Comments for Planning Application 142563/FH/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 142563/FH/2025
Address: 68 Claude Road Manchester M21 8DF
Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey rear and creation of basement following demolition of existing single storey outrigger and outbuilding
Case Officer: Tracie Simpson

Customer Details

Name: Not Available
Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Comment Reasons:
Comment:These are representations in respect of planning application 142563/FH/2025
Erection of part single, part two storey rear and creation of basement following demolition of existing single storey outrigger and outbuilding
on land at 68 Claude Road, Chorltonville, Manchester, M21 ("the application").
We are neighbouring residents, living at 70 Claude Road, and we strongly object to the application for the reasons set out below:
1) the design is out of line with MCC planning rules (see Section 1);
2) unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy;
3) misleading comparisons to other double height extensions on Claude Road;
4) poor design;
5) no meaningful consultation.
Issue 1 and 2 are addressed by our Planning Consultant in Section 1 then the issues 2-5 are addressed in Section 2.

Section 1
Attached: Letter from Philip Rothwell, Planning and Development
Consultant
PRDS



OUR REF:
YOUR REF:

Director of Planning Licensing and Build Control
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Town Hall
Manchester
M60 2LA. 19th May 2025

Dear Sir
PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 142563/FH/2025
ERECTION OF PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND CREATION OF BASEMENT FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY OUTRIGGER AND OUTBUILDING
68 CLAUDE ROAD, MANCHESTER M21 8DF

We are instructed by [redacted] Our clients own and occupy the property situated immediately adjacent to and to the west of the application site.
We are instructed to submit representations in respect of the above application which involves the demolition of the existing two storey outbuilding, the demolition of an existing single storey extension, the erection of a part single storey and part two storey rear extension and the creation of a basement. This description is somewhat misleading as the resultant building would effectively have the appearance of a three story extension when viewed from the north. It is also proposed to create a substantial area of external decking although the construction details of this are unclear in the submitted plans.



The resulting structure would be a dominant and extremely obtrusive feature which will tower over our clients' back garden area. We are pleased to note that the case officer dealing with this application has carried out a full site inspection from our clients' property in order to fully appreciate the impact and consequences of this development on the outlook and amenity currently enjoyed by our clients.
In terms of the documentation submitted with the application we note that no bat survey has been submitted. We would have thought that this would be a required document in order to validate the application given that the proposal involves the demolition of a substantial building.

Site
The proposal relates to a two storey semi-detached house on the north side of Claude Road. The property lies within the Chorltonville Conservation Area. There is a

driveway to the front left of the property and this becomes a shared drive between the application site and our clients' house. The rear garden is approximately 28 metres long and slopes down to Chorlton Brook to the north. On the west side of the garden adjacent to the boundary is a two storey outbuilding which is proposed to be demolished as part of this application. There is a single storey extension at the rear of the property and this is also proposed to be demolished. To the east the other half of the semi, no. 66 Claude Road, has a substantial two storey rear extension which was approved in 2008.

Proposed Development

The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing two storey building at the rear of the property and the erection of what is effectively a three storey extension which will project 4.525 metres from the original rear wall of the house. It is also proposed to construct a small single storey extension on the east side of the main extension. These works would provide additional accommodation in the form of two additional bedrooms with en suite bathrooms, a family bathroom, an enlarged living area and kitchen and a utility area. It is also proposed to construct a substantial external decked area measuring 7.1 metres by 2.55 metres. This structure will have glazed balustrades. In the Design and Access and Heritage Statement submitted with the application, there is mention of new retaining walls and garden boundary treatments although there is no detail of these works shown on the submitted plans.

Planning Policy

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications to be determined in accordance with policies in the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Applications which are not in accordance with Development Plan policies should be refused unless material considerations justify granting permission. Similarly, proposals which accord with Development Plan policies should be approved unless there are material considerations which would justify a refusal of permission.

The development plan for Manchester essentially comprises Places for Everyone, Manchester Core Strategy and the specified Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies

We note that while the applicants have submitted a Design and Access and Heritage Statement, there has been no attempt to put forward any planning policy arguments in support of this proposal. In our opinion the key policies that are relevant to the consideration of this application are contained in the document Citywide Development Control Policies and in particular Policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 which we set out below:

Policy DC1.1 In determining planning applications for extensions to residential

properties, the Council will have regard to:
a. the general character of the property;
b. the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
c. the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
d. the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene;
e. the effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

PolicyDC1.2 Extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:
a. they are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of the original buildings);
b. they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
c. they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details;
d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

PolicyDC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:
a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

It is noted that the Council states in the reasons for these policies that the planning system needs to accommodate the demand for more living space while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected. It is also noted that the Council is not generally in favour of laying down firm rules about home extensions and the policy allows each case to be looked at on its individual merits having regard to a range of criteria. However, it surely follows that the specific criteria set out in Policies

DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 must carry very significant weight when considering any application for residential extensions.

Issues

The immediate issue that springs to mind in the consideration of this application is the sheer size of the proposed extension and, by implication, the impact of the extension on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposed extension would project 4.525 metres from the rear main wall of the house.

The proposed development will have a negative impact on our clients' enjoyment of their property in a number of different ways. Firstly, the erection of this substantial effectively three storey extension will have an adverse impact on the way they are able to use the patio immediately outside their property in that it will completely block out morning sunlight effectively depriving this well used area of sunlight and warmth. No doubt the planning officer will have fully appreciated the likely impact of the proposed extension when visiting the property.

Secondly, we disagree completely with the applicant's contention that the removal of the existing two storey outbuilding will enhance the setting of the properties and the rear gardens by allowing better light across neighbouring properties. We agree that removal of the building would improve morning light across the lower part of our clients' garden. However, the demolition of this building together with the proposed three storey extension would result in an overall worsening of the situation and the overall impact would clearly be negative. Furthermore, the wall of the existing outbuilding currently forms the boundary between our clients' property and the application site and currently provides important screening and privacy for our clients' garden. Removal of this building would expose the garden to overlooking both from the applicant's garden and more significantly from the proposed external decked area which would be at a much higher level than our clients' garden. While the applicant mentions new retaining walls and garden boundary features, no details have been submitted with the application. Our clients are deeply concerned about the subsequent loss of privacy that would inevitably occur should this development proceed as proposed.

In considering the proposed development against the above mentioned planning policies we would comment as follows:

- In relation to Policy DC1.1 the Council must have regard to the effect of the proposed development upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. It is our submission that the proposed extension would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by our clients and in particular in terms of the use of their patio area.
- In relation to Policy DC1.2, it is our view that the proposed extension is excessively large such that it would lead to overshadowing and would create an undue loss of sunlight and daylight. Furthermore, the removal of the existing outbuilding and the construction and use of the external decking area would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy.

- In relation to Policy DC1.3, this states that the Council will not normally approve rearward extensions greater than 3.65 metres in length. The proposed extension would project 4.525 from the existing rear main wall of the house and is therefore larger than the dimension stated in the policy. We are aware that other extensions which project more than 3.65 metres have been permitted in the immediate area including the extension at no. 66 Claude Road. However, none of the extensions that have been approved are in positions relative to the adjoining property that impacted on the amenity of those adjacent properties in the way that the current proposal affects our clients' property. Our clients will comment on these other nearby extensions in more detail in their separate personal submission.

In conclusion, our clients strongly object to the proposed development as it would result in unacceptable harm to amenity due to loss of daylight and sunlight due to the proximity and dominant overbearing impact of the proposed extension. It is our view that this planning application is clearly contrary to adopted planning policies and should therefore be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed extension by reason of its size siting and design would constitute an overbearing and dominant feature which would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy for the occupiers of the adjacent property, no. 70 Claude Road, contrary to the Saved Unitary Development Plan policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Section 2

Issue 2. Unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy

Section 1 has already addressed the unacceptable loss of amenity to a key living area of our home that would result from the proposed overbearing, two-storey extension in such extremely close proximity. We also raised the serious potential impact on the privacy of the two lower tiers of our garden, where neighbours would overlook from a new patio situated one or even two levels above our middle and lower garden areas.

We now wish to provide more context about how we have developed and use this space as our primary outdoor living area-why it is so important to us, and why the impact of this proposal would be so severe. When we discussed these concerns with the residents at No. 66, they dismissed the significance of our usage and stated that the only meaningful use of a patio was in the evening. This does not reflect the reality of how we live.

We have recently invested considerable time and money into rebuilding and relaying the patio, which had become unsafe due to crumbling brickwork and bulging retaining walls supporting the

top-tier terrace and slope. The result is now a level, stone-paved patio spanning the width of our property. This enclosed area-bounded by fences and accessed via central steps-features extensive planting, a dining space, a play area, a large 2 m rabbit hutch for our pets, and parking for several ride-on toys [Fig. X].

With three young children under 11, two of whom have additional needs, this patio serves as a vital, all-year-round space for play, relaxation, and family time-particularly in the mornings, when the children are most active. Functionally and socially, it is the outdoor equivalent of a living room, and we use it 365 days a year during daylight hours. It is an essential part of our daily rhythm, especially before school and in the afternoons after school.

This space is also crucial for our family's wellbeing during autumn, winter, and early spring, when daylight is limited. The proposal will cause an unacceptable loss of sunlight and visible sky throughout much of the year. Due to the patio's orientation, evening sunlight already fails to reach it during these months, making morning and daytime light especially valuable. This impact goes beyond planning regulations: it represents a real loss of amenity with a human cost.

Unlike indoor rooms, which benefit from artificial lighting, this outdoor space relies entirely on natural light and openness. As such, the harm caused by overshadowing and overbearing development here is even more acute. This is not just a change in view or aesthetics-it is a loss of vital space that directly supports our family's health, social life, and daily functioning.

We have included photographs of our family using the space [Fig. 1] to illustrate its role in our lives and to help decision-makers understand the extent of the potential impact.

Fig 1. Photographs showing No. 70 patio in morning light (top left). This would all be overshadowed with current proposal and the daily use of this space by us and our children, feeding pets who are housed on the patio away from the many garden foxes, and dining and playing.

Issue 3. Misleading comparisons

Comparisons to other two-storey rear extensions along Claude Road are misleading, as none are truly comparable to the proposed development at No.68 or the impact it would have on No.70. In every cited case:

- The extensions were buffered by significantly wider gaps or shared driveways with neighbouring properties (e.g. No.66: 20m+, No.84 and No.88: 5m);
- They were constructed after adjacent neighbours had already built single-storey rear extensions, meaning minimal impact on their outdoor space (e.g. No.84);
- Or they are located on the bending section of Claude Road, where rear elevations face northeast rather than directly north, so shadows fall primarily on the neighbouring property wall, not the external natural light space (e.g. No.94 and all properties east of it).

By contrast, the proposed two-storey extension at No.68 would be just 3.2m from our main outdoor living area (2.7m shared gap with a 0.5m setback in the design) with a direct north-facing orientation. This greatly intensifies its overshadowing and overbearing effect, setting a new and more harmful precedent on the street.

We have included photographs, maps and data supporting this (Figs 2-4).

Fig 2. Photographs of driveway width between No. 66 (far left) and 64 (far right)

No.	Date	Height	Impact	Orientation of Rear	Comments on Impact
66	2008	Double	Low	003°	Large gap to 64 (20m+) hence no impact on garden at 64.
84	2015	Mixed (1½-storey)	Low	015°	Built after neighbours Nos.82 and 86 added single-storey extensions so no overshadowing on outdoor amenity
88	2002	Double	Low	015°	5m-wide gap to No.90; extension depth limited to 3.5m and neighbours 86 and 90 have single extensions so no overshadowing
94	2010	Double	Medium	020°	Set well back from shared drive with No.92, which then extended with single story later, unknown if No.96 objected.

Table 3. Table of timings and impact of other double story extensions on Claude Road.

Fig 4. Map of house orientations along Claude Road, showing less impact on light for houses East of No. 90.

Issue 4. Poor design

Firstly, the application title is misleading: "Erection of part single, part two storey rear and creation of basement following demolition of existing single storey outrigger and outbuilding". We feel this should be revised to "Erection of part double part triple storey rear extension through creation of basement following demolition of existing two storey outrigger and outbuilding".

Although the applicants claim that the rear outrigger holds no heritage value, it nonetheless contributes to the historic built form and massing of the site and similar outriggers are present at No. 72 and 74. Its removal and replacement with a significantly more prominent and contemporary structure risks undermining the layered historical character of the back gardens that can be seen across the gardens. While the proposed architectural details may reference aspects of the existing house, the final design remains unmistakably modern, incorporating extensive glazing, roof lanterns, and steel terraces - features that are at odds with the Arts and Crafts character of Chorltonville and incongruous with the uniform character of the North of Claude Road back gardens and the sense of spaciousness that Chorltonville has as a "garden village". Conservation areas are designated to preserve not just individual buildings, but the cumulative, harmonious setting and we believe this design will damage this character.

Further to this the front elevation February 2025 photograph [P.5] is taken at an oblique angle and doesn't show the visibility of the outrigger from the street. we include a photograph facing directly north (compare with our photograph taken 06/05/25 Fig 5):

Fig 5. Photograph looking north between houses 70 (left) and 68 (right).

"A flat roof will sit above the kitchen to allow daylight into the kitchen below via a lantern rooflight." This is a poor design as it will be enclosed on all three, bar north which gets no light.

"Impact on Waste Storage Provisions There will no changes to waste storage provisions." The design does not explain how sewage will be removed from the basement ensuite bathroom. The sewage pipes are very shallow beneath these properties and the basement will be lower than the current sewage pipes.

"Flood Risk A portion of the property's rear garden is situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3, as highlighted on the plan below from the Environment Agency. The proposal does not extend into these zones. The edge of the proposed extension would be approximately 10m away from the

edge of the Flood Zone 2 area, based on the plan below. To reduce the impact from flooding, the finished floor level of the basement will be set 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level."
This only accounts for lateral distance to flood zone, while the proposal is extending the property vertically down into the flood zone to just 300 mm above the lower tier in the garden. This is extremely low and doesn't account the enormous change in flooding and flood height relating to the Mersey valley over the past 20 years which has risen by 2.5 metres, nearly double previous maximum heights! (Fig 6). Hydrology Data Explorer - Didsbury Basin Golf Course.
The current plan does not account for creating a property which will very likely have flooding and therefore insurance issues going forwards. This is unacceptable impact on the groundworks of the house and for potential future owners of this home.

Fig 6. Graph showing large increase in maximum flood height at nearby monitoring station at Didsbury Basin Golf Course, culminating in record breaking heights in January 2025. The impact of these floods on gardens at 68-72 is shown in Fig 7.

Fig 7. Photograph looking North across the gardens of No. 72 (left), 70 and 68 (right) during flooding in January 2025 due to rising groundwater and Chorlton Brook breaking its banks. Additionally, the presence of a land drain running along the shared driveway between No. 68 and 70 raises serious concerns about the stability of groundworks and drainage arrangements, which should be addressed through a geotechnical study.

Issue 5. Lack of neighbour consultation
The document states "The plans have been shared with neighbours on both sides of the property at 70 and 66 Claude Road". [P.17]. This is technically true, however the plans were shared in their final form three days before they were uploaded to MCC. We note with concern that, despite being aware of our neighbours' intentions for a two-storey rear extension since October 2022, no meaningful consultation has taken place.
We had a discussion in October 2022 during a gathering at No. 70, at which point we clearly raised concerns regarding the impact of a two-storey extension on our property, particularly the impact on use of our recently developed patio and emphasised the importance of collaborating with neighbours when developing such plans. Despite us expressing willingness to engage constructively, and visiting No. 68 for a more formal discussion, we were informed unequivocally that our neighbours would proceed with their preferred design and that any input from us should be made post-submission through the formal objection process. This was not a discussion in the generally accepted meaning of the phrase.
Over the following years, we maintained a positive neighbourly relationship and we made several attempts to open dialogue about the extension. We have been constructive and permitted access to our property by their architect to take measurements, but this did not constitute consultation as he made clear he was acting under instruction and was not in a position to consider our views. On 25th March 2025, a text message was received offering to "talk us through" the proposals and, upon our request, the plans were emailed to us. These plans were already complete and ready for

submission, with the application uploaded to MCC's planning portal 3 days later on the 28th of March. In the context of this timeline and finality of their plans, there was clearly no opportunity for meaningful input or revision based on our feedback, and the timing of this gesture suggests it was a formality rather than a genuine effort to engage.
Subsequent text messages offering to "answer questions" post-submission appear to be retrospective and superficial, rather than seeking genuine engagement. This approach does not align with paragraphs 39-40 and 128 of the NPPF, which emphasise the importance of early, proactive, and collaborative engagement with those affected by development proposals. In our view, the process has been one-directional and focused on presenting their finalised plans rather than evolving them through neighbourly discussion.

Conclusions
For all of these reasons, we consider that the Applicant's plans will have a significant, detrimental and overbearing effect on our private amenity space and kitchen, contrary to MCC policies. As we have informed our neighbour, we do not necessarily object to our neighbours extending their property as a matter of principle. However, any extension proposed should be sympathetically designed so that it does not impact our home. We would have been more than happy to discuss these matters fully with our neighbour, and we continue to be happy to engage positively with them in the future.
In summary, the scheme as submitted:
1) has a design that is out of line with MCC planning rules (see Section 1);
2) will be overbearing (visually dominant and oppressive) with unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy;
3) contains misleading comparisons to other double height extensions on Claude Road;
4) has not been discussed with us in any meaningful way.
We regret to say that we must strongly object to planning permission being granted for this particular proposal.