

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144712/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 12 January 2026
Proposal: Erection of first-floor rear extension.
Address: 2 Seymour Avenue, Manchester, M11 4LH
Ward(s): Clayton & Openshaw Ward

Applicant: Mr Khan Yavari
Agent (if any): Mr Ahmad Turkmani, AT A. Design
Case officer: Harriet Aidoo
Tel: 0161 234 4532
Email: harriet.aidoo@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 1 March 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 27 January 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 14 January 2026 Expired: 4 February 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 14 January 2026 Expired: 4 February 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

Description of site / building / area

The application relates to 2 Seymour Avenue, a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse situated along a short cul-de-sac off North Road, within a predominantly residential area of Clayton and Openshaw ward.



Figure 1. Site visit 27.01.2026

The application site benefits from amenity space along the front, side and rear, including boundary treatment, whilst incorporating a gated access along the side elevation. Off-street

car parking is along the front of property and bins are stored within curtilage along the side and rear garden. There is an existing single storey side and rear extension, consented by (planning permission ref. no. 122987/FH/2019), which retains a minimum separation distance of approximately 788mm from the common shared boundary with "Kelsie".

Site History

- 143145/FH/2025 - Erection of first floor rear extension. Refused 03.08.2025
- 122987/FH/2019 - Proposed erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the existing property. Approved 20.05.2019
- 068816/VO/2003/N2 - CITY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT Refurbishment of council housing including renewal of porches and canopies, new bay windows and new roofs. Approved 08.09.2003

Description of development

The initially submitted plan related to the proposed erection of first-floor rear extension and two-storey side extension.

Following negotiations, the initially submitted plan has been revised in the interest residential and visual amenity and revised plans were subsequently submitted, (dated, 17/02/26). The initial title description has been subsequently amended to reflect the revised plans. The revised plan now relates to a proposed first rear extension.

The proposal, measuring approximately (3000mm deep x 3604mm wide), would be placed above the existing single storey rear extension, whilst being flush with the first floor side elevation of the host dwelling. It would also maintain a separation distance of approximately 2114mm from the first floor common shared boundary with no. 4 Seymour Avenue and would comprise of a hip roof, with a window along the rear elevation. It is intended to use external materials similar to the existing house.

Consultations & Notification Responses

1. Local residents / public opinion

Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal.

One representation was received from an RSPB Swift Champion, who was neither objecting to, nor supporting the planning application, but suggested an addition of Swift nest bricks by way of a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.

2. Flood Risk Management Team

Officers have recommended approval with no further condition required, although the following informative is advised:

The applicant is advised to incorporate Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures to a minimum of 150mm above the surface water flood level or a minimum of 600mm above the fluvial flood level.

3. Arboriculture Officers

Tree Officers have advised that if the proposal would involve any digging i.e. for foundations etc. an arboriculture impact assessment to show the methodology and adequate tree protections is required. However, if no digging is proposed, then it is considered that there would not be any impact to the adjacent tree. To which, they wouldn't have any objections.

POLICY

The following guidance and policies are considered to be relevant to the proposed development.

1. The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 (Development Management)
- Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles)
- Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas)
- Policy EN15 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation)
- Policy EN19 (Waste)

2. Places for Everyone (2022 - 2039)

The Places for Everyone Plan is a Joint Development Plan Document, providing a strategic plan and policies in relation to jobs, new homes and sustainable growth for nine of the 10 boroughs which make up Greater Manchester. The Plan and its policies are a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications and therefore be given significant weight in the planning balance. The following policy is considered to be relevant:

- Sustainable and Resilient Places, JP-S1: Sustainable Development
- Places for People, JP-P1: Sustainable Places

3. Unitary Development Plan (UDP), (1995) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.

- Saved Policy DC1 - for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance.

4. Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007:

- Chapter 2: Design

5. Draft National Planning Policy Framework - 16th December 2025 is under consultation and as such is a material consideration. However, until its adoption, the current NPPF (December 2024) is still in place. Of relevance are:

- Section 2: Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4: Decision-making
- Section 12: Achieving well-designed places

ISSUES

In this instance, the initially submitted plan has been revised in the interest residential and visual amenity and revised plans were subsequently submitted, (dated, 17/02/26). The title description has been subsequently amended to reflect the revised plans.

Principle of development

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 2004 states that applications for development should be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development is an extension to a residential dwelling, this is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to extend their homes rather than move in order to meet the changing residential needs of families; provided that there is no overriding unduly harmful impact upon either the character of the property, or upon the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Consideration must therefore be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity.

Residential and visual amenity

Impact of works (First-floor rear extension) - In light of the revised plans, (dated, 17/02/26), it is considered that the issues raised with the agent have been sufficiently overcome. The revised proposal would mitigate from the undue adverse impacts of overlooking, overshadowing, or loss of privacy and would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

It is considered that the proposal along this corner plot, cul-de-sac position of Seymour Avenue is unlikely to detract from the character of the street scene. The proposal would improve the quality of the existing accommodation to meet changing household needs and continued occupation of the house and maintain existing levels of residential amenity within the area. It is not considered that the development would undermine the residential character of the area due

to the revised scale of the development, the quality of the proposed design, and proposed materials.

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

The site is not overlooked along the rear boundary, and the proposal still maintains a significant separation distance from those properties along rear boundary, together with the maintained separation from the first floor common shared boundaries with "Kelsie" and no. 4 Seymour Avenue, and the existing trees along the boundary.

Additionally, as the proposal limits fenestration along the rear elevation only, coupled with the significant separation distance that would still be maintained from those properties along the boundaries, the impact to privacy, overlooking and visual intrusion would be less than substantial harm.

Regarding the associated proposed elevational alteration to the original dwellinghouse, involving 1no. new window along the first side elevation to serve a bathroom, this is considered to be acceptable, subject to a condition requiring the window to be obscurely glazed, in the interests of privacy.

On the basis of these reasons, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would result in a subservient extension with design features in keeping with the host dwellinghouse that would contribute positively to the surrounding context; and thereby accords with policies DM1, SP1, EN1, EN15, EN19 of the Core Strategy and saved UDP policy DC1 of the UDP.

Impact of works (Design and appearance) - It is considered that the proposal has been appropriately related to the character of the existing building, in terms of the proposed roof design and the composition of proposed materials. The proposal appears as subservient additions given the proposed depth and distance from the boundaries and by dropping the pitch of the proposed roof below that of main dwelling and by maintaining a complimentary hip roof configuration.

For the above reasons, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and to comply with the guidelines set out in saved UDP policy, DC1 'Residential Extensions', and Core Strategy policies DM1, SP1, EN1.

Impact of works (Refuse storage and collection) - The existing arrangement would be unaffected. The proposal itself has little impact on waste from the site. It uses the current storage and collection methods on site; pursuant with The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document policy DM1, EN19; and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Impact of works (Vehicular access and car parking) - The proposal doesn't change how vehicles access and park at the property, on-site car parking would still be maintained; pursuant

with The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policy DM1 and saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Impact of works (Trees) - Whilst the site has no significant international or national designations for biodiversity value, particular consideration has been given to the trees along the common shared boundary. The Council's objective is to protect trees. Whilst there are trees/hedges along the immediate south-eastern boundaries, no TPOs appear to exist on these. Notwithstanding this factor, whilst it is considered that they offer significant biodiversity and geological value, as well as providing a buffer and screening from the proposal, given the revised plans (dated, 17/02/26) and in light of the Arboriculture Officers comments, as proposal would not involve any digging for foundations, then it is considered that the adjacent tree would not be detrimentally affected as a result of the proposal. Therefore, the proposal accords with the policy EN15 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

Matters Raised by consultation:

Representation - The matters raised by the RSPB Swift Champion have been duly considered, although there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to warrant the refusal of planning permission. It is therefore, recommended that an advice note by way of an informative is attached to any recommendation for planning approval.

Flood Risk Management Team - Following the revised plans (dated, 17/02/26), as the revised proposal would now relate to a first floor rear extension, it is considered the comments raised by the Flood Risk Management Team have been sufficiently overcome and the advised informative would not be required.

Arboriculture Officers - In this instance, as the revised proposal (dated, 17/02/26) would now relate to a first floor rear extension, and the proposal would not involve any digging for foundations, the adjacent tree would not be detrimentally affected as a result of the proposal and therefore it is considered the comments raised by Arboriculture Officers have been sufficiently mitigated.

Conclusions - For the reasons outlined above, and on balance, and subject to planning conditions, it is considered that the revised proposed development, (dated, 17/02/26) responds positively to the policy documents outlined above.

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

In assessing the merits of a planning application officers will seek to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. In this instance, the initially submitted plan has been revised in the interest of residential and visual amenity and revised plans subsequently submitted, (dated, 17/02/26). The local planning authority had no other issues to raise with the agent but have attached appropriate conditions to the approval.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

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

- Location Plan / Site Plan with application site edge in red, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 08 December 2025.
- Tree survey or information, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 12 January 2026.
- Proposed Plans and Elevations, Drawing No. PP231-3/25, REV B, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 17 February 2026.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and submitted information; pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy (2012).

3) The materials used to construct the external elevations of the development hereby approved shall match the existing dwellinghouse, in terms of colour, type, scale and method of coursing and pointing and as stated on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to saved policy DC1, DC18.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

4) Before first occupation of the development thereby approved, the proposed window along the first floor side elevation to serve the first floor bathroom and as shown on: Proposed Plans and Elevations, Drawing No. PP231-3/25, REV B, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 17 February 2026, shall be opaquely 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 - In the interests of privacy, pursuant to policy to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

5) 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 reenacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors or other openings shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on: Proposed Plans and Elevations, Drawing No. PP231-3/25, REV B, received by the City Council

as the Local Planning Authority on 17 February 2026, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

Informative

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

Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)
MCC Flood Risk Management

Seymour Care Home, 327 North Road, Clayton, Manchester, M11 4NY
Kelsie, Seymour Avenue, Manchester, M11 4LH
12 South Crescent, Manchester, M11 4LN
4 Seymour Avenue, Manchester, M11 4LH
10 South Crescent, Manchester, M11 4LN
15 Seymour Avenue, Manchester, M11 4LH
13 Seymour Avenue, Manchester, M11 4LH

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (More) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA