MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	143737/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	22 August 2025
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension
Address:	17 Porthleven Drive, Manchester, M23 9PP
Ward(s):	Brooklands Ward
Applicant:	Mr Gary Curran
Agent (if any):	Mr Phil Ryan, Cube Design Solutions
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**14/10/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 14/10/2025

Standard consultations:
Printed: 2 September 2025 Expired: 23 September 2025

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 2 September 2025 Expired: 23 September 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 application relates to an end terrace class C3 dwellinghouse on Porthleven Drive. The property is finished in brick with a single storey front and side extension, and a single storey rear outrigger.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
Porthleven Drive is a residential street in the Brooklands Ward. It comprises of terraced and semi-detached family dwellings.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – 2 comments received, 1 in objection 1 in support.

- Support did not provide comments
- Objection can be summarised as follows:
    - Previous/ongoing dispute over shared boundary, the extension would be within the disputed land
    - Party wall issues
    - Extension could potentially damage tree roots
    - Incorrect date of work starting on the application form
    - Impact on light to adjoining property – Extension will overshadow ground floor living space.

MCC Flood risk management – No objection, advise the surface water drainage hierarchy is adhered to.

Application History
110196/FH/2015/S2 – APPROVED – 11.01.2016 - Erection of single storey front, two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation – Constructed started 2019 with only the front extension finished.

140134/PDE/2024 – Turned Away – 01.07.2024 - Prior notification of proposed larger home extension projecting 6m to the rear, with a maximum height of 3.82m and a height at eaves of 2.24m.

Policy
The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 –
The City Council adopted the core strategy on July 11, 2012. It is the key document in the Manchester Local Plan. The plan determines how Manchester will grow and forms the framework that planning applications are assessed against. We consider the following Core Strategy Policies relevant to this proposal.

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

Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
The Core Strategy replaced much of the UDP, but some UDP Development Control policies are extant (remain). The following extant policy is still considered relevant to this proposal.

- DC1 - Residential Extensions

Places for Everyone

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 following policies are relevant:

- JP-S1- Sustainable development

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):

- an economic objective
- a social objective and
- an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places.

Principle
The submitted application is for the erection for a rear extension to provide additional living accommodation. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter or extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposals appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed alteration would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

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. The proposed dormer is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Sitting, Scale and Mass
The proposed rear extension would be single storey and span the width of the main house with a gap of 230mm to the shared boundary with the adjoining property. It would project back by 3m and feature a pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.82m, sloping down to 2.24m at the eaves. The addition would appear as subservient to the host dwellinghouse and is not overbearing on the neighbouring property

The overall scale of the rear extension is acceptable as it would project as far as would normally be expected of a permitted development extension. The application differs from the approved rear extension within the started but incomplete development ref: 110196/FH/2015/S2.

Residential Amenity
As with most extensions on semi-detached properties, there is likely to be a degree of overshadowing from extension at dusk and dawn when the sun is lower. The proposed rear extension has a projection of 3m and a low eaves height at 2.24m. The extension will be due

south of the adjoining, and therefore there will be a degree of overshadowing. However it is noted there is existing dense conifer hedges on the shared boundary here, which are taller than the proposed extension. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable level over overshadowing that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.

The proposal would feature glazed bifold doors and gable window on the rear elevation, a glazed window/door configuration on the side elevation and 4 skylight windows on the roof slope, in addition to this the existing first floor rear window will be reduced in size to accommodate the pitched roof. It is not anticipated that the proposed glazing would provide overlooking or negatively impact the privacy of any neighbouring resident given the gaps to the boundaries for the side facing glazing and the other windows being forward or rearward facing similar to the existing windows.

Visual Amenity
The proposed extension would be finished in brickwork and roof tile to match the main house, with a pitched roof and glazing on the rear and side elevations and skylights in the roof. The extension would not be visible from the highway.

The proposed extension is relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with character of the property. The use of matching materials should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature as such the overall character of the property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The design and appearance of the proposed extensions accord with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Objections
The neighbour consultation process generated objection to proposed development. Concerns relating to overshadowing and loss of daylight have been addressed above. The other matters raised, including right to light, party wall concerns, and boundary disputes, are civil issues and fall outside the scope of material planning considerations. As such, they cannot be taken into account in the determination of this application.

An objection was also raised regarding potential damage to trees. The vegetation in question appears to consist of conifer hedging located within the adjoining property. These trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order and as the proposed extension is set slightly in from the boundary, it is not anticipated that the development would result in their removal or significant harm.

Conclusion
Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as well as waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with policy DC1 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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. No significant problems have arisen 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 OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. 3-year time limit:
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. Specified plans:
The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

a. Drawing – Location plan – 14 August 2025
b. Drawing – Proposed GF Plan – 14 August 2025 – Ref: 1430-10
c. Drawing – Proposed Elevations – 14 August 2025 – Ref: 1430-12
d. Drawing – Proposed Site plan – 14 August 2025 – Ref: 1430-06

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. Specified materials:
The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form and drawings 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. Additional glazing restriction:
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

MCC Flood Risk Management

CARTWRIGHT PROPERTIES LTD, Tatton House, 11 Caldey Road, Manchester, M23 9LF
15 Porthleven Drive, Manchester, M23 9PP
38 Porthleven Drive, Manchester, M23 9PP

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Wythenshawe PD Restriction - Class B1(a) To C3
Article 4 Direction - Wythenshawe PD Restriction - Class B1(c) To C3
Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium 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