

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144485/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 20 November 2025
Proposal: Erection of two-storey extension at the front; a single-storey extension to the side and a part single/part two-storey rear extension.
Address: 34 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LW
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Phil Smith
Agent (if any): The Extension Guys
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 28th January 2026



Application details**Type of application:** Full Householder Application**Development type:** Householder**Date of site visit:** 15 December 2025**Standard consultations:**

Printed: 4 December 2025 Expired: 27 December 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 4 December 2025 Expired: 27 December 2025

Site notice

Posted: 15 December 2025

Expired: 8 January 2026

Press advert

Published: 9 December 2025

Expired: 2 January 2026

Departure from Development Plan: No**Environmental Statement:** Not required**Description of site/building**

The application site is an early 20th century two-storey semi-detached property of red brick and render construction with tiled roof. It is situated on the south side of Ruabon Road and forms a staggered appearance in that no's 26 to 32 are set forward of no's 34 to 40. There are gardens to the front and rear with access along the side, off-road parking and a carport and garage to the rear. The site is adjacent to the eastern side of the Didsbury St. James Conservation Area boundary although does not fall within the Conservation Area.

Characteristically for this house type along this road the properties feature Arts and Crafts characteristics and have a catslide roof to the front gable with decorative porthole window on the front elevation.

**Listed building:** Not applicable**Conservation area:** Didsbury St James Conservation Area 1970**Tree Preservation Order:** Not applicable**Description of area**

The area is predominantly residential in nature

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of two-storey extension at the front; a single-storey extension to the side and a part single/part two-storey rear extension.



Proposed Front Elevation
Scale 1:100



Proposed Side Elevation
Scale 1:100



Proposed Rear Elevation
Scale 1:100



Proposed Side Elevation
Scale 1:100

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 – one letter of objection in respect of this application was received. The comments are summarised as follows;

- ☐ Not informed of this application by our neighbour
- ☐ Missed the opportunity to air concerns
- ☐ Not in a position to include any relevant photographs or measurements to support our concerns, happy to do this on our return
- ☐ Concern with the proposed developments impact from the rear two storey extension on light
- ☐ The existing rear wall of number 34 is already a metre forward of the rear
- ☐ The two storey extension comes in at a further 4.2 metres meaning it will extend into garden the equivalent of over 5 metres
- ☐ This will have significant impact on the light to downstairs kitchen and living room
- ☐ It may also impact during the Winter months on our upstairs rear rooms including the main bedroom/study
- ☐ Light onto patio will be greatly disrupted at the rear of south facing property

- ☐ Light is already at a premium during the Winter months, this extension will further impact that
- ☐ Requests application of the 45-degree rule; potential “tunnel effect” due to similar extension at No. 30.
- ☐ No objection to front/side development or a single-storey rear extension.
- ☐ Would like to meet Planning Officer after return (12/01/2026).
- ☐ Google earth show all existing extensions on the south facing garden, none of which are double storey to the length of this planning application, none affect light source on neighbouring properties
- ☐ Properties historically staggered to allow same light levels , no longer the case now
- ☐ Limited time to seek professional service, is there grounds for appeal

RSPB Swift Champion – if approved attach informative

Policy and Issues

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

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions and DC18 for Conservation Areas is still considered of relevance

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

- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- o Policy EN3 – Heritage

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.

JP-S1: Sustainable Development
 JP-P1 Sustainable Places
 JP-P2 (Heritage)

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025) – The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Governments’ planning policies for England and how these should be applied. A draft revised NPPF was published for consultation on 16 December 2025. The consultation period runs for 12 weeks and will close on 10 March 2026.

The draft NPPF proposes significant changes to the structure and content of national policy. These include a move to Local Plan-style policy sections, a clearer distinction between planning

making and decision-making policies, and the reintroduction of strategic planning through Spatial Development Strategies. Other notable changes include an expanded presumption in favour of sustainable development, policies promoting higher densities around transport hubs, and support for small and medium-scale housing schemes through a new “medium development” category. The draft also integrates Nation Development Management Policies, strengthens climate change and biodiversity policies, and introduces measures to encourage clean energy and critical minerals development.

Once adopted, the revised NPPF will replace the current framework and form a key part of national planning policy. At this stage, as the document is subject to consultation and has not yet been finalised, while still a material consideration, it can only be afforded limited weight in the determination of planning applications. In this instance, the relevant sections is outlined below:

Policy L4(Residential Extensions) – This policy states that development proposals to extend existing dwelling houses should blend effectively with the existing building and its immediate surroundings in terms of its scale and form; and maintain acceptable living standards for current and new occupiers in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

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.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History relating to 34 Ruabon Road

F06653 – Alterations and 2-storey extension side of dwellinghouse to form a garage with bedroom over. This application was approved on 24.08.1977

Residential Amenity

The proposal would see the erection of a two-storey extension at the front; a single-storey extension to the side and a part single/part two-storey rear extension. As outlined in the notification and responses section, a local resident submitted representations in response to the proposal.

A number of factors have been assessed in order to judge the impact of the proposal upon residential amenity, namely overshadowing and loss of light including impact of development from its projection off the rear wall. During the assessment of the proposal, the City Council raised concerns with regards to the first floor rear projection. The agent amended the scheme and reduced the projection in line with policy.

Front extension

The development comprises a two-storey extension to the front of the host dwelling, incorporating a porch at ground floor level with an extended bedroom above. The extension would project approximately 1.4m forward of the existing front elevation and span a width of 3.809m. It would not extend beyond the existing side wall of the property. The roof form would continue the existing downward slope, maintaining consistency with the current design, and would include a circular window at first-floor level and a new entrance feature to the ground floor element.

Ground Floor side

The extension would project off the side wall measuring 2.809m, in line with the front elevation of the property extending rearwards along the side and ending at the rear wall of the property. A gap would be retained to the shared boundary with the adjacent property no. 32 Ruabon Road measuring 750mm at the front increasing to 791mm at the rearrest point of the development. The roof would be hipped with the installation of a door and a window on the side elevation and a bay window on the front elevation; no window is proposed on the rear element of this extension. To prevent the potential to overlooking the neighbouring property, a condition for obscure glaze has been attached.

Ground Floor rear

The proposal would project 4.2m off the rear wall of the property extending across the back wall up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi detached property no. 36 Ruabon Road. Two sets of French doors would be located on the rear elevation leading into the rear garden area; no windows are proposal along the side elevations. The roof would be flat with the inclusion of a roof light.

First Floor

The proposal involves a first-floor rear extension projecting 3.5m from the existing rear elevation and spanning 4.8m in width. A substantial gap would be retained to the shared boundaries with Nos. 36 and 32 Ruabon Road. The roof form would be hipped and set down from the original ridge height, reflecting the existing roof design. A window is proposed on the rear elevation, with no openings on the side elevations. However, the applicant proposes to introduce two window openings in the original side wall of the property. These windows would serve the main bathroom and ensuite and are proposed to be obscurely glazed. A condition would be attached to ensure they remain obscurely glazed and non-opening (below 1.7m above finished floor level) to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Concerns have been raised by a local resident regarding potential loss of light and a tunnelling effect arising from the two-storey rear element. While it is acknowledged that the neighbouring properties are staggered, the retained separation to the shared boundary, together with the orientation of the host dwelling, ensures that the proposed extension would not result in a harmful loss of light or an undue sense of enclosure to adjacent occupiers. In addition, the applicant has reduced the projection of the extension, which coupled with the step-down in ridge height further assists in mitigating any perceived overbearing impact on neighbouring living conditions.

The additions reflect the Arts and Crafts architectural language of the original property, contributing to a coherent and contextually sensitive design. External materials have been selected to match the existing building, ensuring continuity in appearance.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and form part of the street scene. Whilst the front of the property would be altered, the retention of the catslide roof and porthole window feature, ensures the design remains sympathetic. The scale and siting of the extension is comparable to similar developments in the locality, and the proposal would not appear domineering or harmful to the outlook of adjoining occupiers. Two-storey front extensions, including rear and side additions, are common within the area, and the proposal is considered to integrate acceptably with the existing character.

Overall, the proposed development would not result in undue harm to residential or visual amenity. The design, scale, and siting are considered acceptable, and the proposal accords with Core Strategy Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, saved Policy DC1 of the UDP, and guidance within the NPPF.

Siting, scale and massing

The height of the proposed extension has been set below the existing ridge height of the host dwelling, ensuring that it remains subordinate in scale and respects the architectural hierarchy of the property. The overall size and footprint of the extension is comparable to similar developments within the immediate area, reflecting a pattern of growth that is consistent with the local character.

The proposal is considered to have been designed with sensitivity to neighbouring properties and the character of the area, including retaining a gap to the shared boundary from the side wall of the dwelling to reduce its visual projection and mitigate any potential impact on adjacent occupiers. As set out above the design approach assists in preventing the extension from appearing overbearing or intrusive when viewed from surrounding properties.

In light of these considerations, the scale and massing of the proposed extension are considered appropriate within the context of the site and its surroundings. The development is therefore deemed to comply with the principles for residential extensions as outlined in saved UDP Policy DC1, and Policies DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy, which seek to ensure that new additions are proportionate, respectful of local character, and do not adversely affect residential amenity.

Design

The proposal is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials, these are set to be matching as specified in the application form.

The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring properties at either side and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Impact on the Didsbury St James Conservation Area

Although the application site is bounded to the south by the boundary of the designated Conservation Area, it does not fall within the Conservation Area itself. The conservation area

boundary runs along the rear boundary where the alterations to the front elevation will not be visible. The harm to the conservation area will therefore be neutral.

In general design terms, the 2-storey front extension that comes forward of the original building line changes the aesthetic so that the prominence of the front gable and the symmetry shared by both halves of the semi is lost. However, the character is mitigated to some extent by retention of the catslide roof and porthole window features.

A precedent already established within the area, supports the view that forward projecting two storey front extensions would not be out of character with the local context.

Overall, the development is considered to result in less than substantial harm, which is outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.

Other matters

The objector has indicated that insufficient time was available to seek legal advice and that there was a missed opportunity to air concerns due to being out of the country during the consultation period. However, the statutory notification period ran from 4 December 2025 to 27 December 2025, and comments were submitted by the objector on 16 December 2025, well within the consultation timeframe. Additional comments submitted by the objector prior to the target determination date have been fully considered as part of the assessment process.

Waste management

The storage of bins is not affected by this proposal as adequate space is still retained along the side for the movement of bins for collection. Therefore, accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Current parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise. The proposal is considered to comply with saved policies DC1 and DC18 of the UDP, Policies DM1, SP1, EN1, EN3, and EN19 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the objectives of both The Places for Everyone Plan and 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 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) 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:

Received on 28th January 2026 numbered 003 Rev A Proposed First Floor Plan

Received on 20th January 2026 numbered 004 Rev B Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Received on 20th January 2026 numbered 007 Rev B Proposed Front, Sides and Rear Elevation

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy

3) 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) The window(s) in the ground and first floor of the 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. Any parts of the window that can be opened must be more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.

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 [additional] windows, doors or other openings shall be installed in the side 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.

Informative

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

Heritage & Urban Design

36 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LW

17 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LB

15 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LB

Francis House Children's Hospice, 390 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 5NA

32 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LW

13 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LB

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Conservation Area - Didsbury St James Conservation Area 1970

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA