

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143090/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 2 June 2025

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, juliet balcony and render to rear and side proposed elevations

Address: 359 Mount Road, Manchester, M19 3HW

Ward(s): Levenshulme Ward

Applicant: Mr Wasim Akhtar

Agent (if any): Mr V Alyas Architek

Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 23 July 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 19 June 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 5 June 2025 Expired: 26 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: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 359 Mount Road within the Manchester ward of Levenshulme. The applicant site relates to a semi-detached, multi red brick dwellinghouse characterised by a hipped roof, front canopy and a plastic structure to the side of the property. Amenity space to the front of the property relates to a hardstanding driveway and amenity space to the rear of the property takes the form of a rear garden and patio area.

Description of area

The immediate area is residential in nature, but there are industrial uses to the rear of the applicant site. Greenbank playing fields sit further to the west of the applicant site.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, Juliet balcony and render to rear and side proposed elevations.

The part single/part two storey side extension would sit flush with the primary elevation of the host property and would follow the constraints of the boundary. At the largest point it would have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.7 x Length: 7.6 x Width: 1.6 metres. At first floor level, the side extension would be set back significantly and have approximate dimensions of Height: 7 x Length: 3.4 x Width: 1.6 metres.

The single storey rear extension element would wrap into the proposed side extension and extend against both common boundaries with the immediate neighbours, with approximate dimensions of Height: 3.4 x Length: 4.3 x Width: 7.5 metres. The two storey rear extension element would be set off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour with approximate dimensions of Height: 7 x Length: 4.3 x Width: 5 metres.

Render is proposed to the side and rear elevations, although no further materials information was provided during the course of the application.

The proposal would involve the insertion of 2 windows within the front elevation, a window, a set of doors and a juliet balcony within the rear elevation.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal would include:

- Roof tiles to match
- Brick work to match
- Render
- UPVC windows to match or similar to existing
- Juliet balcony
- Stone window/ door surrounds
- UPVC doors to match or composite/ aluminum

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The agent was advised in writing that the scheme could not be supported.

The agent provided a revised scheme for consideration. Concern is still raised that the revised scheme did not address the potential impacts to the non-adjoining neighbour's rear garden and first floor window, as the set off the boundary of the proposed first floor rear extension was not considered sufficient to overcome any adverse harm.

The agent requested an extension of time to work with the LPA to design an acceptable scheme.

Given neither the initial nor revised scheme is considered acceptable to the LPA, the initial submitted scheme is assessed within this report. The agent was advised on the LPA's intentions.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and several responses were received. 3 written responses were received and a further objection letter was received with 27 local resident signatures.

The following concerns were raised:

- The extension would increase the number of residents at the property that would lead to increased demand for on-street parking. This would exacerbate existing problems for parking on the street. Concern the property would be run as an HMO and would give rise to subsequent issues.

- Scale and nature of proposed extension would be out of keeping with the character of the area.
- The overdevelopment would set a precedent for similar developments.
- Proposed Juliet balcony would result in overlooking into neighbouring gardens and neighbouring habitable rooms.
- Height and bulk of the extensions cause overshadowing and loss of light.
- Visually dominant structure to be erected in rear gardens.
- Extension to the rear would result in loss of the garden space and potential adverse implications for drainage and the local eco system.

The following matter was raised which is not considered a planning consideration:

- Previous issues with the landlord of the applicant site and maintenance of the current property.

Issues

POLICY

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):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) an environmental objective.

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

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

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

Policy DM1 (Development Management),
 Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) (Deletions replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)
 Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
- d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABE as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality

of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

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 Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:

i.JP- S1- Sustainable development.

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, juliet balcony and render to rear and side proposed elevations. The agent provided a revised scheme, but it is not considered to address and overcome concerns raised. As such, the assessment within this report is based on the initial scheme as submitted. The principle of development is not acceptable, as the benefits to the applicant do not outweigh the potential harm in relation to residential amenity. Neighbour concerns were received during the course of the application, and the scheme when assessed against local and national policy does not overcome such concerns. Such issues will now be discussed.

Visual/Residential Amenity

Side extension:

The side extension would be sited against the boundary with no.357 Mount Road and against the neighbours existing lean-to extension. The side extension which has a limited width due to the constraints of the site would decrease to some extent the sense of spaciousness between the two properties. However, the use of a significant setback at first floor would avoid any potential terracing effect to the front and together with a subservient roof height to the existing roof would reduce visual impacts on the streetscene.

Rear extension:

The rear extension element of the proposal would have a projection of approximately 4.3 metres at ground floor and first floor level. The concern with this element relates to the potential impacts on the adjacent property at no.357 Mount Road. Whilst it is noted that this property benefits from a 3 metre ground floor extension, the first floor element of the application proposal would project a further 1 metre rearwards and would be sited directly against the boundary to no. 357. The result is that there would be significant two storey built form along this boundary which is considered to give rise to an overbearing impact and be overly dominant on no.357 Mount Road. As the application property is due south of no.357 the two storey built form would also give rise to impacts in terms of loss of daylight and overshadowing particularly of the rear private garden.

The built form has been set off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour at no. 361 Mount Road and whilst the distance between the first floor element and the boundary with that property is 2.5 metres it is not considered to give rise to unacceptable impacts on that property.

Policy DC1.3 of the UDP states that rearward extensions should at a maximum not exceed 3.65 metres. Given the close proximity and relationships with the adjoining properties, it is not considered the 4.3 metre projection can be successfully accommodated within the site. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP.

Concerns have been raised with regards to the proposed Juliet balcony and that this is not in keeping with the style of development in the immediate neighbourhood. It is noted that the provision of a Juliet balcony or window on the first floor rear elevation of the extension would provide views towards adjacent private gardens, however, such an arrangement is not considered to give rise to such significant impacts on privacy that would warrant refusal. First floor bedroom windows generally provide elevated views across neighbouring gardens and the proposed Juliet balcony whilst set further rearwards into the garden would provide similar views.

Render to rear and side proposed elevations:

The proposed render would be installed on the rear and side elevation of the rear extension. Such render would be visible from properties to the rear and in the direction due south facing Provident Avenue only and not from Mount Road. No colouration or product details were provided for the proposed render during the course of the application. The use of a render finish is not a characteristic of the area and such use within the proposed extensions would be at odds with this prevailing character. Had the proposals been acceptable in other regards amendments would have been sought to the choice of external finishes to the extensions in these locations.

In short, the scheme is considered to give rise to impacts on no. 357 Mount Road which are not outweighed by the benefits of the additional accommodation for the application property. As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD, policy JP- S1 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

Recommendation: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a proactive manner, but the initial and revised scheme received did not overcome all issues raised.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

- 1) The proposed part single, part two storey side and rear extension by reason of its projection, scale, height and massing and proximity to the common boundary with property no.357 Mount Road would give rise to an overbearing and overly dominant impact to that property. As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD, policy JP- S1 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

357 Mount Road, Manchester, M19 3HW
306 Mount Road, Manchester, M19 3HN
5 St Marks Street, Manchester, M19 3HG
11 St Marks Street, Manchester, M19 3HG
9 St Marks Street, Manchester, M19 3HG
7 St Marks Street, Manchester, M19 3HG
361 Mount Road, Manchester, M19 3HW
304 Mount Road, Manchester, M19 3HN
302 Mount Road, Manchester, M19 3HN

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA