

PLANNING

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

Application no. 145208/FH/2026
Date registered valid: 24 February 2026
Proposal: Erection of part single, part two-storey side extension.
Address: 15 Burrows Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LS
Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mavis Henry
Agent (if any): Tomislav Vuletic, Flocc Studio Ltd
Case officer: Joshua Lee
Tel: 0161 219 2851
Email: joshua.lee@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 13 April 2026

APPLICATION DETAILS

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	12 February 2026
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications:	Printed: 2 March 2026 Expired: 23 March 2026
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
Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of site/building

The proposal relates to a two-storey semi-detached property on Burrows Lane. The property sits on a triangular plot and at an angle to the adjacent dwelling. The property features an existing single storey rear extension and hardstanding to the front for off street vehicle parking.

Description of area

The property is in a mostly residential part of the Chorlton Park ward.

Description of development

Erection of part single, part two-storey side extension.

The proposed side extension projects 5427mm at the front elevation and follows the angled border 7349mm to project 1573mm in the line with the rear elevation. The first floor has a similar footprint with a 500mm set back to the principal elevation. The proposed side extension is finished in matching brick with a gable end tiled roof to match. New glazing is featured to front and rear. A new bin store is featured to the front garden.

The new development would allow additional living and bedroom accommodation for a foster family.



Figure 1. Proposed site plan

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no planning history at the address.

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Notifications

Local Residents

1no comment in objection to the proposed development with concerns regarding:

- The forward projection of the two-storey side extension disrupting the established building line on the street.
- Potential creation of a terracing effect due to the reduced spacing between properties.
- The scale, width and height of the extension being out of keeping with the character of the original dwelling and surrounding properties.
- Overbearing impact and loss of daylight to the neighbouring garden arising from the extension's position close to the boundary.
- The proposal being significantly larger than what is typically considered proportionate for side extensions, referencing permitted development benchmarks for context.
- Risk of setting an undesirable precedent for similarly scaled and positioned extensions in the area

1no comment neither objecting nor supporting the proposed development was received:

- A neutral public comment was received from an RSPB Swift Champion requesting that any approval include at least one integrated Swift brick to enhance biodiversity.

NEGOTIATIONS

During the consultation stage, several issues were identified that required negotiation with the applicant. Discussions were carried out in a positive and proactive manner.

It was noted that the side extension, as originally proposed, would run directly along the boundary and project forward of the building line of 1 Emery Avenue. This resulted in an awkward and angular form that would appear overly prominent on the corner. The applicant was therefore asked to consider revising the design to better reflect the development at No. 1 by introducing a small gap to the boundary, setting the first floor back from the principal elevation, and incorporating a hipped roof to reduce the perceived massing.

The applicant was also asked to remove the first floor rear window to minimise overlooking and perceived privacy impacts.

Updated proposed development

The updated development removes the prominent corner on the extension to pull the extension away from the shared boundary and sets the first floor back from the principal elevation by 750mm. The proposal also now includes a hipped roof and the rear first floor window has been removed.



Figure 2. Updated proposed site plan

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES TO UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Not required due to reduction in massing and impact.

RELEVANT POLICIES

In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions on planning applications must be made in line with the statutory development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

For Manchester, the development plan comprises:

- The Core Strategy (2012–2027)
- Saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
- The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2022–2039)

These documents are considered up to date and carry substantial weight in decision-making. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and other local guidance may also be relevant.

National planning policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is a material consideration and provides overarching guidance.

The Government has published a consultation draft of the NPPF, intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making. While this draft is not yet adopted, it is a material consideration.

Where applicable, the Council must give special regard to preserving the character of conservation areas and the setting of listed buildings, in line with statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The policies referenced in this report are those considered most relevant to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development as follows:

- [The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027](#)
 - o Development Management and Planning Obligations
 - DM 1 - Development Management
 - o Objective 1 - Spatial Principles
 - SP 1 - Spatial Principles (Partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)
 - o Objective 6 Environment
 - EN 1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
 - EN15 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-G 8)
 - EN 19 – Waste
- [Guide to development in Manchester](#) - supplementary planning document and planning guidance, April 2007
- [Extant Unitary Development Plan \(UDP\)](#) –
 - o Citywide Development Control Policies
 - DC1 - Residential extensions
 - DC26 - Development and Noise
- [Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039-](#)
 - o Strategy
 - JP-Strat9: Southern Areas
 - o Sustainable and Resilient Places
 - JP-S1: Sustainable Development
 - o Places for People
 - JP-P1 Sustainable Places
- [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#) December 2024–
 - o Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
 - o Section 4 – Decision-making
 - o Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

- [National Planning Policy Framework Draft for Consultation December 2025](#) - National decision-making policies
 - o Chapter 3 – Decision-making policies
 - DM1: Preparing development proposals
 - DM2: Information requirements
 - DM3: Determining development proposals
 - DM6: Use of planning conditions and obligations
 - DM7: Relationship with other regulatory regimes
 - o Chapter 4 - Achieving sustainable development
 - S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - S4: Principle of development within settlements
 - o Chapter 12 - Making effective use of land
 - L4: Residential extensions
 - o Chapter 14 - Achieving well-designed places
 - DP3: Key principles for well-designed places
 - DP4: The Design process

ASSESSMENT

Principle of development

Many people prefer to extend their existing homes rather than move, and the planning system needs to accommodate this demand for more living space, while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed. The Council is not generally in favour of dealing with this issue by laying down firm rules about home extensions with each case looked at on its individual merits, having regard to a range of criteria.

In this case, the extension would also provide an additional offering much-needed space to meet their household needs while remaining sensitive to neighbours and the wider character of the area.

In this case the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable.

As stated in Policy DM 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, all development should have regard to the following specific issues:

Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials, and detail

The proposed extension would reflect the character of the existing house by using matching brick, roof tiles and window styles. Its design remains clearly subservient to the original dwelling, helped by the lower roof line to the front.

The first-floor element is set back 750mm from the main front elevation and the extension at its front elevation maintains a 1-metre separation from the shared boundary. This spacing helps avoid a terracing effect, and the natural angles between the two properties, along with the relationship to the existing extension at No. 1 Emery Avenue, further reduce any potential terracing effect.

Impact on No. 1 Emery Avenue

The two-storey side extension would sit alongside the existing side elevation of No. 15. While it would project further forward than the neighbouring property, the 1-metre gap to the boundary and its front face together with the angled relationship between the dwellings mean that it is not considered to result in harmful impacts that would warrant refusal of the proposals. No. 1 Emery Avenue also has an existing two-storey side extension of similar scale, and the proposed extension at No. 15 is considered to sit alongside it without creating significant additional massing.

Impact on No. 13 Burrows Avenue

Given the position of the extension relative to No. 13, any impact would be negligible.

The scale, siting and orientation of the development mean it would not appear over-dominant or overbearing, and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be preserved.

Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

The main proposed works are capable of being seen from the street. Given the position of the extension, including that the principal elevation sits approximately 5m from the front boundary line, the setbacks to the first floor and boundaries, together with the use of proposed materials, the character of the street would not be unduly affected.

The proposal would continue the general building line present to the properties on Burrows Avenue to the north-west, whilst the properties on Emery Avenue to the south-east have a differing building line due to the street pattern in this location.

The proposal is similar in size and scale to other buildings nearby, notably an extension approved directly adjacent at No1 Emery Avenue and would not therefore disrupt the area's existing features.

Effects on amenity

Privacy

The proposal includes new windows in the front elevation. Given that these are street-facing and sit on a similar alignment to existing windows in the principal elevation, they would not give rise to any additional overlooking or loss of privacy beyond that typically associated with front-facing windows.

A new door is proposed in the rear elevation at ground-floor level; however, it would not materially increase overlooking when compared with the existing and typical ground-floor openings on this elevation.

A rooflight is proposed in the rear roof slope. Given its high-level position and downward outlook, it would not result in any significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and in lieu of rear facing first floor windows is the preferred option.

Light

Given that the proposed extension would sit within the existing side elevation of the dwelling, the impact on daylight and sunlight would be acceptable. Although the extension projects slightly further forward than No. 1 Emery due to the site layout, the boundary setbacks and the angle between the properties mean that it would not result in any significant harm to warrant refusal. In addition, having regard to the orientation of the dwellings in relation to the path of the sun, the extension would have little additional effect beyond that of the existing built form.

Noise

The proposed extension is not expected to generate any noise beyond what would be reasonably expected of a residential dwelling.

Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes.

The proposal does not change how people can get in and out of the building.

Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.

The proposal adds space inside the property with minimal effect to the outdoor area and maintains a good level of external amenity space post development.

Refuse storage and collection.

The proposal removes external access to the rear of the property, and the applicant has confirmed that waste bins are to be stored in the garage/bin store as denoted on the submitted plans.

Vehicular access and car parking

The proposal doesn't change how vehicles access and park at the property.

Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage

Biodiversity

Given the small scale and domestic nature of the works, the development is not expected to adversely affect biodiversity on or around the site. Opportunities for minor biodiversity enhancement were raised during the consultation period, including the installation of an integrated Swift brick. While not required to make the development acceptable, the applicant is encouraged to incorporate such features where feasible, in line with Core Strategy policy EN15 and national guidance promoting measurable biodiversity gains in new development.

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private

The dwelling benefits from a garden beyond the siting of the proposed development and maintains a good amount of private green space post development.

Flood risk and drainage.

The site is not located in a flood risk area and therefore does not require a flood statement or assessment.

The proposal has a negligible impact on drainage using the existing drainage on site.

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.

PLANNING BALANCE

Taking all material considerations into account, the proposal represents a proportionate form of development that responds appropriately to the character of the host property and the wider street scene. The revisions secured during the application process have reduced the massing, improved the relationship to neighbouring properties, and ensured that the scheme would not result in unacceptable amenity impacts. While one objection was received, the concerns raised have been addressed through design changes, including increased boundary separation and the removal of upper-floor rear glazing. The extension would also provide an additional bedroom to meet the applicant's needs as a foster family, which is a positive social benefit. On balance, the proposal complies with relevant local and national planning policies and can therefore be supported.

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. There were minor changes required to meet the requirements for approval and the officer and applicant worked together to find an amicable solution.

CONDITIONS TO BE ATTACHED TO DECISION FOR APPROVAL

1. 3-year time limit

The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Specified plans

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

- | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|------|---------|------|-----|---|
| a. Drawing - Existing & Proposed
PLANS AND ELEVATIONS | 26 Mar 2026 | FULL | DRAWING | PACK | REV | B |
|--|-------------|------|---------|------|-----|---|

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 & of Places for Everyone.

3. Materials to match

The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Bin store

The bin store shown on the approved plan/drawing ref. Drawing - Existing & Proposed 26 Mar 2026 FULL DRAWING PACK REV B PLANS AND ELEVATIONS, shall be made available as part of the development and used for the storage of refuse. The bin store shall be retained for that purpose.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health, pursuant to policies EN19 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. Swift Bricks

If the development can accommodate it, it is requested that consideration is given to the installation of Swift Bricks. Swift bricks must be fitted in accordance to the specifications of BS 42021:2022 - Integral nest boxes.

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES & NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED

16 Burrows Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LD

13 Burrows Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LS

1 Emery Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LE

20 Burrows Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LD

3 Emery Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LE

18 Burrows Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LD

14 Burrows Avenue, Manchester, M21 7LD

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