

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144884/FH/2026

Date registered valid: 7 January 2026

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension, first-floor side extension following demolition of existing conservatory.

Address: 7 Kingston Grove, Manchester, M9 6HD

Ward(s): Charlestown Ward

Applicant: Dr Lubeca Mahmood

Agent (if any): Mr Niamat Ali, NA Design

Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 27 February 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 22 January 2026

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 6 February 2026 Expired: 20 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: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 7 Kingston Grove within the north Manchester ward of Charlestown. The application site relates to a semi-detached, two storey, red brick dwellinghouse sitting at the top of the cul-de-sac of Kingston Grove, characterised with dark fenestration, concealed entrance, existing side extension, rear conservatory and two outbuildings within the rear garden. As shown within the submitted location plan, the site results in a vast amount of land to the north. The immediate amenity space takes the form of hardstanding to the front and side and a garden also covered in hardstanding.

Description of area

The property is viewed from the context of the Kingston Grove streetscene which is residential in nature. Further to the north sits the Manchester Outer Ring Road and the Tesco superstore sits further west of the site.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension, first-floor side extension following demolition of existing conservatory.

The part single storey rear extension would involve the removal of the existing conservatory and the erection of a ground floor extension, with approximate dimensions of Height: 4 x Length: 4 x Width: 10 metres. The part two storey rear extension would wrap into the proposed first floor side extension and be set off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour by 4 metres. This

element of the proposal would have approximate dimensions of Height: 7.6 x Length: 4 x Width: 6.2 metres.

The first floor side extension would be sited above the existing side extension and so be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 2 metres and have approximate dimensions of Height: 7.6 x Length: 6.2 x Width: 3.7 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of 1no. window within the primary elevation, 2no. windows within the side elevation, 3no. sets of doors within the rear elevation and 2no. rooflights within the proposed roof.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed as:

Walls: red brick to match existing

Roof: red roof tiles to match existing

Juliet balcony: frameless safety glazing

Doors: black aluminium safety glazing bifold/ sliding door

Windows: black UPVC double glazed to match existing

Fascia/soffit: black to match existing.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The initial scheme presented inaccurate plans, this was addressed with the submission of revised plans.

Concern was raised with the 4 metre first floor rear extension sited in close proximity to the adjoining property. During the course of the application, revised plans were received with a further set away of the development at first floor level from the adjoining neighbour.

During the course of the application, it came to light the chimney stack and breast at the site had been removed. Whilst such works are not subject to planning permission, building control approval is required for this element. The proposed drawings show a hatched chimney to show its removal (not considered as part of this application).

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and 1no. neutral response was received during the course of the application. The resident requested a swift brick condition be attached to any approval granted.

Issues **POLICY**

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):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- ii. Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (16th December 2025)

The government has published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework which is intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making.

Of relevance to the application proposals the draft NPPF makes it clear that local planning authorities should amongst other things:

- Work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, where necessary seeking solutions to problems arising from initial proposals, to enable a timely decision.
- Take account of planning matters raised during any pre-application engagement, including any positive responses to this engagement, as well as representations on the proposals.
- Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and this means that for development within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

HC1: Planning for healthy communities (Chapter 16. Promoting health communities)

DP3: Key principles for well-designed places (Chapter 14. Achieving well-designed places)

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

- Policy DM1 (Development Management),
- Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) and
- Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
- d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

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

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles

recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

Places for Everyone

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 Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:
i.JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension, first-floor side extension following demolition of existing conservatory. The scheme has been subject to amendments as concern was raised with the 4 metre first floor rear extension sited in close proximity to the adjoining neighbour. During the course of the application, revised plans were received with a further set away of the development at first floor level from the adjoining neighbour. Given such amendments, given the spacious plot of the applicant's site and given the proposal provides the homeowners with additional living accommodation to support the changing needs of families without moving, such development can be considered acceptable in principle. The proposal is considered to support the general thrust of provisions within policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1. 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 extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Residential Amenity

No.5 Kingston Grove:

No.5 Kingston Grove is the adjoining property. As existing, the applicant site benefits from a conservatory, with a projection against the boundary of 4 metres. As a result of the proposal, the neighbour would feel an additional 4 metre single storey extension and so the impact at ground floor would not be different from the as existing circumstances. Such relationship is not considered to give rise to significant residential amenity implications.

The first floor rear extension would have a projection of 4 metres but would be sited 4 metres off the shared boundary and the roof form would be hipped. Given the adequate set in from the proposal off the shared boundary, it is not considered the proposal at first floor would give rise

to a tunnelling feature to the neighbour's first floor window, nor give rise to any loss of light implications. The proposed juliet balcony due to the distance off the boundary would not be considered to give rise to adverse privacy implications due to the distance and given the existing level of overlooking from the first floor windows on each property sited close to the shared boundary.

No.9 Kingston Grove:

No.9 is the non-adjoining property and would sit to the north east of the applicant site and sits at the head of the cul-de-sac. Such neighbour would be primarily impacted by the first floor side extension. Given the side extension would sit on top of the existing extent of the garage, the extension would be set back by 2 metres from the primary elevation of the host property. Given such separation, it is not considered such extension would give rise to adverse residential implications to the non-adjoining property.

In addition, those windows closest to no.9- the window within the primary elevation and first floor window within the gable elevation would be obscure glazed. As such, such windows would not give rise to overlooking to the detriment of the neighbour. In this instance, given the splayed nature of the common boundary and the differing positions of the properties, it is considered the window within the gable elevation at first floor level can be inserted without giving rise to adverse privacy implications. The proposed kitchen window would be adequately set away from the boundary and given it is at ground floor level would not give rise to significant levels of overlooking.

Properties to the rear:

The rear of the development and the proposed juliet balcony would look onto the extremely lengthy gardens to the north (relating to those properties located on Victoria Avenue East). At the time of the site visit, such area related to trees and so the proposal would not adversely impact such gardens to the detriment of the corresponding residents.

In short, the proposal is considered pursuant to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Visual Amenity

The property sits close to the head of the cul-de-sac and the area to be developed (side and rear) is not easily visible from the streetscene. As the side extension proposed would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property and have a roof lowered than that of the main dwelling, it is not considered the proposal would give rise to visual intrusion in the streetscene. This is also because the materials to be used would largely match those within the host property and so would be considered to respond sympathetically to the main dwelling.

As such the proposal is pursuant to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design, Appearance and Scale

Materials:

The materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed and would mostly match the properties within the streetscene. A materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Part single, part two-storey rear extension:

The projection at both levels of the rear extension would be 4 metres. Whilst it is noted that such projection would exceed the maximum rearward projection as specified within Policy DC1.3 of the UDP, the site is spacious and it is considered the conservatory with the same projection as existing does not give rise to adverse amenity implications to the adjoining property.

Whilst the LPA acknowledge that a projection of 4 metres at first floor level is generous, it is considered to be accommodated within the site given the 4 metre set away from the common boundary and given the hipped roof of the extension at such point. In this instance, this element is considered acceptable in scale and design.

First-floor side extension:

DC1.4 of the UDP considers two storey side extensions. As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. In this instance, the first floor side extension would be sited above the existing ground floor side extension on the site and so would be sited approx. 2.6 metres from the boundary with no.9 Kingston Grove. As such, the 1.52 metre gap as prescribed would be adhered to and as the extension would be set back 2 metres from the primary elevation, it is considered to exceed such policy and therefore be considered acceptable in scale.

In short, the proposed design and scale of the proposal is considered pursuant in regard to the resultant appearance and so would be considered contrary to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and EN1.

Off Street Parking

Adequate parking will remain as a result of the proposal. No concern is raised in respect of this.

Bin Storage

Adequate space would remain for bins to be stored along the side of the property. No information is required in respect of bin storage.

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

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, guided the applicant through issues arising with the application and appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

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:

-Application Form, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 January 2026.

-Location Plan, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 January 2026.

-Proposed- Floor Plans, numbered NA-P03, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 1 February 2026.

-Proposed- Elevations, numbered NA-P04, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 27 February 2026.

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

3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be as follows:

Walls: red brick to match existing

Roof: red roof tiles to match existing
Juliet balcony: frameless safety glazing
Doors: black aluminum safety glazing bifold/ sliding door
Windows: black UPVC double glazed to match existing
Fascia/soffit: black to match existing.

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) The window in the first floor of the primary elevation of the development (bath) and the window in the first floor of the northern elevation of the development (en-suite) 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 Core Strategy.

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 re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors or other openings shall be inserted in the ground or first floor of the southern elevation of the development and no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be inserted in the ground or first floor of the northern elevation of the development hereby approved, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Informatives

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.

2) Coal bearing strata at surface

Development Low Risk Area - Standing Advice

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

9 Kingston Grove, Manchester, M9 6HD
53 Victoria Avenue East, Manchester, M9 6HP
51 Victoria Avenue East, Manchester, M9 6HP
5 Kingston Grove, Manchester, M9 6HD
55 Victoria Avenue East, Manchester, M9 6HP

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
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA