

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142684/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 11 April 2025
Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension
Address: 82 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5NH
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Graham Smith
Agent (if any): Philip Holmes, PHA Architects Ltd
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 4th June 2025



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 14/05/2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 29 April 2025 Expired: 21 May 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 29 April 2025 Expired: 21 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 site relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Didsbury East ward area of Manchester. The property features bay windows to the front, side and rear, recessed porch, single storey outrigger and detached garage to the rear. Car parking is off road to the front of the property. A garden is to the front and rear with access along the side.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

This is primarily a residential area in nature

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension which would provide additional living space for the occupants of the property.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 – one letter of objection received in relation to this proposal. Summary of comments as follows:

- Impact on Daylight and Sunlight
- The proposed development includes a 3.513-metre-long side wall immediately adjacent to a window serving ground-floor sitting room
- The drawings suggest the extension will rise from approximately 2.5 metres at its lowest point to 3.6 metres at the highest
- Based on the 45-degree rule— the proposed extension clearly breaches both the horizontal and vertical 45-degree lines
- No Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted with the application
- Additional Amenities and Environmental Concerns
- The size, design, and position of the proposed extension, tunnel effect
- Security risk, the height and proximity of the extension's mono-pitch roof will offer direct access to window on adjoining property
- Noise intrusion, amplified rain noise, disturbing sleep and residential comfort

Environmental Health - No objections

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, in particular 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 SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.

JP-S1: Sustainable Development
JP-P1 Sustainable Places

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Principle

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property 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 in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

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

Site history relating to 82 Mellington Avenue

There have been no previous planning application relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of single storey side and rear extension. This would provide additional living accommodation for the occupants of the property. Objections were raised by a local resident as summarised above in the consultation and notification responses.

The extension would be set back considerably from the front wall of the house to a width of 1.8m to the shared boundary extending rearwards with a projection beyond the rear wall measuring 3.5m. The extension would wrap around the property extending across the rear up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi detached property no. 80 Mellington Avenue..

The roof would be hipped on the return and sloping on the shared boundary and to the front with the inclusion of two roof lights to the side and three roof lights to the rear. The proposal would see the installation of a door and window to the side facing no. 84 Mellington with bi folding doors along the rear elevation; no windows on the side elevation facing no. 80 Mellington. Although there is a door and window proposed on the side elevation facing no. 84, given the existing boundary treatment together with the gap retained to the shared boundary, it is not anticipated that there would be any significant overlooking or loss of privacy given by the position of the window.

In relation to concerns raised, the projection on the rear measures 3.5m, and should the applicant remove the corner element of the proposal which projects beyond the side wall at the rear, and reduce the projection to 3.0m, this extension could be built under permitted development. In this instance and given that the extension is single storey, it is not considered that the introduction of an extension to the side and rear would be considered to be a harmful addition. Furthermore, taking into consideration the orientation of the host dwelling, it is not considered that the proposal would provide any overshadowing or loss of light to the neighbouring properties either side

Concerns were raised in relation to noise generated. Given that the property is for a single residential use, it is not considered that the introduction of an extension to the side and rear would give rise to significant or adverse impacts beyond those that would normally be anticipated for such a use. General activity associated with the residential dwelling would be of a similar nature to those residential properties already in the area and would not be expected to lead to unusual or unacceptable levels of noise.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area has been retained therefore, the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

Overall, given the development's height, projection and relationship to adjacent properties, it is considered that the proportions of the extension to the side and rear are acceptable and can be acceptably accommodated at the application property. The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property. In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore the proposal complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Scale and Mass

The size and footprint of the proposal is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed changes are satisfactory and are considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design and appearance

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 render and matching roof tile as specified in the application form.

The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not unduly impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

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

Bins

The storage of bins are not affected by this proposal as access to the rear is retained, therefore the proposal complies with Policy EN19 of the CS.

Vehicular access and car parking

The proposal has no effect on the existing vehicle access and car parking at the property and is therefore not affected by this proposal.

Conclusion

On balance, it is believed that the proposal would not interfere with the character of the area and in terms of residential amenity it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 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 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

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.

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:

Received 11th April 2025 numbered F01/GS//03 Revision B Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Received 11th April 2025 numbered F01/GS//07 Proposed Elevations

Received 11th April 2025 numbered F01/GS//08 Proposed Site Plan

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 shall match those of the existing dwellinghouse 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 policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health

80 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5NH
499 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 5QG
111 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5WF
84 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5NH
78 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5NH
28 Broughville Drive, Manchester, M20 5WH
505 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 5GQ
113 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5WF
503 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 5QG
501 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 5QG
26 Broughville Drive, Manchester, M20 5WH
24 Broughville Drive, Manchester, M20 5WH
115 Mellington Avenue, Manchester, M20 5WF

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Historic Landfill Site 50m Buffer -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA