

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141948/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 20 January 2025
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side and rear extension
Address: 2 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2WL
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Martin Galton
Agent (if any):
Case officer: Jake Walther
Tel: 0161 234 1632
Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 01/05/2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 27 January 2025 Expired: 17 February 2025

Site notice

Posted: 09 April 2025 Expired: 30 April 2025

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 end of terrace two-storey class C3 dwellinghouse. The terrace is an early 1900's red brick terrace with ground floor bay windows. The property features a hardstanding to the front for parking, a small private garden to the rear with access to a larger communal garden at the rear.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not Applicable

Description of area

Northern Grove is a residential street within the West Didsbury ward of South Manchester. The site lies just outside the Burton Road commercial area and is in walking distance to West Didsbury Metrolink. The area is predominantly residential in terms of its character, consisting of terraced and semidetached family dwellings.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 – 2no. neutral comments received from one address in relation to the storage of building materials and maintenance of shared drainage during construction. Additional concerns were raised relating to materials and size of the proposed doors.

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
- Policy – EN3 Heritage

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
- DC18 – Conservation Areas

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
- JP – P1 - Heritage

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 single storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter or 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 alteration 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 extension would be sited at the rear side of the property, infilling the area between the outrigger and the main house. The extension would measure 1800mm x 4040mm with a maximum roof height of 3470mm, sloping down to 3000mm at the eaves.

The proposal is infilling the corner of the property and does not project out any more than the original building footprint, ensuring it is not overly prominent or overbearing on neighbours. As such, 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.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would not project out beyond the existing rear or side walls of the property, and as this is an end of terrace property it would not extend near to a shared boundary with a neighbour. To the rear, the proposal would feature a new large glazed door, with the roof of the extension featuring 3no. skylights, the side elevations would remain blank and featureless.

It is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any unacceptable impacts in terms of overshadowing, overbearing presence, or loss of light to neighbouring properties. The introduction of rear-facing glazing and rooflights is not expected to give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy for adjacent occupiers, given their orientation and positioning.

With regard to concerns raised about potential noise disturbance from the proposed large glazed doors, it is important to note that the property remains in residential use. While the doors may create a wider opening than existing fenestration, the associated level of noise spill out is expected to remain consistent with that typically generated by domestic activity. As such, the

proposal is not considered likely to result in an unacceptable increase in noise levels or disturbance to neighbouring residents.

Given the limited scope and temporary nature of the construction activity, it is considered that the imposition of a construction management plan would be disproportionate and unnecessary.

The proposal therefore accords with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity and Impact on Conservation Area

The proposed extension would be constructed using brickwork and roof tiles that match the existing dwellinghouse, ensuring visual continuity. The side elevations are to remain blank and unadorned, while the rear elevation will incorporate aluminium framed glazed French doors and three rooflights on the rear roof slope. These design choices are modest and sympathetic to the main house.

The extension would not be visible from the public realm or street scene, thereby preserving the wider character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Its use of matching materials and restrained design ensures that it integrates seamlessly with the existing dwelling, avoiding any visual dominance or incongruity.

In accordance with paragraphs 202–206 of the NPPF, which require local planning authorities to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, the proposal has been assessed as causing less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset (i.e., the Conservation Area). In such cases, paragraph 202 of the NPPF requires that this harm be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Given the modest scale and discreet positioning of the extension, the resulting impact is assessed to fall at the lower end of the “less than substantial harm” spectrum. This conclusion aligns with the professional assessment provided by the Conservation Officer, who raised no objections to the proposal.

The design and appearance of the proposed development are therefore considered to comply with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and SP1, as well as Chapter 12 of the NPPF, which promotes high-quality design. The impact on visual amenity and the historic environment is minor and acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed extension 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: 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 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 – Location Plan – 20 January 2025
- b. Drawing – Elevations – 20 January 2025 – Ref: A107
- c. Drawing – Floor Plans – 20 January 2025 – Ref A105

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

187 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ
3 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2WL
185 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ
183 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ
181 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA