

PLANNING

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

Application no. 142113/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 18 March 2025

Proposal: Erection of front porch and part single, part two storey side and rear extension and installation of dormer

Address: 57 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XY

Ward(s): Rusholme Ward

Applicant: Mr Shueb

Agent (if any):

Case officer: Joshua Lee
Tel: 0161 219 2851
Email: joshua.lee@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 10 June 2025

APPLICATION DETAILS

Type of application: Full Householder Application
Development type: Householder
Date of site visit: 16 April 2025
Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications: Printed: 26 March 2025 Expired: 16 April 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
Listed building: Not applicable
Conservation area: Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of site/building

The proposal is related to a two-storey semidetached dwellinghouse on Birch Hall Lane. The property features an existing single storey outrigger extension, hardstanding to the front for off street vehicle parking and a garden to the rear.

Description of area

The property is in a mostly residential part of the Rusholme ward of Manchester. The proposal sits in Flood Zone 2.

Description of development

Erection of front porch and part single, part two storey side and rear extension and installation of dormer

Front porch

The proposal adds a new front porch to the property which project 1200mm from the principal elevation and spans 3540mm across the front of the property to meet the side elevation of the proposed side extension 150mm from the shared boundary. The porch is finished in brick to match with a gable front tiled roof blended into the single storey part of the side extension.

Ground floor side extension

The proposal adds a ground floor side extension which projects 1570mm from the existing side elevation and runs 13550mm from the front elevation of the proposed porch to the meet the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension. The single storey part is finished with a sloping tiled roof blended into the new porch.

First floor side extension

The proposal adds a first-floor side extension which projects the same 1570mm as the proposed ground floor side extension but runs 7100mm from a setback of c. 2000mm from the principal elevation to meet the rear elevation of the proposed first floor extension.

Ground floor rear extension

The proposal adds a ground floor rear extension projecting 4500mm from the existing rear elevation and spanning 7360mm across the full rear of the property from a 150mm gap to the shared boundary to meet the side elevation of the proposed side extension 150mm off the adjacent boundary. The single storey part is finished with a sloping tiled roof with 2no rooflights.

First floor rear extension

The proposal adds a first-floor rear extension projecting 3000mm from the existing rear elevation and spanning the same 7360mm across the rear elevation. The two-storey extension is finished with a hipped tiled roof which blends with the first floor side extension

Installation of dormer

The proposal adds a hip to gable conversion and the installation of a rear flat roof dormer which sits within the main roofline.

PLANNING HISTORY

102423/FH/2013/S1

Description: Erection of a single storey rear extension and access ramp to rear entrance.

Decision: Approved 26/06/2013

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Consultations

Manchester City Council Flood Risk Management

The MCC Flood Risk team were consulted and reviewed the submitted Flood Risk proforma and data and had no further objections.

Notifications

Local Residents

No representations received.

NEGOTIATIONS

Issues have arisen in the consultation phase which required negotiations in positive and proactive manner.

1. Windows to ground floor side elevation need removing as they are on the boundary and would prejudice development at the neighbouring dwelling.
2. First floor side/rear corner is overbearing on the neighbour being at the boundary, would need to step away to keep it open and remove overbearing massing to No.55.
3. First floor rear cannot span the full width of the house as would generate overbearing massing to No.59, would need a considerable step back to boundary with No.59
4. External access to the rear is being removed so we need a secure ventilated bin store on the site plan.

UPDATED PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

The updated scheme:

1. Removes the windows to the side extension.
2. At first floor
 - a. Adds a 1585mm gap to the boundary with No.55 so the first-floor extension sits in line with the existing elevation
 - b. Adds a 2000mm gap to the boundary with No.59.
3. Adds a secure ventilated bin store

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES TO UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Not required due to reduction in massing.

RELEVANT POLICIES & THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Relevant Policies

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 2004 states that applications for development should be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The following policies are considered relevant.

- [The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027](#)
 - Development Management and Planning Obligations
 - DM 1 - Development Management
 - Objective 1 - Spatial Principles
 - SP 1 - Spatial Principles (Partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)
 - Objective 6 Environment
 - EN 1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
 - EN 14 – Flood Risk (partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 4)
 - EN 19 – Waste
- [Extant Unitary Development Plan \(UDP\) –](#)
 - Citywide Development Control Policies
 - DC1 - Residential extensions
 - DC26 - Development and Noise
- [Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039-](#)
 - Strategy
 - JP-Strat5: Inner Areas
 - Sustainable and Resilient Places
 - JP-S1: Sustainable Development
 - JP-S4: Flood Risk and the Water Environment
 - Places for People
 - JP-P1 Sustainable Places
- [The National Planning Policy Framework \(The NPPF\) –](#)
 - Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
 - Section 4 – Decision-making
 - Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Principle

The City Council recognises many people want to extend and develop their existing homes to provide more space and/or better living accommodation. The principle of a residential extension is accepted.

ISSUES

Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials, and detail

The new addition is designed to match the style and features of the current building by using matching brick and tile to the existing dwellinghouse and matching window fenestrations.

The proposal is designed to be subservient to the original dwelling house with the first-floor side extension having a set back to the principal elevations and first floor elements to the rear having lower rooflines.

The two-storey side is sufficiently set back from the principal elevation to prevent a significant terracing effect

The setbacks at first floor to the rear extension minimise the massing and overbearing impacts to both No.55 and No.59 and the first-floor side extension sits in line with the existing building.

The ground rear at 4500mm, is 1500mm beyond the permitted development allowance and would not be overly large with hipped roof forms to help reduce the effect.

Due to its, size, position and location in relation to neighbours the proposal would not create and over-dominant or overbearing feature.

Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale, and appearance of the proposed development.

Only minimal views of the main proposed works are capable of being seen from the street. Given the position of the extension, together with the use of proposed materials, the character of the street would not be unduly affected.

The proposal is similar in size and scale to other buildings nearby, notably an extension approved at No74 and would not therefore disrupt the area's existing features.

Effects on amenity

Privacy

The proposal includes adding glazing to the new rear elevation however given these are on a similar replace similar windows on this elevation the impact to privacy is minimal.

Light

Given the setbacks to the first floor the impact to light from the added massing would not be significant enough to warrant refusal

Noise

The proposed extension is not expected to generate any noise beyond what would be reasonably expected of a residential dwelling.

Accessibility

The proposal introduces a new porch however doesn't create an accessibility issue to the property.

Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.

The proposal adds space inside the property with minimal effect to the outdoor area and maintains a good level of external amenity space post development.

Refuse storage and collection.

The proposal removes external access to the rear of the property and the applicant has confirmed that waste bins are to be stored in the garage/bin store as denoted.

Vehicular access and car parking

The proposal doesn't change how vehicles access and park at the property.

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private

The dwelling benefits from a garden beyond the siting of the proposed development and maintains a good amount of private green space post development.

Flood risk and drainage.

The site is located in Flood Zone 2 and the LLFA reviewed the submitted documents and had no further objections.

The proposal has a negligible impact on drainage using the existing drainage on site.

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.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development at 57 Birch Hall Lane has been carefully assessed against relevant planning policies and material considerations. Following positive negotiations and amendments to reduce massing and address neighbour concerns, the scheme is now considered acceptable in terms of design, scale, and impact on residential amenity. The proposal respects the character of the area, maintains adequate amenity space, and poses no significant issues regarding flood risk or access. As such, the application is recommended for approval subject to the attached conditions.

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. There were minor changes required to meet the requirements for approval and the officer and applicant worked together to find an amicable solution.

CONDITION(S) TO BE ATTACHED TO DECISION FOR APPROVAL

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	10 Feb 2025	THE LOCATION PLAN
b.	Drawing - Site Plan	10 Feb 2025	A119 PROPOSED
c.	Drawing - Existing & Proposed	09 June 2025	REV C DRAWING PACK
d.	Flood Risk Assessment or Drainage FRA PROFORMA	22 May 2025	MINOR EXTENSION
e.	Flood Risk Assessment or Drainage SUMMARY	22 May 2025	FLOOD RISK
f.	Flood Risk Assessment or Drainage PLANNING	22 May 2025	FLOOD MAP FOR
g.	Flood Risk Assessment or Drainage	21 May 2025	EA PRODUCT 4 DATA

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 & of Places for Everyone.

3. Specified materials

The external facing materials to be used on the development hereby approved shall match those of the existing dwellinghouse in terms of type, colour, texture, scale, pointing and coursing and as shown on the approved drawings.

Reason – To ensure that 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 policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 & of Places for Everyone.

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES & NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED

55 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XY

78 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XZ

8A Brynton Road, Manchester, M13 0RB

12 Brynton Road, Manchester, M13 0RB

59 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XY

80 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XZ

76 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XZ

10 Brynton Road, Manchester, M13 0RB

53 Birch Hall Lane, Manchester, M13 0XY

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

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA