

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141097/FH/2024
Date registered valid: 25 November 2025
Proposal: Erection of a first floor side and rear extension.
Address: 28 Sedgley Road, Manchester, M8 5AG
Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Miss Sophia Said
Agent (if any): Subhan Saleem, Saleem Architects
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 14 January 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 1 October 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 8 December 2025 Expired: 31 December 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 28 Sedgley Road within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The application site relates to a semi-detached, two storey dwellinghouse, constructed of red brick with some rendered elements to the first floor within the front elevation. The property benefits from a single storey side and rear wrap round extension, although the front elevation represents a poor brick match to that of the corresponding elevation of the host property. Amenity space to the front of the property relates to an off street driveway with the front entrance sitting at a higher elevation than the driveway. Amenity space to the rear takes the form of hardstanding, which again has a change in levels.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature. St Annes RC Church Crumpsall school sits further south of the applicant site.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor side and rear extension.

The built form would sit on top of the existing ground floor extension elements as seen on site. The first floor side extension would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 2 metres, would have a width of 2 metres and a height at the largest point of 7.6 metres.

The first floor rear extension would create bedroom 4 sitting above the existing kitchen and would be sited against the boundary with neighbouring property no.26 Sedgley Road. The rear extension would have a projection of 1.5 metres and a total height of 7 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of a window within the front elevation and a window within the rear elevation.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed and shown on the elevational drawing as:

- render to match existing
- roof tiles to match existing
- PVC window to match existing
- brickwork to match existing
- brick tint to be added to existing ground floor extension to match main dwelling's brick in colour.

Negotiations during the course of the Application

The application was made invalid as the works appear to be sited on the boundary with no.26 Sedgley Road but Certificate B had not been signed.

Further information was supplied in respect of the materials for the proposal and the agent confirmed agreement that the ground floor extension at the site would be brick tinted to ensure an adequate colour match to the existing property.

A conversation took place with the agent regarding the existing ground floor extensions at the site. The description of development references the first floor elements only and is the only element of works subject to this assessment.

Planning History

101928/FH/2013/N1-Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to provide additional living accommodation following demolition of existing garage.

Approved 5 August 2013.

****The works on site do not match the works as approved under this application. However, as such works were substantially complete prior to the 25 April 2025 and within the last 4 years, such works are immune from enforcement action.**

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and 5no. responses were received throughout the application.

3no. objections from 1no. resident received outlined the following concerns:

- Concern the side extension would give rise to loss of light/ overshadowing. Loss of light to neighbouring windows. The height of the extension would create shadows on neighbouring properties.
- Concern the side extension would create an overbearing impact which would dominate the boundary.
- The extension would give rise to privacy implications due to the proximity of the extension to the neighbour's bathroom.
- The proposed extension would limit the ability for the neighbour to build close to the boundary.

- Any extension closer to the boundary would result in odour and smell issues as there would be less space between the two properties.
- The proposal would change the character of the street and would create a terracing impact to the detriment of other properties.

2no. neutral comments requested a minimum of one Swift nest brick planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.

Issues

POLICY

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):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) an environmental objective.

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

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

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (16th December 2025)

The government has published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework which is intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making.

Of relevance to the application proposals the draft NPPF makes it clear that local planning authorities should amongst other things:

- Work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, where necessary seeking solutions to problems arising from initial proposals, to enable a timely decision.
- Take account of planning matters raised during any pre-application engagement, including any positive responses to this engagement, as well as representations on the proposals.
- Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and this means that for development within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

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

HC1: Planning for healthy communities (Chapter 16. Promoting health communities)

DP3: Key principles for well-designed places (Chapter 14. Achieving well-designed places)

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

Policy DM1 (Development Management),
Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) and
Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
- d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;

c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

Places for Everyone

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 Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:

i.JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted development application is for the erection of a first floor side and rear extension. Whilst such ground floor extension already at the site appears to differ from the previous consent for such works (see planning history for further details), due to the time passed, such development is immune from enforcement action. The first floor side and rear extension adds a further storey to the existing extent of development. The extension would offer additional built form to support the changing needs of the family. The proposal has been assessed against local and national policies and in this instance the principle of development can be supported. 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 extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures. Consideration will be given to neighbour comments received during the course of the application.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

No.26 Sedgley Road:

No.26 Sedgley Road sits to the east of the site and as existing feels the existing ground floor extension to the side and rear running along the common boundary. The extension to the side would have a set back of 2 metres from the primary elevation of the host property. Such set back is considered necessary to ensure the proposal retains a sense of openness at the site to ensure the side extension does not create an overbearing feature. The 2no. first floor windows within the side elevation of the neighbour's property would primarily feel the impact of the side extension. As such windows are obscure glazed and the existing levels of light to such windows would be minimal given the applicant property blocks much of the sunlight, any level of loss of light from the side extension would not be considered severe.

The first floor rear extension runs along the boundary and would extend approximately 1.5 metres beyond the applicant's existing rear building line. The extension would extend no further than the neighbour's existing outrigger. Due to the limited projection of 1.5 metres at the point against the boundary and the proposed hipped roof form with the height of the extension lower than that of the host property, it is not considered that the proposal would create an overbearing feature to the neighbour's enjoyment of their rear amenity space or create a tunnelling impact to the neighbour's first floor window. The neighbour's first floor window is obscure glazed and as such, any levels of loss of light would not be considered severe. This is helped by the orientation of properties in the streetscene as existing. A window would be inserted in the rear elevation of the rear extension and would project out 1.5 metres beyond the rear building line of the applicant site. Whilst it is noted there would be a window sited closer to the boundary with no.26 Sedgley Road than currently the case, such level of overlooking would not be overly dissimilar to the existing arrangements and would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis.

No.30 Sedgley Road:

No.30 is the adjoining property to the applicant site and would feel the additional 1.5 metre first floor rear extension sited approximately 3.3 metres from the common boundary. Due to the separation and limited projection, the proposal would not give rise to an overbearing feature. Due to the orientation of properties in the streetscene, any loss of light would not be considered severe. Due to the gap between the proposed first floor window and no.30, it would be difficult for overlooking to occur from this window and as existing, there is already a level of overlooking, which is not considered to be significantly worsened from the proposed development.

Properties to the rear:

An approximate 15 metre gap would be retained between the rear extension and properties to the rear along Moss Bank. Whilst it is noted the properties to the rear would feel built form coming closer to the rear boundary than currently the case, given the level of separation and the existing building patterns and close proximity of properties in the immediate context, no adverse implications would occur to properties to the rear.

Streetscene:

The first floor side extension has been designed in a way to have a 2 metre set back at first floor level from the host property and have a reduced height to that of the host property. As such, it is not considered the proposal would have a detrimental impact in respect of visual amenity.

The first floor bathroom window within the front elevation of the proposal would be marked as being obscure glazed to protect the privacy of the applicant and passersby.

Overall, any impact in terms of adverse amenity implications- namely overbearing, loss of light or adverse privacy implications would not be considered severe. The scheme is considered to be pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Design, Scale and Appearance

First floor side extension:

Policy DC1.4 of the UDP considers two storey side extensions and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. In this instance, it is not possible to leave a 1.53 metre gap and have a viable side extension. As such, the first floor is set back by 2 metres and so ensures the side extension creates a subservient feature and does not give rise to a terracing effect.

First floor rear extension:

The rear extension has a projection of 1.5 metres and so is considered pursuant to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP where the maximum rearward projection should be no larger than 3.65 metres. The hipped roof of the first floor rear extension ensures the roof is set back lower than that of the applicant site and helps reduce the bulk and massing of the proposal.

Materials:

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed previously within the report and would match those used within the host property. Such materials would be conditioned accordingly.

On balance and in this instance, it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development can be supported, in accordance with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1.

Poor Brick Match of Existing Single Storey Extensions

Discussions took place between the LPA and agent regarding the poor brick match of the existing extension to that of the host property. The applicant put forwards the idea of brick tinting all the elevations at ground floor level and such approach is welcomed. A brick tint condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Car Parking

No change to car parking provision would occur as a result of the proposal.

Bin Storage

No change to bin storage would occur as a result of the proposal.

Neighbour Comments received during the Couse of the Application

3no. objections were received during the course of the application from 1no. neighbour. Concerns relating to residential and visual amenity, and design and scale have been addressed previously within the report.

One response states the proposed extension would limit the ability for the neighbour to build close to the boundary. The extension has been designed in a way to ensure the first floor side extension creates a subservient feature. The planning process must respond to built form at the applicant and neighbouring sites and not speculative intentions to develop land.

One response states any extension closer to the boundary would result in more odours and smells as there would be less space between the two properties. Such issue in relation to smells cannot be dealt with through the remit of planning and should be picked up with colleagues in Environmental Health if necessary.

2no. neutral comments requested a Swift nest brick planning condition be attached to any approval granted. An informative to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

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 was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

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

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

-Location Plan, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 September 2024.

-Application Form- V2, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 25 November 2025.

-Site Plan- Proposed- Sheet 6, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 September 2024.

-Drawing- Proposed- Floor Plans- Sheet 4, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 September 2024.

-Drawing- Proposed- Elevations, numbered Sheet 5 REV B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 20 October 2025.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3a) Within three months of the date of this permission a sample panel of treated brickwork shall be prepared on site and shall be inspected by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt the sample panel shall be on the primary elevation of the single storey side extension adjacent to original brick.

b) Any required changes following the inspection shall then be carried out within a further one Month period and again inspected by the Local Planning Authority; those changes shall continue until the final finish of the sample panel has been inspected and agreed.

c) The agreed final finish shall then be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the remainder of brickwork of the existing single storey side and rear extension shall then be finished in accordance with the agreed details within a further 12 month period. The finish shall then be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the character of the local area, pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) The materials used in the walls, roof and all other elements of any exterior work of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to the materials used in the majority of the equivalent element of the host dwellinghouse, 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.

5) The window in the first floor of the front 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.

6) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors or other openings shall be installed in the first floor of the side elevation of the side extension facing in the direction of no.26 Sedgley Road, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Informatives

- 1) If the development can accommodate it, it is requested that consideration is given to the installation of Swift Bricks. Swift bricks must be fitted in accordance to the specifications of BS 42021:2022 - Integral nest boxes.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

30 Sedgley Road, Manchester, M8 5AG
26 Sedgley Road, Manchester, M8 5AG
58 Moss Bank, Manchester, M8 5AP
28 Maureen Avenue, Manchester, M8 5AR
60 Moss Bank, Manchester, M8 5AP
56 Moss Bank, Manchester, M8 5AP

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA