

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142568/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 28 March 2025
Proposal: Erection of front porch
Address: 8 Royal Avenue, Manchester, M21 9EU
Ward(s): Chorlton Ward

Applicant: Mr Oliver Jervis
Agent (if any): Mr Jordan Clarke, GoodWinter Design & Planning Ltd
Case officer: Jake Walther
Tel: 0161 234 1632
Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 19/05/2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 16/05/2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 14 April 2025 Expired: 8 May 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 14 April 2025 Expired: 8 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

Description of site/building

The application relates to a two-storey storey mid-terrace class C3 dwellinghouse on Royal Avenue in Chorlton. The property is built from red brick with and slate roof tile with low level brick boundary treatment to the front.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Royal Avenue is a residential street between Ivy Green Road and the Ivy Green Allotments, it consists of two rows of terraced houses and is in close proximity to Ivy Green Park and Chorlton Brook.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey front porch.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per Appendix 1 – No comments or objections received.

Policy

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 –

The City Council adopted the core strategy on July 11, 2012. It is the key document in the Manchester Local Plan. The plan determines how Manchester will grow and forms the framework that planning applications are assessed against. We consider the following Core Strategy Policies relevant to this proposal.

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- Policy EN19 – Waste

Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

The Core Strategy replaced much of the UDP, but some UDP Development Control policies are extant (remain). The following extant policy is still considered relevant to this proposal.

- DC1 - Residential Extensions

Places for Everyone

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 following policies are relevant:

- JP-S1 – Sustainable development

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):

- an economic objective

- a social objective and
- an environmental objective.

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

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

Principle

The submitted application is for the erection of a single storey front extension to form additional living accommodation. 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. However, 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.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application. The proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy

Sitting, Scale and Mass

The proposed front porch would measure 1125mm x 1700mm and would have a lean-to roof with a maximum height of 3100mm, sloping down to 2555mm at the eaves.

The development is considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of its dimensions and would not result in 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the property. Therefore, the proposed alteration is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

The proposed front porch is small in size, at 1.91m² of internal floor space it is less than the 3m² which is usually allowed under permitted development, the roof would be lean-to with a maximum height of 3100mm (just above the permitted development height), sloping down to 2555mm at the eaves. Given the small scale of the porch, it is not anticipated that it will have an overbearing impact on neighbouring residents, nor will it cause overshadowing or block sunlight from neighbouring windows.

The porch features one narrow window on the side elevation, a door on the front elevation and the other side elevation is to remain blank. It is not anticipated that the proposed window would give rise to overlooking or privacy concerns.

In addition, no objections from neighbouring residents were received in response to this application.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DC1 of the UDP, and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity

The proposed addition would be built using red brickwork and roof tiles match the existing host dwellinghouse, it would feature a lean-to roof. One side elevation features a window whilst the front elevation will feature a door.

There is a precedent in the area of small front porches canopies, therefore the proposal would be in-keeping with the street scene. Sited at the front of the property, the extension would be visible within the street scene, however it is in keeping with the character of the area and will have a minimal impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

The design and appearance of the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as its impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed single-storey front porch is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as well as waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with policy DC1 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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: Approval

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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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

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 – Drawing Pack, existing and proposed – Received 28 March 2025.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

3. Specified materials:

The materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form in type, size, colour, and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the structure. Pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

4. Additional glazing restriction:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional glazing, windows, or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted at the property unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residences, pursuant to policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health

7 Royal Avenue, Manchester, M21 9EU
5 Royal Avenue, Manchester, M21 9EU
10 Royal Avenue, Manchester, M21 9EU
9 Royal Avenue, Manchester, M21 9EU
6 Royal Avenue, Manchester, M21 9EU

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA