

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 145216/FH/2026
Date registered valid: 18 February 2026
Proposal: Erection of two-storey side extension and front porch.
Address: 83 Brynton Road, Manchester, M13 0UX
Ward(s): Rusholme Ward

Applicant: Mr Dayaram Gautam
Agent (if any): Mr Rashid Mehmood, I. Planning Services
Case officer: Holly Wright
Tel: 0161 219 6381
Email: holly.wright@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 9 April 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 3 March 2026

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 23 February 2026 Expired: 16 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

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of red brick with a red tiled dual-pitch roof. The property features white uPVC-framed windows, a front porch canopy, a paved front yard space bordered mid-level panelling, and a shed located within a spacious side and rear garden.

Brynton Road is a residential street situated within the Rusholme ward of Manchester, close to the railway line, Birchfields Road, and MEA Central. The area is predominantly residential in terms of its character, consisting of terraced and semi-detached dwellinghouses.

The property is not listed, nor is it sited within a Conservation Area.







Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the “Erection of two-storey side extension and front porch.”

Relevant planning history

No.83 Brynton Road – no previous history.

No.81 Brynton Road - 043891/FH/CENTL2/93 - Two storey extension side of dwellinghouse to form a living room with 2 bedrooms over – Approved (1993).

Consultations & Notification Responses

One representation was received from **a local resident**. Their comments are summarised as follows:

- If your authority intends to grant permission for this planning application, we recommend you make installation of a minimum of one Swift nest bricks a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.

Policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 – Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy – Development Plan Document 2012-2027 (“the Core Strategy”) was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012:

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN19 – Waste

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.

- Policy JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024)

- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2025)

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.

- Chapter 4 – Achieving Sustainable Development
 - Policy S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Chapter 14 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
 - Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places



Issues

Principle – the principle of the proposal, to erect a two-storey side extension together with a front porch, is acceptable, however, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale, and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity, waste storage, and parking, as well as other matters.

Siting, scale, and massing – the proposed two-storey extension would be positioned to the side of the dwellinghouse, projecting south/southeast-wards. It would measure to approximately 4m in width and 6.6m in length with a dual-pitch roof height of 7.5m (set at the same level as the existing) with eaves to match the existing dwellinghouse. A gap of approximately 2.5m would be maintained to the plot's southeastern shared boundary.

The porch extension would be positioned to the front of the dwellinghouse, projecting west/southwest-wards. It would measure to approximately 4m in width and 1.4m in depth with a dual-pitch roof height of 3m and an eaves height of 2.1m. A gap of approximately 4.6m would be maintained to the adjoining semi and a gap of approximately 5.2m would be maintained to the plot's southeastern shared boundary.

Whilst the extensions, particularly the two-storey side extension, represent a sizeable addition to the host dwellinghouse, this is considered acceptable within the site's specific context. Although the two-storey addition would not appear clearly subservient to the host dwellinghouse, its scale is deemed appropriate given that it would mirror the form and proportions of the existing side extension at the adjoining semi, No.81 Brynton Road (approved under 043891/FH/CENTL2/93). Collectively, the two properties and their respective extensions would create the appearance of a row of quasi semi-detached dwellings, which is consistent with the prevailing character of the surrounding area. Further to this, the generous width of the plot and the spacious nature of the side and rear garden also ensure that the site could accommodate an extension of this scale whilst retaining adequate distances to the shared boundaries, thereby preventing any undue sense of enclosure or overbearing impact. The proposed porch extension would also reflect the scale and design of the existing porch at No.81 and is therefore considered acceptable.



View of No.81 and No.83 Brynton Road



Quasi semi-detached properties in surrounding area

Appearance and visual amenity – the submitted application form indicates that the extensions would be constructed of brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse with uPVC-framed windows and doors. At ground floor level, the side extension would feature one window to the front, one window to the side and one window and door to the rear. At first floor level, the side extension would feature one window to the front, one window to the side, and one window to the rear. Its roof slopes would be blank. The porch extension would feature blank side elevations and one window and door to the front. Its roof slopes would be blank.

The proposal is relatively standard in terms of its design for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale, with comparable extensions evident in the surrounding area (i.e., No.81 Brynton Road). Sited at the front and side of the property, the proposal would be visible within the street scene, however, its use of matching materials (i.e., brickwork, roof tiles, and windows) should provide a blended appearance and cohesive relationship with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that the extensions do not form overly prominent visual features. Hence, the proposal is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impact upon the character of the application property or the wider area.

Residential amenity – the proposed side extension would be sited to the south of the host dwellinghouse and would not project any further beyond the existing rear elevation of the property, therefore, it is not considered to result in an unduly harmful impact upon the residential amenity of those occupying the adjoining semi (No.81) in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook, or loss of light. Moreover, given the side extension's siting to the north of the properties along Old Hall Lane with a considerable gap of 2.5m maintained to the plot's southern/southeastern shared boundary, it is also not considered to result in an unduly harmful impact upon the residential amenity of these occupiers, in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook, or loss of light. Moreover, the extension's side facing windows have been conditioned to be obscurely glazed so as to avoid unacceptable impacts relating to potential overlooking and loss of privacy.

Given the single storey form and modest scale of the porch extension together with the gaps maintained to the plot's shared boundaries, significant issues associated with overshadowing, loss of outlook, and loss of light are not anticipated. Similarly, given that the porch extension

would not feature any side-facing windows, significant issues associated with overlooking or loss of privacy are not anticipated.

Waste storage – the existing waste storage and management arrangements would be unaffected by the proposal as external access to the rear would be retained. Bins could therefore continue to be stored away from the street scene.

Parking – the existing parking arrangements would be unaffected by the proposal as the property does not feature any off-street parking provisions.

Biodiversity – it is acknowledged that concerns were received regarding the potential inclusion of a swift brick within the proposed development. However, imposing such a requirement is considered to be onerous and disproportionate given the nature and scale of the proposal, which comprises a householder extension rather than the creation of a new dwellinghouse. Furthermore, there is currently no adopted policy within Manchester City Council's planning framework that mandates the inclusion of swift bricks in householder extensions. As such, while ecological enhancements are encouraged where appropriate, it is not considered reasonable to require this measure in this instance.

Conclusion – given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity, waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

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 permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Act Planning Act 1990.

2) Specified plans:

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

'Proposed Floor plans and Elevations', received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 18th February 2026.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) Materials:

The materials used in the walls, roof or other element of any exterior work of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to the materials used in the majority of the equivalent element of 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) Obscure glazing:

The windows in the southern/southeastern side elevation of the development hereby approved 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 be retained as such thereafter.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

5) Restriction on additional openings:

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be inserted in the northern/northwestern and southern/southeastern elevations of the development hereby approved, without planning permission being granted by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Informatives:

1) The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242. Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

2) 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

46 Old Hall Lane, Rusholme, Manchester, M13 0TL
81 Brynton Road, Manchester, M13 0UX
12D Clee Avenue, Manchester, M13 0UN
12C Clee Avenue, Manchester, M13 0UN
12B Clee Avenue, Manchester, M13 0UN
12A Clee Avenue, Manchester, M13 0UN
44 Old Hall Lane, Rusholme, Manchester, M13 0TL
42 Old Hall Lane, Rusholme, Manchester, M13 0TL
101 Brynton Road, Manchester, M13 0UX

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA