Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	142569/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	28 April 2025
Proposal:	Erection of part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
Address:	68 Sale Road, Manchester, M23 0DE
Ward(s):	Northenden Ward
Applicant:	Mr Jivan Dhanik
Agent (if any):	Mr Rakesh Mistry m83 Associates Ltd
Case officer:	Ami Savage Tel: 0161 219 2632 Email: ami.savage@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date of recommendation:	**23 June 2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 7 May 2025

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 28 April 2025 Expired: 20 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 and area

68 Sale Road is located in the Northenden ward of Manchester. The property is a two-storey semi-detached house, which is common of many houses in the neighbourhood. The area is primarily residential with a mix of semi-detached and detached houses.

The property features hardstanding to the front of the house and a garden to the rear. The area is well connected by public transport, with regular bus and tram services to Manchester city centre and other parts of Greater Manchester running nearby.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of development

The applicant has proposed the erection of a part two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity – Notification letters were sent to nearby properties (see appendix 1 for the list of properties).

Local residents/public opinion – No objections, comments or representations in support of the application have been received.

Legislative Issues

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF (updated December 2024) sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, i.e., the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and accompanying policies, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasizes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-making, this means:

- Approving development proposals that align with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the key policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  1) Policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusal.
  2) The adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the NPPF as a whole

Regional Policy

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039

On the 21st of March 2024, nine of the ten Greater Manchester Councils voted to adopt the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039 (PfEJDP); Manchester City Council is one of the Council's that has voted to adopt the plan. The PfEJDP has superseded parts of some of the policies contained within the Council's Core Strategy.

The relevant PfEJDP policy is as follows:

JP-S1: Sustainable Development

Focuses on ensuring that all new developments contribute to sustainable development. This means balancing social, economic, and environmental objectives to create resilient and thriving communities.

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Aims to create places that are not only sustainable but also resilient, safe, and capable of adapting to major environmental and economic changes. This policy emphasizes the importance of designing out crime, reducing opportunities for anti-social behaviour, and ensuring that developments make appropriate provisions for emergencies.

Local Policy

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant Core Strategy policies for this application are as follows:

Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

Development in all parts of the City should make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including creating well designed places that enhance or create character and protect and enhance the built and natural environment.

DM1 – Development Management

Focuses on ensuring high-quality design in new developments. It sets out criteria to assess the design, scale, and appearance of proposals to ensure they enhance or create character and protect the built environment. Key considerations include:

- **Design Quality**: Ensuring developments are visually appealing and contribute positively to the local area.
- **Context Appropriateness**: Making sure the design, scale, and appearance are suitable for the surrounding context.
- **Sustainability**: Promoting sustainable design and construction practices.
- **Amenity Protection**: Safeguarding the amenity of existing and future occupants

The relevant UDP policies for this application are:

DC 1.1 – 1.4 – Residential Extensions

Focus on residential extensions and set out criteria for assessing proposals.

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

Adopted in 2007, the SPD provides comprehensive planning guidance to support and enhance the development of the city. For example, the SPD aims to ensure attractive, well-designed, and well-maintained neighbourhoods that support sustainable development and community well-being.

<u>Assessment – Impact on character and appearance</u>

The application is for the erection of a part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The two storey element features a flat roof, with a car port and bin storage underneath at ground floor level, and has a height of 4.62m, up to the eaves of the existing house. The proposed width is 2.25m and it will be built directly adjacent to the neighbouring boundary with 66 Sale Road. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend by 5.85m and will replace an existing conservatory. It also features a flat/parapet roof and will have a height of 2.87m. In addition, three roof lights are proposed which will project a further 0.5m above the flat roof. At 9.2

metres wide, the proposed rear extension will extend the full width of the rear garden and will be constructed adjacent to the shared boundaries with 66 and 70 Sale Road.

The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs and it was observed on a site visit that none of the properties in close proximity to the application site have been extended to the side. The design, scale and siting of the two-storey extension is considered to be unacceptable due to the lack of two storey extensions in the surrounding area. As stated, the prevailing character of the area is characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties with hipped roofs and as such the addition of a two-storey flat roof, which would be highly visible from the highway, would be out of keeping with the surrounding area in that it would introduce an incongruous and alien roof form and feature into the street scene. As such it would be contrary to policies SP1, DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Assessment – Impact on residential amenity

The length of the proposed single storey rear extension, at 5.85m, would not comply with policy which states that rear extensions should not exceed 3.65m. There is an existing single storey extension to the rear of no. 70, which is approximately 3m long, but it is considered that the length of the proposed extension, together with its proximity to the shared boundary with the adjoining property, will result in a built form that would be overbearing on the neighbouring property to the detriment of the occupier's amenity. The proposal would also significantly reduce the private amenity space for present and future occupiers of the dwellinghouse.

It is accepted that the applicant could erect a single storey flat roof rear extension with a length of 3m under permitted development, which is the estimated length of the other semi-detached property, but it is considered that this would have far less of an impact and would be almost half the length of what has been proposed.

The proposal in its current form would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity, contrary to policies SP1, DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP

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 polices 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 regard 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. Whilst a new scheme was provided, the scheme differed from the original scheme substantially and therefore necessitated the re-consultation of neighbours. In this instance, there was not adequate time to reconsult neighbours and whilst the agent was given the opportunity to extend the determination period by 7 weeks in order to notify relevant neighbours about the new proposal ("a single storey side and rear extension"), no instruction was given from the agent to extend the determination period or to withdraw the application so the application is therefore refused in a timely manner.

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

1) The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale and design, would not be acceptable as it is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a flat roof and introduce an alien and incongruous feature into the street scene and, when viewed from Sale Road to the front, it would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. The single storey extension would also feature a flat roof and would be constructed directly adjacent to the shared boundaries with 66 and 70 Sale Road, which is considered would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies DM1 and DC1 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 and policy JP-S1 of the Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

70 Sale Road, Manchester, M23 0DE
8 Millom Avenue, Manchester, M23 0DB
21 Millom Avenue, Manchester, M23 0DB
10 Millom Avenue, Manchester, M23 0DB
72 Sale Road, Manchester, M23 0DE
66 Sale Road, Manchester, M23 0DE

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

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