MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	142952/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	15 May 2025
Proposal:	Erection of front porch extension and part single, part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.
Address:	18 Monsall Street, Manchester, M40 8QF
Ward(s):	Harpurhey Ward
Applicant:	Mr Muhammad Javed Ashraf
Agent (if any):	
Case officer:	Sam Elliott Tel: 0161 219 2856 Email: sam.elliott@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**13/06/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 22/05/2025

Standard consultations:
Printed: 22 May 2025 Expired: 13 June 2025

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 22 May 2025 Expired: 13 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The proposed development site is located in a residential area of Monsall, bounded by Monsall Street to the northwest, Rushwick Avenue to the northeast and residential dwellings and rear gardens to all other aspects.

The class C3 dwellinghouse is an end-of-terrace property within a wider estate sharing a dark brick palette, alternating orientations and pitched roofs with cut-out features. The dwelling itself has a cut-out within the front roof slope and an original single storey rear outrigger. To the front of the dwelling there is a hardstanding driveway and an accessibility ramp, to the side boundary there is a contrasting red brick wall feature typical of the estate and to the rear there is a rear yard.

The dwellings in the surrounding area are a mixture of 20th century terraced and semi-detached properties of varying original designs with either a red or dark brick materiality.

Description of development

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a front porch, as well as a part single and part two-storey rear extension.

An existing ramp to the front of the dwelling would be removed to erect a porch projecting 1.5m from the dwelling's principal elevation with a width of 2.4m. Its roof would be pitched with an apex height of 3.4m and an eaves height of 2.4m. The porch would utilise traditional materials in its construction, with the

proposed brickwork, window frames and tiling to be utilised in the development to match those of the existing dwelling. The gable would also feature hung tile matching those used in the roof, and the driveway around the porch would be made good with paving stones matching those in the existing driveway.

At the rear, the proposed two-storey element would have a width of 5.1m and a depth of 3m. Its roof would have a hipped design, would be set down from the main ridge, have an apex height of 6.4m and have an eaves height matching that of the main dwelling.

The proposed single storey element would extend 8.8m across the dwelling's rear. Where it would project from the dwelling's main rear elevation it would have a depth of 3.9m, projecting 90cm beyond the proposed two storey element. The proposed roof would be of a mono-pitched lean-to design with an apex height of 3.7m and an eaves height of 2.7m. It would be also set in from the boundary with Rushwick Avenue, would be erected entirely within the curtilage of the dwelling and would not impact upon the existing brick wall boundary treatment.

The proposed brickwork, window frames and tiling to be utilised within the rear extension are similarly to match those present within the existing dwelling.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity: The application was advertised through notification letters sent to immediate neighbours. No representations were received in response to the application.

Highway Services: Responded to the original version of the scheme, requesting a dimensioned plan for retained driveway showing parking spaces.
The extension itself would not impinge upon the highway.
Expected that refuse servicing will be unaffected.
Advised that the applicant is required to discuss and agree any requirements for licensing, hoarding /scaffolding, and skips, as well as temporary traffic and pedestrian management with MCC via email at highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk and highwaynetworkmanagement@manchester.gov.uk

Policy Context

The proposal is for extensions and alterations to an existing residential property, within a predominately residential area. Therefore, the proposed development will be assessed against the requirements and limitations of the Manchester Core Strategy, Policy JP-S1 of the PfE Joint Development Plan and the Extant Unitary Development Plan, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024). The following policies are considered relevant to this application:

The Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester

- DM1 – Development Management
- EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- SP1 – Spatial Principles

The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

- Saved policy DC1 – Residential Extensions

Places for Everyone

- JP-P1 – Sustainable Places
- JP-S1 – Sustainable Development

NPPF

- Section 8 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities)
- Section 12 (Achieving Well Designed Places)

Principle of Development

The householder extensions and alterations are acceptable in principle as they provide a means for the home owner to extend and alter their home to meet their family needs. Matters which require consideration are any impact on residential and visual amenity.

Appearance

The dwellinghouse is an end-terrace property and the proposed extensions would be visible within the street scene. Seen from the Monsall Street, the proposed porch would be acceptable in scale and the proposed materials would match those of the existing dwelling. As such it is considered to integrate well with the principal elevation would therefore not appear incongruous within the terraced façade.

With regards to the proposed rear extension, where the two-storey element would be seen from Rushwick Avenue it would be set down from the main ridge and would feature a subservient roof design with a matching roof slope and eaves. This element would not span the width of the main dwelling and would comply with UDP policy DC1 guidance on rear projection, appearing proportionate to the main dwelling with respect to its massing.

Where the single storey element would project beyond the two-storey element, it is acknowledged that it would exceed the 3.65m guidance on rear projection in policy DC1, as well as occupy a notable amount of the limited rear yard space. However, the single storey elements would be modest in height with a subservient roof design. There would also remain a suitable garden space for the dwelling particularly to dry clothes and outdoor play.

On balance, it is considered that when seen from Rushwick Avenue the proposed rear elements would not dominate the dwelling's rear façade, would not appear 'excessively large or bulky' and would appear proportionate to both the plot and the main dwelling.

With respect to materiality, the proposed brickwork, roof tiling, and UPVC framing would match those of the original dwelling and are considered to help integrate the proposed addition with the existing dwelling. It is noted that the proposal would not impact upon the existing brick boundary treatment to Rushwick Avenue.

Ultimately, the proposed extension is not considered to have a significant visual impact when viewed from within the street scene by virtue of its scale, massing, design or materiality. The proposed development would therefore comply with the Core Strategy, UDP, Policies JP-P1 and JP-S1 of the PfE Joint Development Plan and the NPPF in this respect.

Residential Amenity

Impact upon adjoining 16 Monsall Street

The proposed two-storey element is set 3.5m away from the shared boundary and is sited to the northeast of the adjoining property. Given this, it is not considered to result in any significant overshadowing impact on the neighbour, nor to be unacceptably overbearing on their rear yard or rear habitable room windows.

The proposed single storey element would extend immediately up to the shared boundary and would project 3.9m along it. It is noted that the host dwelling features a 1m-deep existing single storey outrigger in this position, with the proposal only extending an additional 2.9m. Moreover,

immediately adjacent to the boundary the neighbour features a door and a small kitchen window further beyond.

Given the separation distance to the neighbour's window and its single storey height, this element of the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact on the adjoining neighbour.

The proposal would furthermore feature no windows facing the shared boundary and is not considered to result in a loss of privacy.

Impact upon no. 2 Rushwick Avenue to the rear

While there would be some indirect overlooking of the neighbour's rear garden due to increased proximity, the proposed first floor windows would directly face no.2 Rushwick Avenue's side elevation. Given the orientation and configuration of the dwellings within the estate it is not considered that the proposal would unacceptably impact the neighbour's privacy beyond existing conditions.

Where the proposed first-floor window faces the neighbour's side elevation, it features no windows other than an obscure-glazed utility room/bathroom window at the ground floor. The proposed ground floor windows and bi-folds are not considered to provide any particular vantage into any of the neighbour's windows or gardens. As such, it is not considered that there are any significant amenity concerns to the rear of the host site.

As assessed on-site, the proposal is not considered to be significantly overbearing nor to significantly compromise the light or privacy of the neighbouring sites. To conclude, it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, the Council's UDP guidelines and government guidance contained within the NPPF relating to residential amenity.

Parking and Waste Management

While Highway Services have requested additional drawings to demonstrate how many parking spaces the driveway would support following the erection of the porch, the proposed site layout plan indicates that the driveway would provide space for 2no. 2.4m x 4.8m off-street parking spaces. It was also observed on site that there is on-street parking availability along Monsall Street. Given this, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on parking arrangements along Monsall Street.

Further detail requested by Highways relating to proposed construction or fit-out arrangements is not considered necessary in order to determine the application.

The storage of refuse bins would not be affected by the proposal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

All relevant planning issues have been taken into consideration in concluding that the proposal comprises an appropriate form of development for the site. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and appearance, not causing harm to the character of the host dwelling and the street scene and according with the Core Strategy, the UDP and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

In addition, the proposed development will have no significant impact in terms of any overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impact or parking demand in the area, it therefore meets the aims

of the Core Strategy and the NPPF in this respect. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

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: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

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. Amendments were sought during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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 location plan received 15/05/2025 and drawing no. 05-05-025 Revision A received by the Council as Local

Planning Authority 12/06/2025.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

3.

The materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the 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 structure. Pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

4.

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional glazing, windows, or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted at the property unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residences, pursuant to policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services

2 Rushwick Avenue, Manchester, M40 8QE
14 Rylane Walk, Manchester, M40 8GE
12 Rylane Walk, Manchester, M40 8GE
16 Monsall Street, Manchester, M40 8QF

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
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Area Team Boundary - Name: CENTRAL