

11 Princes Road
Heaton Moor
Stockport
SK4 3NQ
01614326464
07923015503

steveandsallylamb@btinternet.com

Manchester City Council
Planning Department
PO Box 532
Manchester M60 2LA

19th March 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application for single storey rear extension at 8 Eileen Grove, Manchester, M14 5WE

I enclose a planning application for a ground floor rear extension at 8 Eileen Grove, Manchester.

The property is lawfully occupied as a small HMO for which a lawful development certificate was issued on 30 July 2025 (Application No. 143595/LE/2025) and this will continue after the completion of the extension.

The proposal is to provide a full width single storey L-shaped rear extension, as shown on the proposed plans. The proposed roof mounted solar pv, which is permitted development, is also shown on the plans, for completeness and information only.

The property has permitted development rights to extend with two separate unattached single storey rear extensions, along with a rear dormer extension, which has been confirmed by the Lawful Development Certificate (Application No: 144950/LP/2026) dated 9th March 2026. This provides a valid fall-back option, which is a material consideration to the determination of this application. The plans of this development are included with the application.

The current proposal provides significantly improved internal living conditions for the occupiers, with a more spacious kitchen/dining room, to create a high standard of accommodation. The improvement has no effect on the occupancy number of the property, which will remain at 5 people and is entirely qualitative in purpose. As such the proposal is in accordance with Policy H11 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

The main difference between the proposed extension and the fall-back option, is the addition of a 1.3m extension along the boundary with 10 Eileen Grove. This addition is still less than a 3m rear extension from the original rear wall, which is allowed

under permitted development rights and is a recognised acceptable size of extension on a neighbouring boundary. Moreover, in this case the extension is to the north of 10 Eileen Grove, so has no adverse effect on sunlight to that property.

Given that the fall-back provides a viable alternative that will be undertaken, if the current proposal is not accepted; the incremental difference of the development now proposed, creates no material adverse reason to refuse the application, which would only thwart the desire to improve the living standards of the occupiers. The proposal is therefore justified on planning merit.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me, otherwise I look forward to your determination of the application.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Lamb DipTP MRTPI

Planning Consultant