

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 145160/FH/2026
Date registered valid: 11 February 2026
Proposal: Erection of a single-storey front extension to roof design.
Address: 33 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Matthew Stevenson
Agent (if any): Mr Ian Grainger Blu Room Architecture
Case officer: Ciara Gettinby
Tel: 0161 234 3048
Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 2 April 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 9 March 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 16 February 2026 Expired: 9 March 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 16 February 2026 Expired: 9 March 2026

Site notice

Posted: 9 March 2026 Expired: 30 March 2026

Press advert

Published: 24 February 2026 Expired: 17 March 2026

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The applicant property is a two-storey, end terraced, C3 dwellinghouse. The property features red brickwork, white uPVC window frames and a grey roof tile. To the front of the property is a hardstanding driveway with the parking provision for two vehicles. The property features an existing front extension.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Cresswell Grove is a residential street situated in the Didsbury West Ward of Manchester. The property and surrounding street is located in the Albert Park Conservation Area. The conservation area is principally an area of housing but also includes a district shopping centre on Burton Road, a smaller group of shops on Barlow Moor Road, schools, public houses and a number of churches. The area also benefits from nearby green space such as Cavendish Road Park. The area also benefits from nearby sustainable transport routes including multiple bus routes and Metrolink tram stops.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the Erection of a single-storey front extension and alteration to roof design.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per appendix – no comments or objections.

West Didsbury Residents Association- no comments or objections.

POLICY

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 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, it is a key document for the local plan which provides a framework that planning applications are assessed against.

Policy DM1- Development Management

Policy SP1- Spatial Principles

Policy EN19- Waste

Policy EN3- Heritage

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)- The Government's own planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied.

-Chapter 8- Promoting healthy and safe communities

-Chapter 12- Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

-Chapter 16- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

The DRAFT National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)- The Government's new national planning policies and how they are to be implemented through local authorities. Whilst this is a draft NPPF for consultation it is considered that the development proposals are in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it.

Achieving sustainable development

Policy S3- Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy S4- Principle of development within settlements

Achieving well-designed places

Policy DP3- Key principles for well-designed places

Policy DP4- The design process

Places for Everyone- Along 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 (Bolton, Bury, Rochdale, Oldham, Tameside, Stockport, Manchester, Trafford, Salford, Wigan) and took into effect and become part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

-Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places

-Policy JP-P2: Heritage

Issues

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy seeks to ensure that any new built development enhance or creates character, meets local needs and enhances the built environment and its design, scale and appearance of the proposed development that is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 of the UDP for the City of

Manchester relate specifically to residential extensions and set out several criteria against which proposals for extension will be assessed. Although the latter policies are of age, they are of long-established practice with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks a high standard of design in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future residents.

Principle

The principle of erecting a single storey front extension for additional living accommodation is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes to meet changing household needs rather than move. Residents' homes should enable growth by providing sufficient space to accommodate changing needs and circumstances. However, consideration must be given to the proposal siting scale and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity, waste storage and parking.

Planning History

There is no relevant planning history.

Siting Scale and Massing

The front extension would project forwards from the host dwellinghouse by approx. 1.7m, the extension would measure 2.5m across the front of the property to meet the existing front extension. It proposes a mono-pitched roof which would measure to 3.2m sloping down to meet the eaves at 2.2m. This roof design would replace the existing roof form on the existing front extension to create a uniformed mono-pitched roof design across the application property. The extension would be set back by approx. 1.5m from the shared southern boundary. The development would also be slightly set off the southern boundary. The extension proposes the addition of one door and a full-length window facing out onto the street scene.

The overall siting scale and massing of the proposal is acceptable as the extension is understood as being subservient to the host dwellinghouse and given the remaining amenity space, is considered to be acceptable in this instance. The proposal is not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of introducing an overbearing feature into the area. The proposed site plan demonstrates the private outdoor amenity space that would be retained to the rear.

Visual Appearance and Amenity

The submitted application form confirms that the extension would be built with matching materials to the existing dwellinghouse. The roof would be made of matching roof tiles to the original property. The proposed door/ window frames would also match the existing dwellinghouse, as the property features white uPVC window frames. Although the difference in the roof design would differ compared to the neighbouring properties, there is already a precedent for this type of work within the street. Specifically, no. 36 and 25 Cresswell Grove who feature a lean-to roof design. On balance the use of a mono-pitch roof is considered to be acceptable.

The use of matching materials would ensure that the overall character of this property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works. The extension would be set back by approx. 5m from passers-by and would overall be a small addition to the street scene. The development would not be out of place for the character of the street as many other residents have benefitted from planning permission. The design and appearance of the extension therefore accord with saved Policy DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework

The extension is not considered excessively large or bulky in pursuant with Policy DC1.2. The submitted site plan demonstrates that sufficient private outdoor amenity space would be

retained to the rear, and the parking provision would be maintained. A materials condition has been attached to ensure that materials are adhered to pursuant with the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policies SP1 and DM1 and saved policies DC1 of the UDP.

Residential Amenity

The adjoining property, no. 30 Cresswell Avenue sits south of the applicant property. This property is considered to be separated from the development due to the existing front extension that is a feature of the properties. The development is not considered to give rise to any residential amenity implications such as privacy, overlooking or loss of light at the extension would not pass the existing principal line of the front extension. The change in the roof form is not considered to cause any significant overshadowing than that is existing to the neighbouring property and is therefore not considered to create an overbearing feature.

The non-adjoining neighbour, no 35 Cresswell Avenue sits north of the applicant property. The front extension would be set back from the shared boundary by approx. 1.5m. Given the modest dimensions and one-storey height, the extension is not considered to create an overbearing impact for the neighbouring property. Additionally, no windows face towards the neighbouring property and therefore the existing levels of privacy would remain between the residential units. The extension is not considered to create any significant overshadowing onto the neighbouring property.

Given the above reasons and considering there has been no objections received, the proposed extension should not give rise to issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. The proposal therefore accords with saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policies SM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Impact on Albert Park Conservation Area

Development control in Albert Park is aimed at encouraging development which enhances the prosperity of the area whilst paying attention to its special architectural and visual qualities. Property owners in the area are encouraged to retain the original character and detail of their houses. This should include the details, colour and materials of window frames, doors and other elements of the buildings.

The proposal would be sited approx. 5m from the pavement and therefore the proposal would be visible in the wider street scene. Additionally, the extension would utilise matching materials to those already featured on the dwellinghouse, which would provide a blended appearance with the existing property, minimising the degree of harm caused to the visual amenity of the area and the character of Albert Park Conservation Area. The extension would provide benefits in the form of improved and enlarged living accommodation for the residents, which in this instance is considered to outweigh any potential less than substantial harm caused to the Albert Park Conservation Area.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which stipulates 'where development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use' as well as Policy DC18 of the UDP, Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy and Policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone.

Waste Storage and Parking

The proposal is not considered to impact the current waste storage arrangements. The proposed site plan demonstrates that the parking provision of two vehicles would be retained to the front of the property.

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 8 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone joint development plan document.

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 applicant has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies in the development plan.

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

1) The development must have begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of permission. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990.

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

Drawing proposed site plan, ref- 09

Location plan, ref- 04

Drawing proposed elevations, ref- 04

Drawing proposed floor plans, ref- 03

Received on 11 February 2026

Proposed side elevation, ref- 05

Received 9 April 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) 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Heritage & Urban Design
West Didsbury Residents Association

31 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
26A Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 4, 26 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 1, 26 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 5, 22 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 4, 22 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 3, 22 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 2, 22 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 1, 22 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 3, 26 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 2, 26 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 5, 24 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 4, 24 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 3, 24 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 2, 24 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 1, 24 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
35 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
36 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
34 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
32 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA