

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142289/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 15 May 2025

Proposal: Erection of front porch extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and part single, part two storey side extension, including application of render to sections of all elevations; and associated elevational alterations to host dwelling.

Address: 44 Horncastle Road, Manchester, M40 5QA

Ward(s): Charlestown Ward

Applicant: Mr Shazad Munawar Raja

Agent (if any): Mr V Alyas, Architek

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 9 July 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10 June 2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 4 June 2025 Expired: 25 June 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 24 June 2025 Expired: 8 July 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:

Tree Preservation Order:

The application site relates to 44 Horncastle Road within the ward of Charlestown in north Manchester. The application site relates to a two storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse characterised by light coloured stone cladding to the front elevation, red tiles above the front porch and between the ground and first floor box bay windows and a recently converted gable roof form. Amenity space to the front, side and rear of the property consists of hard standing with some grassed garden. At the time of the site visit, it appears the property was vacant and works had been undertaken to the property including the hip to gable roof conversion and rear roof dormer.

Description of area

The property sits to the northern most part of Horncastle Road and sits to the south of open green space connected to Boggart Hole Brook.

The surrounding context is residential in nature.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of front porch extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and part single, part two storey side extension, including application of render to sections of all elevations; and associated elevational alterations to host dwelling.

The front porch would replace the existing front porch at the site with approximate dimensions of Height: 3.5 x Length: 1.9 x Width: 3.5 metres.

The part single storey side extension would have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.6 x Length: 7.3 x Width: 4 metres. The part two storey side extension would have the same built form except the front elevation would have a setback of 1 metre from the primary elevation of the host property.

The part single storey rear extension would wrap into the proposed side extension and have approximate dimensions of Height: 4 x Length: 3.5 x Width: 8.8 metres. The part two storey rear extension would be set in from the boundary with the adjoining neighbour and so would have the same dimensions as at first floor level except for a reduced width.

The extension would involve the insertion of two windows, a door and two roof lights within the front elevation, three windows within the side elevation and 4 windows and a set of doors within the rear elevation.

Render would be installed to sections of each of the elevations. This would involve changes to both the host property following removal of the existing stone tiles and installation of render to the extension. The ground floor level, the extension would be constructed of a red brick and so within the extension, the render would be installed to the first floor level only. The proposed render would be a K rend system RAL1013 oyster white.

Elevational alterations would occur throughout the host property. This would take the form of changing the position and size of a window within the first floor primary elevation and the addition of a new window within the first floor rear elevation. All windows within the host property would be changed to dark grey windows to match the extension.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal would involve:

- roof tiles to match the host property,
- Ibstock Anglican multi brick (similar to existing gable elevation),
- K Render RAL1013 oyster white,
- UPVC windows and bi-folding doors- dark grey colouration,
- Composite door with side windows- dark grey colouration,
- Guttering and fascia soffit downpipes- dark grey.

Negotiations during the course of the Application

The initial scheme gave rise to concern to the LPA. Amendments took place to the scheme to try to mitigate concerns raised. These took the form of:

- Changing the width, set back and roof form of the proposed side extension.
- Reduction in the amount of render proposed across the proposal.
- Inaccuracies and discrepancies with the plans overcome.
- Addition of the works to the existing fenestration of the host property added into the description of development for consideration.
- Further material information provided for review.

Neighbours were notified accordingly on the revised scheme.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

1no. neighbour comment was received during the initial consultation. Concern was raised that the property would be used for a HMO use which would increase traffic, disturbance and footfall. The proposed design would appear out of character with the neighbouring property, with use of contrasting materials and being larger in proportions. The neighbour raises concern the new windows would give rise to adverse privacy implications, and the built form would give rise to adverse loss of light implications.

3no. comments were received during the re-notification period. Concern was raised the property would be used for an HMO purpose. Further concern was raised to a lack of privacy from the proposal, and the potential impact to surrounding trees at the edge of Boggart Hole Clough.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health requested a gas membrane pre-commencement condition be attached to any approval granted, as the development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill gas.

Mining Remediation Authority

The Mining Remediation Authority were consulted; however no response was received.

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.

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) and
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 CABI 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

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 development application is for the erection of front porch extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and part single, part two storey side extension, including application of render to sections of all elevations; and associated elevational alterations to host dwelling. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. The revised scheme is considered to overcome concerns raised to the developer during the course of the application. Consideration must be given to the proposal's 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 extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

Potential impact to no.42 Horncastle Road:

No.42 Horncastle Road is the adjoining neighbour and would be most impacted by the proposed extension. The rear extension would be sited close to the common boundary. The neighbour benefits from a rear conservatory. The proposed single storey extension would extend 4.5 metres set 0.9 metres from the shared boundary. Due to the neighbour's existing conservatory, the neighbour would only feel approximately 1 metre of built form beyond the conservatory. Given the majority of the built form would be blocked, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to an overbearing feature, nor give rise to any adverse loss of light implications. At first floor level, the built form would be set away from the common boundary by approximately 4.6 metres and have a hipped roof. Given this, the proposal is not considered to give rise to an overbearing feature.

Due to the placement of windows within the rear extension, it is not considered to give rise to any adverse privacy implications to no.42 Horncastle Road.

Neighbours along Rudston Avenue:

Properties to the north of Rudston Avenue would sit to the south east of the proposal. Given the bend in the road at the point Horncastle Road and Rudston Avenue intersect, the properties do not sit in a parallel position. However, given the position of windows, it is not considered these neighbours would be adversely impacted by any loss of light implications and would be sited far enough away to not experience an overbearing feature.

Impact to streetscene:

Neighbouring properties and passersby to access to open green amenity space would feel the additional front porch and side extension.

Given the 1 metre set back of the set extension, the lowered roof form and the 2 metre gap from the gable wall to the boundary of the site, the proposed side extension is considered to create a subservient feature. The front porch would replace the existing front porch at the site and would not be considered excessively bulky or large to create an unwelcoming feature in the streetscene.

Windows would be inserted in the gable elevation of the proposal and face onto open green space. To protect the privacy of the applicant and passersby, the windows would be conditioned within any approval granted as being obscure glazed.

As the built form at first floor level would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 1 metre, it is not considered the extension would create any adverse privacy implications to the opposite neighbour no.59 Horncastle Road.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to any significant visual residential amenity implications, namely overbearing, privacy nor loss of light implications, and so is considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and JP-S1 of Places for Everyone.

Design and Appearance

Erection of front porch extension:

The front porch would create a new front porch to the site, replacing the existing. It is acknowledged that front porches can be achieved through the route of Permitted Development, although the proposed would measure 4 square metres so would not comply with PD

restrictions. However, given such extensions are considered common place and the design is not considered overly large or bulky, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and appearance pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1.

Part single, part two storey rear extension:

Both the single and part two storey rear extension would have a projection of 3.5 metres and so would be considered compliant with Policy DC1.3 of the UDP which states that rearward projections should not exceed 3.65 metres. Further, the first floor level of built form is considered to respond positively to the constraints of the site by being adequately set in from the common boundary with no.42 Horncastle Road.

Part single, part two storey side extension:

Policy DC1.4 of the UDP states that in the case of two storey side extensions 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. In this instance, the first floor would be set back by 1 metre, the extension would have a lower roof form than that of the applicant site and a 2 metre gap would remain from the gable wall to the boundary of the site. As such, the proposed side extension is considered to create a subservient feature and exceeds the stipulations of Policy DC1.4 of the UDP.

Associated elevational alterations to host dwelling:

The insertion of additional windows/ changes in colouration of windows and doors to a dwellinghouse could be considered permitted development. However, given the works would be undertaken at the same time as the applicant site, they have been included within the description of works. This would take the form of changing the position and size of a window within the first floor primary elevation and the addition of a new window within the first floor rear elevation. All windows within the host property would be changed to dark grey windows to match the extension. The position and proportions of such alterations are considered sensible and the colouration would match the proposed fenestration. No issues in terms of design occur for this element of works.

Application of render to sections of all elevations:

Render would be installed to sections of each of the elevations. This would involve changes to both the host property following removal of the existing stone tiles and installation of render to the extension. At ground floor level, the extension would be constructed of a red brick and so within the extension, the render would be installed to the first floor level only. The proposed render would be a K rend system RAL1013 oyster white.

Given the existing circumstances of the property whereby the front elevation is clad in a stone material, the introduction of render can be considered acceptable. With the use of the K rend white oyster material, it is considered to create a more aesthetically appealing finish than the current circumstances. The use of white render is restricted to the front porch and to the first floor of the property and so the use of red brick breaks up the extent of the render and so reduces visual prominence.

The other materials to be used throughout the proposal are considered to be acceptable and relate well to the existing house. The introduction of the grey windows and doors across both the host property and extension is considered acceptable to ensure a consistent design approach.

The materials listed would be conditioned within the decision notice of any approval granted.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development

accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Car Parking

Adequate space would remain for cars to be parked off street due to the front drive and so no concern is raised to this element. The plans show that the gate opening would be widened with a dropped kerb. The works would fall outside of the remit of planning and so has not been considered within this application.

Bin Storage

A 2 metre gap would be retained alongside the side extension to the site boundary. As such, it is considered space would remain for bins to be stored in the side or rear amenity space.

Response to Neighbour Objections

1no. neighbour comment was received during the initial consultation. Concern was raised that the property would be used for a HMO use which would increase traffic, disturbance and footfall. The proposed design would appear out of character with the neighbouring property, with use of contrasting materials and being larger in proportions. The neighbour raises concern the new windows would give rise to adverse privacy implications, and the built form would give rise to adverse loss of light implications.

3no. comments were received during the re-notification period. Concern was raised the property would be used for an HMO purpose. Further concern was raised to a lack of privacy from the proposal, and the potential impact to surrounding trees from the trees to the edge of Boggart Hole Clough.

Given the concern that the property would be used for a HMO purpose, a condition would be attached to any approval granted to ensure the property is use for a C3 dwellinghouse purpose only. It is to be noted that the application has been applied for as a single dwellinghouse and the LPA has no knowledge of the property to be used in any other manner.

The revised scheme is considered to reduce the visual prominence of the scheme with the reduction in proportions of the side extension and the reduction in the amount of render used across the extension.

The new windows given their position are not considered to give rise to any adverse privacy implications, as discussed previously within the report.

There would be no trees to be impacted as a result of the proposal. Those trees identified by the neighbour sit beyond the site edged red.

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: Approve

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 positive and proactive manner, and a revised plan has been supplied which is considered to overcome issues raised during the course of the application. Appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

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

1) 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) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

-Application Form, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 28 February 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Floor Plans, numbered A105, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 18 June 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Loft Plan, numbered A107, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 18 June 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed Location Plan/ Site Plan, numbered A102, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 18 June 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Elevations, numbered A106 REV P2, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 27 June 2025.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no openings, including windows and doors, shall be inserted within the elevations of the extension, other than those shown on the approved drawings, unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellinghouse, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Before first occupation, the ground floor WC window and the 2no. SH/WC first floor windows and bathroom window as shown within the approved 'Drawing- Proposed- Floor Plans, numbered A105', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 18 June 2025, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) The materials to be used throughout the proposal hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details as set out in the Application Form and within the 'Drawing- Proposed- Elevations, numbered A106 REV P2' specified in Condition 2 of this approval.

Reason- In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no part of the residential units shall be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) other than the purpose(s) of C3(a) not precluding occupation by two unrelated people sharing a property.

Reason - In the exceptional circumstances of a proliferation of HMOs restricting housing choice and adversely affecting sustainability and in the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through the

provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to paragraph 7.4 of the Guide to Development in Manchester: Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

7) Prior to the commencement of development appropriate and comprehensive construction designs for the installation of a proprietary gas membrane, in order to alleviate any possibility of landfill gas ingress to the building, shall be submitted for approval to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall then be implemented as part of the development.

Reason - The development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill gas pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health
Mining Remediation Authority

57 Horncastle Road, Manchester, M40 5QF
1 Rudston Avenue, Manchester, M40 5QE
42 Horncastle Road, Manchester, M40 5QA
40 Horncastle Road, Manchester, M40 5QA
59 Horncastle Road, Manchester, M40 5QF

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development High Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_HIGH_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Historic Landfill Site 50m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA