
FW: Planning Application: 143245/FH/2025-59 Longley Lane, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4JD-Impact on 57 Longley Lane

[REDACTED]

Date

To Jake Walther <Jake.Walther@manchester.gov.uk>

 6 attachments (2 MB)

P25.02_1010C - Planning - Proposed Site and Roof Plan (1).pdf; P25.02_1011B - Planning - Proposed Plans.pdf; P25.02_1012B - Planning - Proposed Elevations.pdf; P25.02_1013A - Proposed Sun Path - Rear Elevation.pdf; P25.02_1014A - Shadowing and View from neighbouring property.pdf; 28072025_mm mm l-'-' rM.pdf;

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Good afternoon Jake.

As previously discussed, we did not receive the initial planning notice until the 8th July and we have only just received the last update of the proposed extra large extension design (attached) on Friday afternoon but it appears the proposed height and footprint has only been reduced by .3 of a metre. As per my previous e-mail it would be good to speak but the revised extension drawings do not take into account:

- the proposed extension is more than one storey high
- as discussed, the 45 degree planning rule and the current **building line to the outrigger at 61 Longley Lane have not been adhered to**, with no consideration to mass, bulk or sizing
- the proposed design is **overly dominant and overbearing** to the habitable rooms to the rear of [REDACTED] Longley Lane, **resulting in loss of amenity, aspect and blocking of daylight**, in particular in the morning which will **significantly impact the light** into the living rooms (**morning room, kitchen and basement chambers**) at [REDACTED] Longley Lane and the garden
- the Architect has again made a **mistake on where South and North are on the plans** (drawing P25.02_1010)? Which does not instil confidence in any of the drawings
- the proposed design is **too close to the boundary**, which will have a **significant impact on light to the habitable windows/accommodation and garden to the rear of [REDACTED] Longley Lane**
- there has been no survey carried out on [REDACTED] Longley Lane, in particular how this will impact its living accommodation in the morning room, kitchen, garden and basement chambers
- the proposed extension will impact **the visual amenity** of [REDACTED] Longley Lane and set a precedent for the neighbourhood and the planning precedents for the area
- the proposed design is **disproportionate in size, unbalance the symmetry of this 1900 property, dwarfing the rear of [REDACTED] Longley Lane**
- it impacts [REDACTED] Longley Lane **privacy, and peaceful enjoyment of the property**
- as far as we are aware, no other semi-detached house has anything remotely similar in the area
- **the resubmitted drawings only reduces the proposed build by .3 metres in height and length**
- proposed materials to be used in view of the age of the property?

- the proposed extension roof would be 4.5 metres at its highest point (this is supposed to be a single storey extension) and the projection from the wall would be 4.2 metres. Which breaches the 45-degree rule in both plan and elevation and will create loss of light to the rear living rooms and created a tunnel effect in the garden area
- number 59 and 57 Longley Lane are matching semi-detached properties and the proposed development is removing the original character of 59 Longley Lane and significantly impacts 57
- the proposed drawings show the building considerably close to the shared boundary
- the neighbourhood consultation was limited, as most residents are unaware, as no notice was erected and we only received our notice on the 8th July

The attached proposed design results in loss of amenity, is overly dominant/blocks daylight, in particular in the morning to [REDACTED] Longley Lane and impacts [REDACTED] more than 59 Longley Lane.

In the circumstances, although in principle we are not against the applicants developing their home, the proposed design and application, has not allowed a meaningful discussion with the applicant and their Architect, as they had already submitted their application, **it is felt that it would be best if the application is refused** and then the planning department can work with the applicants, to outline what is /is not permissible, which will allow them to come up with a considered design.

Yours sincerely,

From: Jake Walther [REDACTED] >

Sent: 25 July 2025 13:53

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Planning Application: 143245/FH/2025-59 Longley Lane, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4JD

Good afternoon [REDACTED],

I hope all is well.

I have attached the amended plans provided by the agent following discussions with them. They have reduced the projection of the extension down from 4.5m to 4.2 and have provided new sun/shade analysis drawings to highlight how the extension will affect your breakfast room window at different times of the year.

My manager is off today, but I will be discussing the amendments with her on Monday.

Kind regards,

Jake Walther

Assistant Planning Officer
Area Team

Planning, Building Control and Licensing

Growth and Development
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Floor 6 Town Hall Extension
Manchester
M60 2LA