

## **Planning**

## **Growth & Development**

### **Delegated officer report for planning application**

**Application no.** 142205/FH/2025  
**Date registered valid:** 19 February 2025  
**Proposal:** Erection of single storey outbuilding to form ancillary residential accommodation  
**Address:** 401 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER  
**Ward(s):** Fallowfield Ward

**Applicant:** Mr Saleem Shoukat  
**Agent (if any):** Mr Adil Mulk  
**Case officer:** Janet Lawless  
Tel: 0161 234 4535  
Email: [janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk)

**Recommendation:** Approve  
**Date of recommendation:** 06.05. 2025

## **Application details**

**Type of application:** Full Householder Application

**Development type:** Householder

**Date of site visit:** 30.04.2025

### **Standard consultations:**

No consultations have been printed and sent.

### **Neighbour notifications**

Printed: 27 March 2025      Expired: 17 April 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 property that is the subject of this planning application is a two- storey brick-built property with garden area to the front and rear. There is parking for one vehicle on the driveway to the front of the property. A gate on the side leads through to the rear garden which is laid mainly to lawn. The property itself is identified as 401 Princess Road and is located close to the junction of Princess Road and Wilbraham Road.

**Listed building:** Not applicable

**Conservation area:** Not applicable

**Tree Preservation Order:** Not applicable

### **Description of area**

The area is predominantly residential in nature and sits on the main arterial route A5103 (Princess Road). Whalley Range High school is located to the south- west of the site. Beyond the junction to the south is a parade of commercial units including a BP petrol station and a gym, Hough End playing fields and the Metrolink stop are all located a few minutes to the south of the site. The area is well served by public transport.

### **Description of development**

The proposal is for the erection of a free- standing single storey outbuilding that would run vertical to the host property in the rear garden. It will have a hipped roof and have a height of 2.4 metres at the eaves. The accommodation created is for a disabled elderly relative and the accommodation will comprise of- a lounge, bathroom, bedroom and small kitchenette. - The resident would rely on the cooking facilities within the host property in the main.

### **Consultations & Notification Responses**

Local residents were informed- two representations have been received, from the road to the rear, the main points of objection being as follows.

There are already two brick storage buildings at the bottom of my garden, the introduction of a third building will leave me feeling blocked in. I do not believe that it is appropriate to accommodate an elderly resident at the bottom of the garden away from the main house. The issues that I already have with the exterior lighting on the property will be worse if this development goes ahead.

The proposed unit will be too close to our boundary. This extension will lead to loss of light to our property and garden area. It will also impact upon our privacy as it will be used for additional residential accommodation and not storage. The proposed building is also larger than the average unit of this type. Adding another extension within the gardens in this area results in restricting our enjoyment of our property.

## **Issues**

### **Policy and Issues**

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance.
- o Policy DC1.5 - the Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for Everyone Greater Manchester Joint Development Plan (March 2024) Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was published in March 2024 and has been produced by Greater Manchester Combined Authority to provide a long-term plan for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth for nine of Greater Manchester's districts.

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 significant weight in the planning balance.

The Plan identifies the essential aspect of the efficient and effective use of land with the preference to be given to making as much use as possible of suitable previously developed brownfield land and vacant buildings when meeting development needs.

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

## **Principle**

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in

the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes. These policies are also consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of the existing and future occupants.

The principle of extending a residential property in an established residential area to provide enlarged or improved residential accommodation is considered acceptable subject to further assessment to ensure that there is not a detrimental impact upon the property itself or the character of the area within which it is located or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

### **History**

There are no previous applications that relate specifically to number 401 Princess Road.

### **Residential / Visual Amenity**

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey free standing unit to the rear of the property for a disabled family member.

The proposed extension would be on a vertical projection from the rear of the host property. It would run 8.5 metres in length and would be 4.1 metres wide. The hipped roof has been designed to reduce the impact where it sits close to the common boundaries of 403 Princess Road. The windows proposed would be in the northern and western elevation with none in the southern or eastern elevations, as this would be along the common boundary. The windows proposed would look onto the applicants own garden and down their own driveway towards Princess Road (and would provide no further overlooking than would be afforded from a permitted development outbuilding). By hipping the roof, it has reduced the scale and massing of the proposal where it sits closest to the common boundary with the neighbouring properties. The materials proposed would match those of the existing property and a condition to that effect would be attached to any consent granted.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be a difference, with built form where previously there was none, it is not anticipated that the introduction of a single storey free standing unit in this location would have such a detrimental impact upon the level of residential amenity currently enjoyed by the neighbouring properties so as to merit refusal of the application. The unit has been proposed to run vertically within the garden rather than horizontally, and it would in part sit against the free-standing unit within the garden area of number 403 Princess Road. By having the vertical emphasis, it reduces the width it occupies at the bottom of the garden leaving a more open aspect for the properties that back onto the proposal site.

The accommodation is required for the use by a disabled resident as the host property is not capable of being adapted sufficiently due to stairs and corridor widths etc. The family occupant however would remain dependent of the services provided within the host property for day to day living including kitchen facilities. There is sufficient external amenity space retained for the occupants of the host property post development. It is felt that the proposal can be accommodated at the application property, and it is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area.

As a fallback position, a freestanding structure could be constructed subject to the following:

Outbuildings must not exceed 50% of the total area of land around the original house as it was first built or as it stood on 1st July 1948 (if it was built before that date), other outbuildings must be considered when calculating the 50% limit. It must not be self-contained living accommodation. Outbuildings must be single storey with a maximum eaves height of 2.5m and a maximum overall height of 4m with a dual pitched roof, or 3m in any other case. If the outbuilding is within 2 metres of the property boundary it should not exceed 2.5 m in height.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway, and this would only be from down the driveway of the host property, as it is set back beyond the rear elevation. It would not be highly visible given its location, and its setback from the property frontage, and therefore would have limited views from within the street scene. It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the property or the area within which it is located.

In this instance the proposal is considered acceptable and therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 and DC1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

### **Siting, scale and massing**

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house, is not excessively large or bulky. It is therefore considered to accord with the principles set out in saved UDP policies DC1 (in particular policy DC1.5) and accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 of the Core Strategy.

### **Design**

The proposal is considered acceptable and is similar to other free standing units that are located in the neighbouring gardens, as such the design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use materials to match the existing property and again will be a condition to that effect will be attached to any consent granted.

It is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and is considered acceptable.

### **Waste management**

There will be sufficient space retained for the waste bins to be brought kerb side on collection day, and as such the proposal accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal complies with the above policies; it received two objections, and the City Council recognises the importance of adapting homes to suit changing household needs and accommodate disabled residents. The single storey rear extension and vehicular access would improve the safety and comfort of the dwelling for the resident, allowing them to remain independent in their own home, therefore development may commence in accordance with the attachment of appropriate conditions.

For the above reasons, the proposal is unlikely to have any detrimental impact and therefore accords with saved UDP policy DC1 and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

### **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**

Positive and proactive working - 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 it has been determined in accordance with both local and national policies.

### **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:

2403-00 Location Plan received 19th February 2025.

2403-100 Rev A Proposed Plans and Elevations received 19th February 2025

Design and Access Statement received 19th February 2025.

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

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, including patching in and mortar, shall match those of the existing building 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 extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) 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 windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interest of residential amenity, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and policy DM1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

5) The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling identified as 401 Princess Road Manchester M14 7ER.

Reason - To ensure the proposed use remains ancillary to the principle use on the site. In the interest of residential amenity, in accordance with the policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

#### **Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified**

46 Bowdon Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HD  
405 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER  
399 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER  
386 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ES  
48 Bowdon Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HD  
384 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ES  
382 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ES  
403 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER  
50 Bowdon Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HD  
44 Bowdon Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HD

#### **Appendix 2 – Planning constraints**

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4  
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -  
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA