace is overly large for the constraints of the rear garden, given the proximity to surrounding properties and its height would result in overlooking opportunities and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and occupiers. As such, the proposal is not considered acceptable on the grounds of design, contrary to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Materials:
Materials throughout the proposal have been listed as:
-tiles to match existing
-UPVC windows
-sand cement render
-facing brick work to match existing
-SS handrail/ frame glazing guarding
-deck by specialist

Whilst the materials to match are welcomed, concern is raised to the acceptability of the sand cement render, as the existing property and surrounding properties are largely characterised by red brick. No justification has been provided as to why such contrasting render is considered acceptable to the first floor side extension. As such, such element of works is considered contrary in regard to the resultant appearance and so would be considered contrary to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and EN1.

Inaccurate Information

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) provides general requirements for the submission of planning applications and states that *"an application for planning must….be accompanied by…. 7(1c)(ii) any other plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development which is the subject of the application".* 7(2) states that *"any plans or drawings required to be provided by paragraph (1) or (1A) must be drawn to an identified scale and, in the case of plans, must show the direction of North".*

With this in mind, it is considered that the information submitted under this application fails to meet the requirements set out in this Order on account of the inaccuracies and discrepancies which exist amongst the submitted drawings.

It is noted that the agent amended the proposed plans to ensure the measurements were correct.

However, discrepancies within the location and site plan, drawing number 0.03, have not been amended during the course of the application. The site plan with a scale reference of 1:1250 does not result in accurate measurements of the site.

Therefore, given the quality and accuracy of the submitted information, and the uncertainty of how the proposal may affect the amenities of neighbouring residents as shown within the site setting out plan, the City Council is unable to support this application, as it conflicts with the principles set out under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Proposed Car Port

Concern was raised as to whether the proposed car port and garage would have adequate dimensions to be able to accommodate a car parking space. No confirmation was provided during the course of the application. However, given the availability of off street parking, if all other elements of concern of the proposal were dealt with, the LPA could review such off street parking provision in further detail.

Bin Store

During the course of the application, the agent was asked to provide information in respect of bin storage, as it would no longer be possible to access the space to the side of the property. No information was supplied. It is noted that such information could be dealt with via condition if the proposal were considered acceptable in regards to the other matters set out in this report .

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 polices 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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration
The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a proactive manner, but no revised scheme was provided for review to overcome the concerns raised with the application proposals.

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

1) The proposed two storey side extension and single storey front extension by reason of its height, scale, massing, materiality, proximity to the common boundary with property no.45 Wilson Road and lack of setback would give rise to an extension which: is not subservient to the host property, in turn creating an overly large and bulky feature; does not allow the development potential of the gap between houses to be shared equally by the owners or occupiers of numbers 43 and 45 Wilson Road; the potential result of building the extension could be the creation of a terracing effect, which would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole. As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2) The proposed enlargement of the rear raised terrace area including the new stepped access and installation of balustrade by reason of its projection, height, materiality and proximity to the boundaries with properties at no.45 Wilson Road, no.41 Wilson Road and no.44 Hertford Road would give rise to adverse impacts in terms of overlooking and a resultant loss of privacy . As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3) The submitted information contained within the application site plan drawing is not accurate in that the incorrect scale reference is used.
Therefore, given the quality and accuracy of the submitted information, and the uncertainty of how the proposal may affect the amenities of neighbouring residents, the City Council is unable to support this application, as it conflicts with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) part 7(1c)(ii) and part 7(2), policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health
Environmental Health

43 Wilson Road, Manchester, M9 8BQ
41 Wilson Road, Manchester, M9 8BQ
45 Wilson Road, Manchester, M9 8BG
48 Hertford Road, Manchester, M9 8BW
44 Hertford Road, Manchester, M9 8BW
17 Cumberland Road, Manchester, M9 8BH
42 Hertford Road, Manchester, M9 8BW
15 Cumberland Road, Manchester, M9 8BH
47 Wilson Road, Manchester, M9 8BG
2 Cumberland Road, Manchester, M9 8BH
46 Hertford Road, Manchester, M9 8BW

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Historic Landfill Site 50m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA