MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

# Planning

## Growth & Development

## Delegated officer report for planning application

| | |
|---|---|
| **Application no.** | 142480/FH/2025 |
| **Date registered valid:** | 19 March 2025 |
| **Proposal:** | Erection of two storey rear extension with a single storey side extension, following demolition of existing kitchen and bedroom at the rear of the property and replacement of conservatory roof with a flat roof with roof lantern. |
| **Address:** | 3 Verdure Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PP |
| **Ward(s):** | Brooklands Ward |
| **Applicant:** | Mrs Deana J Kalita |
| **Agent (if any):** | Mr Mamdouh Asher, Asher Design Services Limited |
| **Case officer:** | Jake Walther<br>Tel: 0161 234 1632<br>Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk |
| **Recommendation:** | Approve |
| **Date of recommendation:** | **09/05/2025** |

**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: 9 April 2025 Expired: 2 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 application relates to a two-storey detached class C3 dwellinghouse on Verdure Avenue. The house is finish in brick with render and wood detailing on the first floor. With a hipped roof. The property features a front garden with hardstanding for parking, to the rear there is an existing conservatory, detached garage and garden.



**Listed building:** Not applicable

**Conservation area:** Not applicable

**Tree Preservation Order:** Not applicable

**Description of area**
Verdure Avenue is a residential street in the Brooklands Ward, it is comprised of a mixture of semidetached and detached bungalows and two-storey family dwellings.

**Description of development**
The applicant is seeking permission for a single storey side extension, two storey rear and replacement on conservatory roof with flat roof.

**Consultations & Notification Responses**
Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – 1no. objection in response to the application on the basis of harm to visual amenity due to the size and scale of the proposal causing an overbearing impact when viewed from the neighbouring property.

**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

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

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:

- S1- Sustainable development

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 single storey side extension and two-storey rear extension with the replacement of conservatory roof with flat roof 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 side extension would project out from the existing side elevation by 2072mm and span a width of 7233mm up to the rear of the house. It would be set back from the boundary by 1000mm and set back from the front of the house by 4100mm, it would have a hipped roof with a maximum height of 3800mm, sloping down to 2670mm at the eaves.

The proposed rear extension would be two-storey and project back by 4565mm from the main house, 1125mm more than the existing outrigger and inline with the existing single storey conservatory, it would span 4675mm at the rear of the house, set back from the boundary with no.5 Verdure Avenue by 4775mm. The roof would be single pitched with an open gable at the rear, with an eaves height of 5415mm, the top of the roof pitch would be 630mm lower than the ridge of the roof on the main house.

The proposed flat roof on the conservatory would have a height of 3145mm, with a roof lantern having a maximum height of 3700mm.

Overall, although large, 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, therefore the proposal accord with polices SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

**Residential Amenity**

Although the proposed extension is large in relation to guidance in policy, the house itself is a large, detached property with large garden space and significant setbacks of the neighbouring properties on all sides. Given the orientation of the neighbouring properties and the east facing gardens the levels of overshadowing caused by the proposed extension are considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The proposed single storey side extension would feature windows on the front elevation and a glazed door on the rear elevation, whilst the side elevation would remain blank and featureless. The rear extension would feature one obscure glazed window on the side elevation, with a rooflight on the roof slope, to the rear there would be a new bifold glazed door at ground level and a juliet balcony with surrounding windows on the first floor.

Given the only windows proposed on the side elevation are to be obscurely glazed (and would be conditioned as such), it is not anticipated the proposed extension would give rise to issues relating to privacy or overlooking.

Regarding the overbearing impact mentioned in the objection, it is acknowledged that the proposed two-storey rear extension will be visible from the gardens and rear windows of No. 1 Verdure Avenue. However, there is a substantial gap of over 14 meters between the rear windows of No. 1 and the edge of the proposed extension at No. 3. This distance ensures that the extension will not overly dominate the view for the residents of No. 1.

Additionally, the orientation of No. 1 relative to No. 3 ensures that the rear windows of No. 1 do not directly face the rear extension. This positioning minimizes any potential overshadowing, as the extension will not overly block direct sunlight or significantly alter the light levels within the neighbouring property.

Furthermore, the design of the extension has been considered to blend with the existing architecture and maintain the overall aesthetic of the area. This approach helps to ensure that the visual impact on neighbouring properties is kept to a minimum.

In conclusion, the combination of the substantial gap, the orientation of the properties, and the design of the extension collectively mitigate any potential negative effects on the visual amenity of No. 1 Verdure Avenue, and the proposal therefore accords with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

**Visual Amenity**
The proposed extensions would be finished in brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse. The proposed windows would be uPVC to match the existing windows. From Verdure Avenue, only the front portion of the side extension would be visible, slightly obscured by the existing bay window on this elevation. The rear extension would read as subservient to the main house and would not appear incongruous with the main house or wider area.

The design and appearance of the proposed developments therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

**Parking**
The side addition will remove parking for one car, however there is still ample parking at the front of the property to off-street parking.

**Waste Storage**
Access of 1m will be retained at the side of the property, therefore storage of refuse bins at the rear will be unaffected.

**Conclusion**
Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed side and rear extension and changes to existing roof are 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 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:** 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 – 19 March 2025 – Drawing no. 100
b. Drawing – Proposed Elevations – 19 March 2025 – Drawing no. 203
c. Drawing – Proposed Floor Plans – 19 March 2025 – Drawing no. 202

d. Drawing – Proposed Site Plan – 19 March 2025 - Drawing no. 201

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.

**5. Obscure Glazing:**
Before first occupation the windows in the side elevation (As shown in Elevation Drawing Ref 203 – Received 19 March 2025) shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

## Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

6 Verdure Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PP
10 Verdure Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PP
5 Verdure Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PP
22 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PW
8 Verdure Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PP
1 Verdure Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PP

## 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