

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143041/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 9 December 2025
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension.
Address: 155 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LD
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Anthony Noble
Agent (if any):
Case officer: Robert Tyrer
Tel: 0161 234 4068
Email: robert.tyrer@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 27 January 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 12 January 2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 11 December 2025 Expired: 4 January 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 December 2025 Expired: 4 January 2026

Site notice

Posted: 12 December 2025 Expired: 5 January 2026

Press advert

Published: 16 December 2025 Expired: 9 January 2026

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Application site relates to three storey end-terraced dwellinghouse located on the corner of Burton Road and Beaufort Avenue.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The surrounding area forms part of West Didsbury local centre and Albert Park Conservation area. It is principally an area of housing but also includes shops on both Burton Road and Barlow Moor Road, schools, public houses, restaurants, bars and churches.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity – A site notice and press advert were published, and notification letters were sent to surrounding properties (see Appendix 1 for the full list).

Local residents/public opinion – Two representations were received.

The first sought clarification on matters including whether there is an east-facing first-floor side window and the height of the external stairs, as these elements have the potential to create overlooking into neighbouring gardens.

The second representation raised an objection on the grounds that the extension overlooks the neighbouring garden and has, as a result, devalued their property. It was also noted that a trellis has been installed, which they consider to be an omission acknowledging that the extension affects the neighbouring occupiers' privacy and dignity. They argue that the trellis is insufficient in preventing views into their garden. The representation requests amendments to the proposal, including lowering the door so that it sits below the height of the garden wall.

The comments also express concern that the extension constitutes an illegal development and sets a dangerous precedent for overdevelopment within the conservation area.

West Didsbury Residents Association (WDRA) – WDRA have raised concerns and objection to the extension.

WDRA note that the extension exceeds the dimensions of the previous utility room, which they believe was constructed in the 1990s, although they have been unable to locate any planning applications relating to it.

They also state that the rear alleyway wall has been rebuilt and incorporated into the extension, creating an oppressive addition to the property, particularly for No. 3 Beaufort Avenue, as it casts additional shadow over the small rear yard, which is the only amenity space for the three flats. Although the rear door is of solid construction and a trellis has been installed along the shared boundary, WDRA consider that there is still a loss of privacy for users of the rear yard from persons using the extension door or lingering within the doorway. WDRA believe that, had the applicant submitted a planning application before building the extension, this issue could have been identified and resolved.

As the extension has already been constructed, they request that the door be lowered or that a canopy with an obscure overhang be added above the door to prevent direct overlooking into the rear garden/yard.

WDRA also raise concern that, despite the application form stating that no hedges would be removed, an evergreen hedge has been felled and replaced with a low brick wall. They note that the hedge previously provided screening and helped absorb noise and traffic pollution from Burton Road. They therefore request that the hedge be reinstated.

City Arborist – No further comments, following clarification regarding the proposed works.

Heritage and Urban Design - The brickwork mismatch causes minimal, less than substantial harm, which should reduce as the brick weathers. The roof changes, including the rooflight, have a negligible impact on the conservation area. Overall, the modest proposals would, on balance, preserve the conservation area in line with national and local policy.

Legislative Issues

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF (updated December 2024) sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, i.e., the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and accompanying policies, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasizes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-making, this means:

- Approving development proposals that align with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the key policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 1. Policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusal.
 2. The adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the NPPF as a whole

Paragraphs 202, 207, 208, 210 and 212 of the NPPF requires that new development should protect and enhance the historic environment. Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking improvements in the quality of the historic environment, replacing poor design with better design that makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness

Regional Policy

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039

On the 21st of March 2024, nine of the ten Greater Manchester Councils voted to adopt the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039 (PfEJDP); Manchester City Council is one of the Council's that has voted to adopt the plan. The PfEJDP has superseded parts of some of the policies contained within the Council's Core Strategy.

The relevant PfEJDP policy is as follows:

JP-S1: Sustainable Development

Focuses on ensuring that all new developments contribute to sustainable development. This means balancing social, economic, and environmental objectives to create resilient and thriving communities.

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Aims to create places that are not only sustainable but also resilient, safe, and capable of adapting to major environmental and economic changes. This policy emphasizes the importance of designing out crime, reducing opportunities for anti-social behaviour, and ensuring that developments make appropriate provisions for emergencies.

JP-P2 Heritage

Aims to positively conserve, sustain and enhance our historic environment and heritage assets and their settings. Opportunities will be pursued to aid the promotion, enjoyment, understanding and interpretation of heritage assets, as a means of maximising wider public benefits and reinforcing Greater Manchester's distinct character, identity and sense of place.

Local Policy

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant Core Strategy policies for this application are as follows:

Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

Development in all parts of the City should make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including creating well designed places that enhance or create character and protect and enhance the built and natural environment.

DM1 – Development Management 1

Focuses on ensuring high-quality design in new developments. It sets out criteria to assess the design, scale, and appearance of proposals to ensure they enhance or create character and protect the built environment. Key considerations include:

- **Design Quality:** Ensuring developments are visually appealing and contribute positively to the local area.
- **Context Appropriateness:** Making sure the design, scale, and appearance are suitable for the surrounding context.
- **Sustainability:** Promoting sustainable design and construction practices.
- **Amenity Protection:** Safeguarding the amenity of existing and future occupants

EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas

All development in Manchester will be expected to follow the seven principles of urban design, as identified in national planning guidance and opportunities for good design to enhance the overall image of the City should be fully realised,

The application site is located within the Southern Character Area

EN3 – Heritage

Through the City, the Council will encourage development that complements and takes advantages of the distinct historic and heritage features of its districts and neighbourhoods include those of the City Centre.

The relevant UDP policies for this application are:

DC 1.1 – 1.4 – Residential Extensions

Focus on residential extensions and set out criteria for assessing proposals.

DC18.1 – Conservation Areas

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

Adopted in 2007, the SPD provides comprehensive planning guidance to support and enhance the development of the city. For example, the SPD aims to ensure attractive, well-designed, and well-maintained neighbourhoods that support sustainable development and community well-being.

Planning History

There has only been one previous application at this property for a change of use of a dwellinghouse to a ground floor shop with living accommodation over. The application, reference 021739 was refused on the 4 July 1984.

Retrospective Application

The applicant has submitted a retrospective householder planning application to retain a single-storey side extension that was constructed between April and May 2025. The planning history of the site does not provide any information regarding previous extensions; however, historic mapping confirms that the existing single-storey structure is an addition to the property. Comments from WDRA indicate that an extension was built during the 1990s, although there is no evidence available to confirm the exact date of construction. Google Street View imagery also shows a single-storey brick structure attached to the dwellinghouse in earlier years, further demonstrating that an extension previously existed on the site.

According to Paragraphs 012 and 013 of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance on Enforcement and post-permission matters (Reference ID: 17b-012-20140306 and 17b-013-20140306), a local planning authority can invite a retrospective application (section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). If the Council, as the local planning authority, believes that an application is the appropriate way forward to regularise the situation. In this case, the applicant was asked to submit a planning application following an investigation into complaints about the development.

Whilst the Council may invite an application, it cannot be assumed that permission will be granted, and the local planning authority must be careful not to limit its ability to make decisions before reviewing any planning permission application, such an application must be considered in the normal way.

A person who has undertaken unauthorised development has only one opportunity to obtain planning permission after the event. This can either be by means of a retrospective planning application or by means of an appeal against an enforcement notice on the ground that planning permission ought to be granted or the condition or limitation concerned ought to be discharged, this is referred to as a ground (a) appeal.

Principle – Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) aim to ensure that new developments enhance or create character, protect and enhance the built environment, and that their design, scale, and appearance are appropriate to their context.

Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) specifically address residential extensions, outlining criteria for assessing such proposals. Despite their age, these policies align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which advocates for high design standards in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

In this case, the applicant seeks to retain a single-storey side extension built without prior planning permission.

To assess the proposal's acceptability, considerations will include siting, scale, massing, design, and appearance. Additionally, the impact on surrounding residential amenity, particularly the effect on neighbouring occupiers, will be evaluated.

The site is also located within a designated conservation area, in this case Albert Park and therefore consideration should be given to the proposal impact upon heritage and the conservation area in accordance with JP-P2 Heritage of the PfEJDP, saved policy DC18.1 and EN1 and EN3 of the Core Strategy

Siting, Scale and Massing

As shown in photographs 1 and 2, the applicant has extended to the side of the property with a single-storey extension.

Erecting an extension to the side or rear of the property is a common and appropriate approach. As seen in street-view images dated 2022 (Images 1 and 2), the extension appears to have been built upon the previous extension to the property. This has resulted in works that are essentially alterations to the existing extension, including changes to the height and roof materials, as well as the addition of a rooflight. This is seen by a comparison of the site photograph taken from Burton Road when compared with a street view image from April 2022 (Photograph 3 and Image 3).

This has resulted in an extension that is taller than the previously built structure, reaching a height of 4.25 metres at its highest point, with a lean-to roof that culminates in an eaves height of 2.7 metres. The sideward projection measures 3.15 metres.

Single-storey side and rear extensions are generally not overbearing to neighbouring properties because of their siting, scale, and massing. In this case, a lean to roof with a maximum height of just over 4 metres, the extension is not overly dominant and does not overshadow neighbouring properties. The scale of the extension is proportionate to the existing dwellinghouse and has resulted in an extension that is still subservient to the main dwellinghouse.

It is therefore considered that the extension accords with policies with SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP, the overall siting, scale and massing still maintain a level of subservience to the main dwellinghouse.



Photographs 1 and 2: Case officer site photographs, taken on the date shown.



Images 1 and 2: Street View images captured in August 2022, obtained from Google Maps (accessed 26 January 2026).



Photograph 3 Case officer site photograph of the principal elevation as viewed from Burton Road, taken on the date shown.



Image 3 Street View images captured in April 2021, obtained from Google Maps (accessed 26 January 2026).

Design/Appearance and Impact on the Conservation Area

The Albert Park Conservation area is predominantly an area of late Victorian era dwellinghouses dated in part by the English Bond red brickwork and blue slate roofs.

Both policy EN3 and extant policy DC18 state that new proposals should preserve or enhance the conservation area. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that new development should protect and enhance the historic environment. Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking improvements in the quality of the historic environment, replacing poor design with better design that makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

This increase in roof height aligns with the brick cornice band separating the ground and first floor, and the new roof join does not interfere with the scale or visual order of the original building (Photograph 3 (see arrow)). The new roof slate and window on the extension have minimal visibility from the street scene and have improved the quality of the previous roof without deviating from the character of the conservation area or being overly intrusive.

It is noted that the bricks used and mortar are brighter than the existing brickwork at the front of the property; greater care could have been taken to minimise any potential harm to the conservation area. Additionally, there is no clean joint between the two structures facing Burton Road, which results in the brickwork of the extension appearing somewhat disjointed. However, at the rear the extension is more successful in terms of blending in within the existing brickwork.

Given the overall size of the conservation area, however, the resulting harm is considered to be negligible and less than substantial. It is also likely that the new brickwork will weather and mellow over time, further reducing its visual impact.

Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with the NPPF, policy JP-P2 Heritage of the PfEJDP saved policy DC18.1 of the UDP and policies, EN1 and EN3 of the Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

The floor plans show that the extension is used as a kitchen and utility room, with a door and a set of three steps leading out of the property to provide access to the rear yard. It is clear from

the layout of the ground floor that this space forms part of the primary living accommodation for the property. Concerns have been raised that the doorway and steps may create privacy issues for neighbouring properties, in particular the rear garden of 3 Beaufort Avenue. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires that all development has regard to the effects on amenity, including privacy, and saved Policy DC1 of the UDP requires that extensions do not lead to an undue loss of privacy.

It is noted that the properties along Beaufort Avenue and Burton Road are townhouses built in densely compact rows with small front and rear gardens/yards. These townhouses are three storeys in height and, in some cases (such as the adjoining property on Beaufort Avenue), have been converted into flats.

As such, an element of overlooking is inevitable due to this dense form of development, whether from within the street or from the rear of properties. The rear gardens are enclosed by 1.6–1.8 metre high brick walls.

The rear door of the extension is a solid black door with no windows. The three steps provide access in and out of the extension, and although the door faces towards the rear garden, it does not create an opportunity for direct overlooking into any neighbouring rooms. It was also noted that there are no side-facing windows either to or from the extension. Furthermore, as observed during the site visit, the ground-floor and top-floor rear windows of the 3 Beaufort Avenue appear to be obscurely glazed.

The property is a single family dwellinghouse, by approving the extension it is not envisaged that the general activity at the property would be materially different to those of the neighbouring residential properties and thus the activity particularly at the rear would be no different to how it was prior to the changes.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Other Matters

Impact on Trees/Hedges

As discussed earlier within the report the extension appears to have been built upon the previous extension to the property. This has resulted in works that are essentially alterations to the existing extension, the footprint of the extension does not appear to have been altered and as such its impact on the existing trees would be no different than the previous extension.

Comments by WDRA specifically raised concerns that, despite the application form stating that no hedges would be removed, an evergreen hedge has been felled and replaced with a low brick wall.

However, a comparison between the street view imaged dated 2022 and the site photographs show no changes to the existing low brick wall, it is clear that part of the hedge has been removed but the applicant has stated that it was not part of these works.

Property Values

Comments received have raised that the extension has devalued neighbouring properties, however, whilst the scope of what can constitute a material consideration is very wide, courts have generally taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so

that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light could not be material considerations.

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 complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively and positively to issue the decision without delay. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 39 of the NPPF.

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

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Heritage & Urban Design
West Didsbury Residents Association
Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)

178A Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH
176A Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH
174 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH
Top Flat, 174 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH
176B Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH
176C Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH
4 Beaufort House, 1 - 3 Beaufort Avenue, Manchester, M20 1LL
3 Beaufort House, 1 - 3 Beaufort Avenue, Manchester, M20 1LL
2 Beaufort House, 1 - 3 Beaufort Avenue, Manchester, M20 1LL
1 Beaufort House, 1 - 3 Beaufort Avenue, Manchester, M20 1LL
149 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LD
178 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1LH

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