

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144511/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 5 December 2025
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension
Address: 2 Cranmere Avenue, Manchester, M19 3FR
Ward(s): Levenshulme Ward

Applicant: Ms Charlotte Dyce
Agent (if any):
Case officer: Ciara Gettinby
Tel: 0161 234 3048
Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 21 January 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 8 January 2026

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 December 2025

Expired: 4 January 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

The property that is subject of this householder application is a two-storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse. The property features red brickwork with white uPVC window frames and a grey tiles roof. To the front of the property is a hardstanding driveway and area of soft landscaping bordered by shrubbery. To the rear of the property is a moderately sized rear garden with associated soft landscaping. As existing, to the side of the property is an attached garage.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

Cranmere Avenue is a residential street situated in the Levenshulme Ward of Manchester. The property is surrounded by similar built family properties. Other dwellings in the area consist of semi-detached and terraced houses of a similar design and age. Many other properties in the area benefit from planning permission. The area benefits from sustainable travel links nearby and pockets of green infrastructure, including Greenbank Park to the south and Nutsford Vale Park to the north.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension. This would facilitate a ground floor bathroom and enlarged living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per appendix 1- 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Unitary Development Plan (UDP)- The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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

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

The DRAFT National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)- The Government's new national planning policies and how they are considered 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- 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 (Bolton, Bury, Rochdale, Oldham, Tameside, Stockport, Manchester, Trafford, Salford, Wigan) and took into effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21 2024.

-Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places

Issues

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy seeks to ensure that any new built development enhances 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 DC.1, 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 extensions 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.

Planning History

No relevant planning history

Waste Storage and Parking

The proposed development is not considered to alter the current waste storage arrangements for the property and is not expected to impact the existing parking provision for no. 2 Cranmere Avenue.

Principle

The principle of erecting a single storey rear 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. Resident's homes should enable growth by providing sufficient space to accommodate changing needs and circumstances. However, consideration must be given to the proposals siting scale and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity, waste storage and parking. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse, it is not considered that the conversion would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Siting Scale and Massing

The rear extension would be located south-east of the applicant property and project 4.1m in length backwards from the dwellinghouse. The extension would extend sideways from the dwellinghouse by 1.2m. The extension would have a total length of 5.4m across the rear of the property. The roof height would measure to 3.8m sloping down to meet the eaves at 2.9m. The rear extension would be set back from the adjoining neighbour's shared boundary by 0.6m and be set back from the southern shared boundary by 0.7m.

The extension would feature seven new windows, four would be bi-folding doors that would face into the applicant's private rear garden. Two windows are proposed to be roof lights which are not considered to affect the existing levels between neighbouring occupiers. One window would be inserted on the side elevation in the ground floor bathroom and would be obscurely glazed.

The overall siting scale and massing of the proposal is acceptable as the development is understood as being subservient to the host dwellinghouse and given the remaining amenity space to the rear, the proposed layout 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.

Appearance and Visual Amenity

The submitted application form indicates that the extension would be built of matching materials to the original dwellinghouse. The bricks would match the existing dwellinghouse, and the flat roof would be made of black planum roof tiles. The window frames would be made with materials of uPVC white double glazed. This type of development would not be out of character for the surrounding area as many nearby properties benefit from planning permission.

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 design and appearance of the extensions 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 location plan demonstrated 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 neighbour, no. 4 Cranmere Avenue sits north of the applicant property. Regarding sunlight, the extension is not considered to cause any significant overshadowing onto no. 4 Cranmere Avenue, although the extension would cause some loss in light to the neighbouring property, it would not be so significant to warrant a reason for refusal. No windows are proposed to face towards the neighbouring property, therefore existing levels of privacy between neighbouring units would be maintained. The one storey height, combined with the flat roof design and distance to shared boundaries would lessen any feelings of overbearingness for the neighbouring property.

Although the next neighbour of the property is no. 61 Guildford Road, this neighbour is not considered to feel the impact of the extension and would be separated from the development and therefore would not pose any residential amenity implications. However, no. 63 Guildford Road would be more exposed to the development. In regard to sunlight, the proposed is not considered to cause any significant shadowing onto no. 63 Guildford Road. Although one window is proposed to face towards the neighbouring property it would be obscure glazed and would not pose any privacy or onlooking concerns for the neighbouring property. The shared boundary is not considered to be open, as it features multiple outbuildings along. Therefore, combined with the distance to the shared boundary and one-storey extension is not considered to create any feelings of overbearingness for the neighbouring property.

The neighbour to the rear of the property, no. 1 Norley Drive is approximately 24m away from the proposed development. The development is not considered to cause any residential amenity implications for the rear neighbour. Although the rear windows would face towards this property the distance is considered to be acceptable from a privacy perspective. Given the above reasons, and considering that there has been no objections received, the proposed extension should not cause 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 DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

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 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 with 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 existing & proposed, ref CJD-BD-25 Rev 0
Drawing location plan

Received on 5 December 2025

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 as follows:
 - *[main brick: brickwork to match existing]*
 - *[window frames: windows to match existing]*
 - *[roof: black planum roof tiles or similar approved]*

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 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.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

1 Norley Drive, Manchester, M19 3FX
61 Guildford Road, Manchester, M19 3ER
4 Cranmere Avenue, Manchester, M19 3FR
3 Norley Drive, Manchester, M19 3FX
65 Guildford Road, Manchester, M19 3ER
63 Guildford Road, Manchester, M19 3ER

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA