

PLANNING

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

Application no. 142647/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 8 April 2025

Proposal: Erection of first and second floor side extension together with the installation of a rear roof dormer

Address: 9 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr Ruifeng Li

Agent (if any): Mrs Sarah Pope, ML Planning Consultancy Ltd

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 03 June 2025

APPLICATION DETAILS

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 30 April 2025

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 23 April 2025 Expired: 15 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of site/building

The proposal relates to a semidetached dwelling house on Macefin Avenue. The proposal features an existing two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The property features 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 Chorlton Park ward of Manchester.

Description of development

Erection of first and second floor side extension together with the installation of a rear roof dormer.

The proposal would add a first and second floor extension to the existing two storey side extension. The new first floor extension would bring the extension in line with the principal elevation continuing the roofline and adding a gable front feature. The second-floor extension features a gable end with small, hipped feature into the main roof. The extension is finished in matching brick, tile and render.

The dormer sits within the main roofline and is finished in matching tile.

PLANNING HISTORY

141446/FH/2024

Description: Erection of a second storey side extension together with the installation of a rear roof dormer
Decision: Refused 07/01/2025

The proposed hip to gable roof extension and erection of rear roof dormer extension by reason of the scale and design form an incongruous and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the area and would be unduly harmful to the character of the application property. As such the proposals are contrary to saved policies DC1.1 and DC1.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

140355/FH/2024

Description: Erection of hip to gable roof extension and erection of rear roof dormer extension

Decision: Refused 11/09/2024

The proposed hip to gable roof extension and erection of rear roof dormer extension by reason of the scale and design form an incongruous and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the area and would be unduly harmful to the character of the application property. As such the proposals are contrary to saved policies DC1.1 and DC1.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is noted that the applicant has previously submitted variations of a first floor and second floor side extensions. Both applications feature slightly different treatments of the roof finish and setbacks but neither were deemed acceptable.

067891/FH/2003/S2

Description: Erection of part single/part two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation and garage

Decision: Approved 20/10/2003

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Notifications

Local Residents

No representations received.

NEGOTIATIONS

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

Terracing

The existing extension features a setback to first floor which ensures subservience and helps negate a terracing effect to the street scene. The proposal would remove this, bringing the elevation in line with the principal elevation and further adding a bay feature.

Added massing to roof/'second floor' side extension

The added massing to the roof on the side extension would remove the subservience of the side extension and create a heavy massing to the boundary. Generally side extensions should be clearly subservient to the main dwelling and the small, hipped part fails to make this clear.

The officer advised that there wasn't negotiable scheme on this occasion and would likely be refused.

The Agent floated the idea of removing the side extension and retaining the dormer.

No further plans were provided by the target date and so the application proceeded on the submitted plans.

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](#)

- o Development Management and Planning Obligations
 - DM 1 - Development Management
- o Objective 1 - Spatial Principles
 - SP 1 - Spatial Principles (Partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)
- o Objective 6 Environment
 - EN 1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- [Extant Unitary Development Plan \(UDP\)](#) –
 - o Citywide Development Control Policies
 - DC1 - Residential extensions
 - DC26 - Development and Noise
- [Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039-](#)
 - o Strategy
 - JP-Strat9: Southern Areas
 - o Sustainable and Resilient Places
 - JP-S1: Sustainable Development
 - o Places for People
 - JP-P1 Sustainable Places
- [The National Planning Policy Framework \(The NPPF\)](#) –
 - o Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
 - o Section 4 – Decision-making
 - o Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
 - o Section 13 - Protecting Green Belt land

Principle

The City Council recognises many people want to extend and develop their existing homes to provide more space and/or better living accommodation. This cannot be, however, to the detriment of the local residential or visual amenity of the area. In this case the harm caused by the extension is not outweighed by the impact to visual amenity.

ISSUES

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

The extension to existing side extension would be of a size and scale dominating to the adjacent properties so close to the boundary.

The proposal is not subservient to the original dwelling house by continuing the main roofline and the principal elevation, including a gable feature, would not be a clear delineation from the existing dwellinghouse.

The new first floor extension would sit in line with the principal elevation continuing the main roofline to the main dwelling. This, plus the addition of a new gable feature would completely remove the semidetached nature of the dwelling and risk creating a terracing effect.

The overall effect would create a visual harm by creating over-dominant and overbearing feature.

The new dormer sits entirely in the main roof and would likely be acceptable on its own.

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

The addition of another storey to the existing two storey extension would be of a size and scale dominating to the street scene and overall area to the detriment to the character of the area.

There would not be a clear delineation within the street scene, and it would create a large dominating massing out of place for the character of the area.

The first-floor extension being in line with principal elevation and the addition of the gable feature would completely remove the semidetached character of the building and harm the character of the area by risking a terracing effect.

It is noted that there is a similar extension to No.13 however this was approved prior to the current local plan (Manchester Core Strategy) in 2010 and wouldn't be supported today. The more appropriate example is an extension to No.19 Macefin approved in 2016 which is more in keeping with the area.

Effects on amenity

Privacy

The proposal would add windows in the front of the building. It doesn't unduly affect privacy because there are other windows to this elevation.

Light

There would likely be some impact to local light by the added massing, however, given the existing extension the impact to light of the proposed extension would not be significant enough to warrant as a reason for refusal.

Noise

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

Accessibility

The proposal does not change how people can get in and out of the building.

Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.

The proposal maintains a good level of external amenity space post development.

Refuse storage and collection.

The proposal itself has little impact on waste from the site. It uses the current storage and collection methods on site.

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 not located in a flood risk area and therefore does not require a flood statement or assessment. The proposal has a negligible impact on drainage using the existing drainage on site.

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 9 Macefin Avenue fails to respect the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area due to its excessive scale, lack of subservience, and potential to create a terracing effect. Despite previous refusals and opportunities for revision, the current scheme remains contrary to local and national planning policies. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Article 35 Declaration

The application has been determined within the statutory timescale. In this instance the principle of the application proposal is contrary to the adopted development plan and are not considered to improve the economic, social or environmental conditions of the area. It is not considered, in this instance, that amendments could be made that would make them acceptable. The applicant's agent was informed of these concerns prior to the determination of the application.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO REFUSE

1. Visual amenity harm

The proposed erection of first and second floor side extension would form an incongruous and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the area and would be unduly harmful to the character of the application property. Notably the removal of the subservience of the existing extension and the potential effect of terracing. As such the proposals are contrary to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies EN1, SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES & NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED

Flat 1, 5 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

10 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

6 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

2 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ

14 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ

12 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ

14 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

13 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

11 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

4 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ

Flat 2, 5 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

7 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

16 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

12 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

6 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ

10 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ

8 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

APPENDIX 2 – PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA