MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	142241/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	25 February 2025
Proposal:	Erection of single storey front and rear extensions to provide both additional living accommodation and a front garage/bike storage area.
Address:	29 Westerling Way, Manchester, M16 7AW
Ward(s):	Moss Side Ward
Applicant:	Mr Soran Saadi Abdalaziz
Agent (if any):	Mr Soreen Billbas, Barcx Ltd
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**22/04/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 5 March 2025 Expired: 26 March 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 mid terrace class C3 residential dwelling on Westerling Way. The property is built from brown brick with black concrete roof tiles and white uPVC windows. The property features a glazed porch to the front, with hardstanding for vehicle parking, to the rear there is a modest garden.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
Westerling way is a residential Street in the Moss Side Ward. The area is characterised by terraced and semi-detached family dwellings.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of single storey front and rear extensions to provide both additional living accommodation and a front garage/bike storage area.

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – No comments or objections received.

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 of single storey front and rear extension to form additional living accommodation and additional storage facilities. 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 rear extension would project back by 3000mm, would span 4550mm and would have a lean-to roof with a maximum height of 3600mm, sloping down to 2785mm at the eaves. The roof would continue to extend 2165mm along the rear wall of the property to create a canopy above the patio and proposed doors. The 3000mm rearward projection does not exceed

the limit stipulated in policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3650mm), and the proposed extension is not more than 50% of the existing floor space and makes use of a low-level roof.

The proposed front extension would project forward by 1780mm and span 4700mm, with a lean-to roof measuring a maximum of 3260mm, sloping down to 2375mm at the eaves. The proposed front extension is within the footprints of the existing front porch, only extending to the side by an additional 700mm more than the existing porch, the overall projection and height would remain the same as existing.

Overall, the development is considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of the dimensions of both additions and they would not result in 'excessively large or bulky' additions to the property.

Residential Amenity
The proposed rear extension would make use of a lean-to roof that has a maximum height of 3600mm where it joins the main house and slopes down to 2375mm at the eaves. The roof extends the width of the house, to create a canopy area above the porch to the side of the proposed extension. The rear elevation will feature a window whilst one side elevation will feature a set of glazed doors, it is not anticipated that the new glazed doors will cause any privacy issues for the residents or neighbours.

The proposed front extension would make use of the existing roof and projection, only extend around 700mm to the side to make way for elevation alterations that allow the new roller shutter garage door. Give that there is no addition forward projection or increase in height, it is not anticipated that the proposal should cause issues associated with unacceptable levels of overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area.

In addition, no objections to the proposal were received.

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

Visual Amenity
The proposed rear extension would be finished in brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal is relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Set at the rear of the property, the proposal would not be visible within the street scene or public realm and, as such, should have a minimal impact upon the visual amenity of the area. Moreover, its use of matching materials should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, thus ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature. Hence, the overall character of the property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The proposed front extension would use brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC windows to match the existing, it would also partially have a glazed roof to match the existing porch. In addition, it would have an aluminium roller shutter on the front elevation to provide access to the new storage area.

The proposed shutter would be visible from the street scene and would introduce a new feature, as none of the houses on these terraces feature front storage areas. However, given the small scale of the shutter, no additional projection to the existing porch and the positioning of the shutter in front of the car parking area, the addition would not look out of place or detract from the character of the 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.

Conclusion
Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal 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 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 – 25 February 2025 – Ref: 2038-(00)
b. Drawing – Proposed Floor Plans – 25 February 2025 – Ref: 2038-(05) 03
c. Drawing – Proposed Elevation – 25 February 2025 – Ref: 2038-(05) 04

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

21 Triscombe Way, Manchester, M16 7TX
24 Westerling Way, Manchester, M16 7FG
11 Stanworth Close, Manchester, M16 7FF
31 Westerling Way, Manchester, M16 7AW
25 Westerling Way, Manchester, M16 7AW
33 Westerling Way, Manchester, M16 7AW
27 Westerling Way, Manchester, M16 7AW
25 Triscombe Way, Manchester, M16 7TX
23 Triscombe Way, Manchester, M16 7TX

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