

## Planning

## Growth & Development

### Delegated officer report for planning application

**Application no.** 142534/FH/2025  
**Date registered valid:** 26 March 2025  
**Proposal:** Erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension  
**Address:** 41 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS  
**Ward(s):** Northenden Ward

**Applicant:** Mr P Hodnett  
**Agent (if any):** Mr C Harrison, Ambit Architectural Design  
**Case officer:** Tracie Simpson  
Tel: 0161 234 4537  
Email: [tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk)

**Recommendation:** Approve  
**Date of recommendation:** 28<sup>th</sup> August 2025



## Application details

**Type of application:** Full Householder Application

**Development type:** Householder

**Date of site visit:** 13 May 2025

**Standard consultations:**

No consultations have been printed and sent.

**Neighbour notifications**

Printed: 9 April 2025

Expired: 2 May 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 comprises a two storey brick built semi-detached property in the Northenden area of Manchester. The property has gable fronted curve bay windows and has recently changed from hip to gable and constructed a rear dormer window. The property benefits from a previous enlargement to the side and features a front porch. The front has paved garden area with landscaped garden to the rear with access along the side. The property is bounded by a mix of timber fencing and low brick wall, hedging and soft landscaping.



**Listed building:** Not applicable

**Conservation area:** Not applicable  
**Tree Preservation Order:** Not applicable

### **Description of area**

The area is predominantly residential in character

### **Description of development**

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension

### **Consultations & Notification Responses**

**Local residents**, as per Appendix 1 - No comments, objections or representations in respect of this application were received.

### **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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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**

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 41 Royle Green Road

118578/FH/2017 - Recv: 18.12.2017 - Application Approved - 08.02.2018 41 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS Erection of part single and part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

115702/FH/2017 - Recv: 03.04.2017 - Application Withdrawn - 22.05.2017 41 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS Erection of a part single, part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

F01624 - Recv: 15.10.1974 - Application Approved - 22.11.1974 41 Royle Green Road,, Northenden., 2-storey extension at side of house, to form a garage and kitchen with 2 bedrooms over.

#### Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension. The City Council raised concerns about the initial projection at the rear, the position of the first floor window and the roof style. These have been addressed by the agent/applicant.

#### Ground Floor

The proposal would project of the rear of the building extending across the rear wall up to the side wall of the side extension with a total projection from the rear wall of the house measuring an overall projection of 4.378m. The proposal would extend up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi detached property no. 43 Royle Green Road. A window and sliding doors are proposed facing the garden area. The roof would be flat with a parapet on the side wall and raised roof light.

#### First Floor

The first floor would extend part way across the rear wall measuring 2.827m in width and a projection measuring 4.378m. A window would be positioned on the rear elevation which is considered to be acceptable given the distance to the rear of properties opposite (minimum of 15m retained first floor window to first floor window). The roof has been amended from a gable projection and would be hipped reducing any visual impact and would match the previous enlargement roof to the side of the property.

Given the orientation of the property together with the gap retained to the shared boundaries, the first floor projection is not considered to provide any overshadowing or loss of light, given the proposal is single storey along the shared boundary with the adjoining property, this element of the proposal is not considered to provide any overshadowing or loss of light to the occupiers of this property.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area has been retained although over time the houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended. Varying style of extensions to the side and rear are particularly popular in this area. Therefore, the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property.

Overall, 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

The height of the proposed extension has been set down considerably from the existing ridge height of the host dwelling. The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. 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 proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials by way of brick, render and tile as specified in the application form. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

### Trees

A tree marked T1 is positioned within close proximity to the development. Following consultation, it was thought that although the tree did not provide any amenity value, it maybe harmful to the tree root causing severance. As a result, a condition has been attached to ensure tree root protection during works.

### Bins

Bin storage to the rear of the property is unaffected by this proposal and therefore is considered would be acceptable.

### Car parking

Off road car parking space would still be retained to the site on the front driveway and therefore is unaffected by this proposal.

### Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be 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, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

### **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 guidance contained within saved policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **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:

Stamped received on 28th May 2025 numbered 2205/02 Revision A Proposed Elevations

Stamped received on 28th May 2025 numbered 2205/02 Revision A Proposed Floor Plans

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 of the existing building 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) Prior to commencement of works, the erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site in accordance with policies EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

## **Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified**

58 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4WR  
39 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS  
7 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF  
5 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF  
56A Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4WR  
43 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS  
56B Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4WR  
3 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF

## **Appendix 2 – Planning constraints**

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4  
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA