Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	144495/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	11 November 2025
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension.
Address:	195 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ
Ward(s):	Didsbury West Ward
Applicant:	Mr Gareth Stephens
Agent (if any):	Mr Lee Harper, LH
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**05/01/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 26/11/2025

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 24 November 2025 Expired: 15 December 2025

Site notice
Posted: 26/11/2025 Expired: 18/12/2025

Press advert
Published: 2 December 2025 Expired: 23 December 2025

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building
The application relates to mid terrace two storey class C3 residential dwelling. The property is finished in red brick and features a front and rear garden; the rear garden is accessed via a gated alley.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
This section of Burton Road is predominantly residential, consisting of terraced family dwellings. The Withington Community Hospital sits directly opposite the site.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking permission for a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – no comments or objections received.

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 EN3 – Heritage
- 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
- DC18 – Conservation Areas

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
- JP-P2 – Heritage

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.
- Chapter 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Given that the site lies within a Conservation Area, the policies in Chapter 16 of the NPPF are of particular relevance. These include:

- Paragraph 208 – Local planning authorities should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset and should avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

<u>The National Planning Policy Framework December 2025 (Draft)</u>
The Government published a draft update to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in December 2025. While the draft has not yet been formally adopted, it is a material consideration and weight can be afforded to its policies. The following emerging policies from the draft NPPF are considered relevant to this application:
Chapter 3 – Decision-making policies

- DM1: Preparing development proposals

Chapter 4 – Achieving Sustainable Development

- S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Chapter 12 – Making Effective Use of Land
Chapter 14 – Achieving well designed places
Chapter 20 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

- HE9: Conservation Areas

Principle
The submitted application is for the erection of single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. 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 extension would be sited at the rear side of the property, infilling the area between the outrigger and the main house. The extension would measure approximately 1755mm x 4860mm with a maximum roof height of 3445mm, sloping down to 2940mm at the eaves.

The proposal is infilling the corner of the property and does not project out any more than the original building footprint, ensuring it is not overly prominent or overbearing on neighbours. As such, the development 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.

Residential Amenity
The proposed extension would not project out beyond the existing rear or side walls of the property, and as this is an end of terrace property it would not extend near to a shared boundary with a neighbour. To the rear, the proposal would feature a new large glazed door, with the roof of the extension featuring 3no. skylights, the side elevations would remain blank and featureless.

It is not anticipated that the proposal would result in a overshadowing or loss of light for any neighbours, the new rear glazing and skylights will not cause any privacy issues for the residents or neighbours.

In addition, no objections have been received in response to the application.

The proposal therefore accords with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity and Impact on Conservation Area
The proposed addition would be constructed in brickwork to match the existing dwelling, ensuring visual continuity. Both side elevations would remain blank and featureless, while the rear elevation would incorporate a glazed bifold door. The roof would be finished with aluminium-framed glazing, adding a contemporary element to the design.

The extension would not be visible from the street scene or wider public realm and is therefore expected to have minimal impact on the area's visual amenity. The use of matching brickwork will help the addition blend with the host property, preventing it from becoming a prominent feature. Therefore, the overall character of the dwelling and the surrounding Conservation Area would not be significantly harmed. Any impact is considered to amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Albert Park Conservation Area. In line with paragraph 206 of the NPPF, this limited harm is outweighed by the proposal's neutral effect on the site's character and its contribution to maintaining the property's residential use.

Accordingly, the design and appearance of the proposed development are considered acceptable and in accordance with Core Strategy policies DM1, SP1, and EN3, as well as Chapter 14 of the NPPF, given that its impact on visual amenity would be minor.

Conclusion
Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed extension 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 14 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 – Proposed Floor Plan – 11 November 2025 – ref: L200
b. Drawing – Proposed Elevations – 11 November 2025 – ref: L301
c. Drawing – Proposed Site Plan – 11 November 2025 – ref: L101

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. Materials:
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. Additional Glazing:
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 additional windows, doors or other openings shall be installed in the development hereby approved, 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

193 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ
197 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 2LZ
1 Stratford Avenue, Manchester, M20 2LH

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA