

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143401/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 15 October 2025
Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension.
Address: 4 Elmswood Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JR
Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Mr Trevor Lewis
Agent (if any): Mr Mark Valentine
Case officer: Ciara Gettinby
Tel: 0161 234 3048
Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 5 December 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 6 November 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 23 October 2025 Expired: 13 November 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 property that is subject to this householder application is a C3 terraced dwellinghouse. The property features white uPVC windows and red brickwork. To the front of the property is a small, paved area bordered by a mid-rise brick wall and gate posts. The rear garden borders onto an alleyway that runs adjacent to Elmswood Avenue. As existing, the property has a rear outrigger.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

Elmswood Avenue is a residential street situated in the Chorlton ward of Manchester. The area consists of family dwellinghouses of a similar age and design of the applicant property. The street is located east of Princess Road. The area benefits from green spaces such as Alexandra Park Playground to the west and Clinton Gardens to the south.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, to facilitate a larger kitchen.

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP)- The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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

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 become 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.

Principle

The principle of erecting a 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.

Planning History

No relevant planning history.

Siting Scale and Massing

The single storey rear extension would be sited east of the property and would project backwards from the host dwellinghouse by 2.16m. The extension would project lengthways across the rear of the property by 2.7m. The development would match the dimensions of the existing outrigger, extending this feature of the property. The roof height is proposed to be 3.5m sloping down to meet the eaves at 2.6m. The proposed mono-pitched roof design would ensure that the mass and bulk is reduced in terms of intruding onto the neighbouring property. The scale and size of the extension is seen to be subservient from the host dwellinghouse.

The extension proposes the addition of three new windows, two of which would face into the rear garden. One window is proposed to be roof light and both side elevations would be blank. The proposed would result in sufficient private outdoor amenity space retained to the rear of the property.

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

Residential Amenity

The adjoining neighbour to the south is no. 2 Elmswood Avenue. The extension would pass the neighbours rear building line by 2.1m. Although development would be built along the shared boundary, the one-storey element would limit the impact on the neighbouring property. Regarding sunlight, the extension is not considered to contribute to any overshadowing or reduction in sunlight hours on no. 4 Elmswood Avenue. The mono-pitched roof design ensures that the mass and bulk of the extension is contained onto the applicant property. No windows are proposed to face towards the property and therefore would not affect the existing levels of privacy between the neighbouring residential units.

The adjoining neighbour that sits north of the property is no. 6 Elmswood Avenue. Considering that the extension would be set back off the shared boundary by 2.4m and the one storey element, the development is not considered to create any feelings of overbearingness for the neighbouring property. The extension would not contribute to significant levels of overshadowing on no. 6 Elmswood Avenue. Additionally, the proposal is not considered to give rise to any privacy or issues of overlooking as no windows proposed would face the neighbouring property.

The extension is not considered to cause any residential amenity implications for the property to the rear, no. 3 Regent Avenue as the property is approximately 15m away and is separated by an alleyway. Although the proposed windows would face towards the property, they would be situated on the ground floor level and have an obstructed view of the rear property. The proposal would be in-keeping with providing enough private external amenity space. Overall, the proposal is not considered to give rise to any overlooking, significant loss of light nor privacy implications to the surrounding properties, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and the Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1.

Appearance and Visual Amenity

The submitted application form indicates that the extension would be built with brick and rood tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse. Materials of uPVC would be used on the proposed

windows and doors to match existing. The location of the extension, at the rear of the property limits its prevalence in the street scene. Additionally, the extension would not look out of character as many properties in the area benefit extensions under permitted development and 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 extension therefore accords with saved policy DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The rear extension is not considered excessively large or bulky in pursuant with Policy DC1.2. The location plan demonstrates the sufficient private outdoor amenity space retained to the rear. 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.

Waste Storage and Parking

Residents on the street utilise on street parking, the proposed development is not considered to affect the current car parking arrangement. Additionally, the proposal would not affect waste storage as the rear alleyway allows for the resident to wheel bins to the street from the rear of the property.

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:

Existing & Proposed plans and elevations, ref- 4EAM/001
The Location Plan
The Application Form

Received on 2 July 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: to match existing]*
- *[window frames: white uPVC to match existing]*
- *[roof tiles: to match existing]*

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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interest of residential amenity, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and policy DM1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

1 Elmswood Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JR
5 Regent Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JQ
6 Elmswood Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JR
3 Elmswood Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JR
2 Elmswood Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JR
3 Regent Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JQ
1 Regent Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JQ
5 Elmswood Avenue, Manchester, M14 7JR

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA