MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	144013/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	19 September 2025
Proposal:	Part retrospective planning application for single storey rear extension, front porch and change of walls finish
Address:	6 Birling Drive, Manchester, M23 2ZF
Ward(s):	Baguley Ward
Applicant:	Mr Pooriya Salimy
Agent (if any):	Mr Rashid Mehmood, I. Planning Services
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**20/11/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 14/10/2025

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 1 October 2025 Expired: 22 October 2025

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 application relates to a two-storey semi-detached family dwelling on Birling Drive. The property is finished in white render with black roof tiles. To the rear there is a good size garden with access via the side of the property.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
Birling Drive is a residential cul-de-sac comprising of terraced and semidetached two storey family dwellings.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking retrospective permission for a single storey rear extension, front porch and change of materials on external walls.

Consultations & Notification Responses
Baguley Ward Councillor Tracey Rawlins – Echoes the objections raised by neighbours and does not support a development of this kind in a residential neighbourhood.

Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – 9 no. objections received, issues raised in objection letters are summarised in the following points:

- Speculation that this property will be used as an AirBNB which is not supported by neighbouring residents – Could lead to increased disturbances and anti-social behaviour
- Overshadowing on adjoining ground floor window
- Safety concerns as the roof of the extension could allow access to the first-floor bedrooms of the adjoining property
- Potential traffic increases – putting more pressure on limited parking
- Change to external finishes is not in keeping with surrounding properties
- Objections to the outbuilding/gym of ongoing PDE application
- Extension in conjunction with proposed outbuilding takes up more than 50% of the garden
- Concerns over standards of the building work/potential damage to adjoining property floor and fence.

Scope of Application
In addition to this application, there is a separate Lawful Development Certificate (Ref: 144075/LP/2025) for an outbuilding to the rear of the property. While several comments refer to the proposed outbuilding as a concern, these relate to the certificate application and therefore cannot be considered in the determination of this proposal.

A number of comments raise concerns about antisocial behaviour associated with building work/contractors. However, the alleged conduct of the applicant or contractors cannot be controlled through planning conditions, nor is it a valid reason for refusal. These matters fall outside the remit of the Planning Department

Furthermore, a number of objections raise concerns about the potential use of the property as a short-let or AirBnB. However, such uses do not constitute a separate use class, nor are they part of this application. Consequently, these concerns cannot be given weight in the assessment of this application.

Policy
The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 –

The City Council adopted the core strategy on July 11, 2012. It is the key document in the Manchester Local Plan. The plan determines how Manchester will grow and forms the framework that planning applications are assessed against. We consider the following Core Strategy Policies relevant to this proposal.

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- Policy EN19 – Waste

Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

The Core Strategy replaced much of the UDP, but some UDP Development Control policies are extant (remain). The following extant policy is still considered relevant to this proposal.

- DC1 - Residential Extensions

Places for Everyone

Places for Everyone (2022-2039) – Places for Everyone is 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 and took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

The following policies are relevant:

- S1- Sustainable development

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- an economic objective
- a social objective and
- an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

Principle

The submitted application is for the erection of single storey rear extension and front porch to form additional living accommodation, as well as a change of materials on external walls. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter or extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed alteration would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

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

Sitting, Scale and Mass
The proposed front porch would project forward by 1190mm and span a width of 3100mm, with an external floor area just over the 3sqm allowed under permitted development. The roof would be pitched with a maximum height of 3220mm. Whilst slightly taller, the proposed porch has a similar footprint to the front porch it replaced and overall does not add overly increased massing to the front of the property.

The proposed rear extension will project back by 4000mm, spanning the width of the main house at 6700mm, with a lean to roof with a maximum height of 3520mm, sloping down to 2820mm at the eaves. The rear extension is only 450mm beyond the UPD recommendation of 3650mm, but given the good-sized garden, spacing between sets of semis, and the adjoining property sitting directly south of the extension, therefore it is considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of its dimensions and would not result in 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the property.

The proposed brick slips are minimal in depth and do not result in any noticeable additional massing to the property.

Visual Amenity
When viewed from the street, both the proposed front porch and the change in external materials will be noticeable. However, Birling Drive features a variety of finishes and colours, including render, cladding, metal roofing, traditional roof tiles, and a mix of properties with and without porches. Although the proposed brick slips would not match the existing dwelling or its immediate neighbour, the variation in the streetscape means the material change would not cause harm to the character or visual amenity of the area.

The front porch, while slightly larger than what is typically allowed under permitted development and incorporating a pitched roof, is consistent in style with other porches in the area. It is considered neither visually intrusive nor out of keeping with the surrounding street scene. Moreover, it is similar in scale to the existing porch it replaces, thus not providing an overly incongruous change to the street scene.

The proposed rear extension would not be visible from the street scene. Its design incorporates a lean-to roof, matching materials, and roof tiles to match with the main house. Glazing is limited to the rear elevation and roof. Given these factors, the proposal is considered to have no adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Residential Amenity
The proposed rear extension would include glazed bifold doors on the rear elevation and a roof light window in the roof. In addition, a new obscurely glazed window would be inserted into the side elevation of the main house, replacing the existing door. As the bifold doors would face the rear, and the side window would be obscurely glazed, it is considered that the proposed fenestrations for the rear extension would be acceptable in terms of their impact on privacy.

As with most extensions to semi-detached properties, there is likely to be some degree of overshadowing at dusk and dawn when the sun is lower. The proposed rear extension has a projection of 4m; however, as it is positioned directly north of the adjoining property, the level of overshadowing would be somewhat reduced and the extension is set in from the shared boundary to the non-adjoining neighbour. Overall, the impact on daylight/overshadowing is considered to be within acceptable levels.

The proposed front porch is set away from either shared boundary and is not overly large in terms of its scale, so it will not create any overshadowing on neighbouring properties. The porch

features less glazing than the porch it replaces, so it would not raise any privacy concerns. It is therefore not anticipated that the proposed front porch would have any impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The proposed external wall cladding would not have any impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents.

Parking

The current parking arrangements would remain unchanged.

Waste Storage

The current waste storage arrangements would be unchanged.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed front porch, rear extension and external wall finish is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as well as waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with policy DC1 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapter 12 of 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 polices 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. **3-year time limit:**

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. **Specified plans:**

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

a. Drawing –Elevations, Site and Floor Plans – 19 November 2025 – Ref: IPS/R/06/M232ZF REV B

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

3. **Specified materials:**

The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be those as specified on approved plan/drawing ref. IPS/R/06/M232ZF REV B received 19/11/2025 and the application form received 20/11/2025

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. **Additional glazing restriction:**

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional glazing, windows, or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted at the property unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residences, pursuant to policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

5. **Obscure glazing:**

Before first occupation the windows in the side elevation, as shown on drawing IPS/R/06/M232ZF REV B 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 remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

6 Ninfield Road, Manchester, M23 2ZG
5 Birling Drive, Manchester, M23 2ZF
4 Birling Drive, Manchester, M23 2ZF
4 Ninfield Road, Manchester, M23 2ZG
8 Birling Drive, Manchester, M23 2ZF
7 Birling Drive, Manchester, M23 2ZF
3 Birling Drive, Manchester, M23 2ZF
247 Firbank Road, Manchester, M23 2YG
245 Firbank Road, Manchester, M23 2YG
243 Firbank Road, Manchester, M23 2YG

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

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