

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144982/FH/2026
Date registered valid: 29 January 2026
Proposal: Erection of single-storey rear extension following demolition of conservatory.
Address: 42 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Ricardo Trenado
Agent (if any): Mr David Dixey, DSquare Architects
Case officer: Ciara Gettinby
Tel: 0161 234 3048
Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 23 March 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 12 March 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 6 February 2026 Expired: 27 February 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 6 February 2026 Expired: 27 February 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 and brown window frames. The roof is made from brown tiles and as existing the property features a rear extension and conservatory. Additionally, to the side of the property is a garage with a black, retractable door. To the front of the property is a hardstanding driveway with provision for one car parking space and a small area of soft landscaping. The property is bordered by a low-rise brick wall. To the rear of the property is a garden which is bordered by the Metrolink tram stop to the south and other residential gardens to all other aspects.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Lynwood Road is a residential street in the Didsbury East Ward of Manchester. The surrounding properties are built of a similar design and age of the applicant property. Many nearby properties benefit from planning permission and have undergone varying extensions and alterations to the dwellings. The street benefits from the proximity of the East Didsbury Metrolink Station, which connects the area to surrounding suburbs and Manchester City Centre.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The extension would facilitate a larger kitchen and a ground floor bathroom and cloakroom.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per appendix 1- no comments or objections.

Transport for Greater Manchester, *'The location of the proposed development has sufficient lateral separation from Metrolink that we have no comments to make from a Metrolink perspective in respect of this application.'*

Site Photos:





Proposed Plans:



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 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 2025)- 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 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- Along 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 enhance 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 DC1, 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 extension 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 single storey rear extension for additional living accommodation and the alteration of the front extension roof is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes to meet changing household needs rather than move. Residents' homes should enable growth by providing sufficient space to accommodate changing needs and circumstances. However, consideration must be given to the proposal 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 rear extension would be built south of the property. The extension would project from the dwellinghouse by 3.2m and extend along the rear of the property by 5.07m. The extension

would be set back from the shared boundary with no. 40 Lynwood Avenue by 0.119m. The development proposes a roof height of 3.5m sloping down to meet the eaves at 2.5m.

At present, the existing rear extension and conservatory projects 2.9m from the original dwellinghouse and expands across the rear of the property by approximately 5m. The existing development offers two differing roof heights. The proposed extension would replicate the existing footprint of the conservatory and extension.

The proposed extension would include a reconfiguration of fenestration, including the addition of a roof light, and the insertion of a window on the rear elevation. The proposal would be retaining one window on the rear elevation and a window and door on the side elevation.

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, 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. The proposed site plan demonstrates the private outdoor amenity space that would be retained to the rear.

Residential Amenity

The adjoining property, no. 40 Lynwood Avenue sits west of the applicant property. Regarding sunlight, the development is not considered to create any significant additional overshadowing than is already existing. The extension is not considered to interrupt the existing path of light established by the outrigger and conservatory. The extension would be set back from the adjoining boundary by 0.119m and is not considered to cause an overbearing feature as the existing extension would reduce the impact of the proposed. Additionally, as existing the neighbouring property features a conservatory and rear extension. The proposed extension would approximately match the neighbours existing rear building line. No windows are proposed to face towards the neighbouring property and therefore would not affect the existing levels of privacy between the neighbouring properties.

The non-adjoining property, no 44 Lynwood Avenue sits southeast of the applicant property. As existing, this property features a rear extension. The proposed extension would not pass the neighbour's existing rear building line and would be set back from the shared boundary by approx. 2.1m. The extension does include a window and door in the side elevation that is existing at present. The window and door would face towards the blank elevation of the neighbour's side extension is not considered to create any significant overlooking towards the neighbouring property. The side elevation window would be obscurely glazed to reduce any perceived onlooking, which would be attached as a condition to the planning permission.

Given the above reasons and considering there has been no objections received, the proposed extension should not give 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 SM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appearance and Visual Amenity

The submitted application form indicates that the extension would be built with brickwork to match the existing property. The roof tiles would be made of clay tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse's roof and uPVC would be used as matching materials to the existing doors and windows of the property. The use of matching materials would ensure that the extension look subservient to the dwellinghouse. The proposed extension is considered to be an improvement to the existing appearance of the rear of the property, as the existing conservatory is in a state

of disrepair. The addition of the extension would also provide a more uniform appearance across the rear of the property. The extension would not be visible from the street scene and would not be out of place for the character of the street as many other residents have benefitted from planning permission. The design and appearance of the extension therefore accord 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 submitted site plan demonstrates 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.

Waste Storage and Parking

The proposed is not considered to impact the existing parking arrangements to the front of the property which would retain one car parking space. The extension would not impact the existing waste storage arrangements.

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 8 and 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 in 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:

Location Plan

Proposed Site Plan, ref- 2521-01

Proposed Plans, Elevations and Section, ref- 2521-03

Received 19 January 2026

Application form

Received 29 January 2026

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 walls, roof or other element 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 existing building, 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.

- (4) The window on 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

Transport For Greater Manchester

40 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ

44 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ

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