

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143378/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 30 October 2025
Proposal: Part retrospective application for the erection of a front extension with a new pitched roof over
Address: 39 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Miss Victoria Ellis
Agent (if any): Mrs Dawn Winterbottom, Plans Drawn
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 18 December 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 25 November 2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 11 November 2025

Expired: 2 December 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 November 2025

Expired: 2 December 2025

Site notice

Posted: 18 November 2025

Expired: 9 December 2025

Press advert

Published: 18 November 2025

Expired: 9 December 2025

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The property that is the subject of this householder planning application is identified as 39 Cresswell Grove. It is the second property in a terrace of 4. It is 2 storey and of red brick construction. The front is open plan and provides off road parking space, having historically been brick paved. There is a timber dividing fence between the plot and the neighbouring properties of approximately 1 metre.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature and has a varied mix of house types, however these predominantly comprise of Victorian villa style properties constructed of brick with projecting bay windows interspersed with 1970's 80's properties. The property is within the Albert Park Conservation area.

Description of development

The proposal is part retrospective and is for the erection of a front extension which comprises of an extended porch with a change in roof design across the bay and porch to a hipped roof with a gable feature over the entrance door. The tiled roof is a grey tile and matches the host property. It has been constructed in brickwork to match the existing. There is currently a breeze block panel on the porch to the side of the door. Following discussions this will now be finished in a grey render detailing to match the fenestration to the porch area around the entrance door. The original proposal was also including render to the full front and rear elevation, however following negotiations, the proposed white render has been removed from the scheme, with the only render being to the front porch in a matching grey finish.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were informed- no representations have been received.

Issues

Planning History relating to 39 Cresswell Grove
143378/FH/2025 (current application under consideration).

Recv: 30.10.2025

Application Pending Consideration -
39 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH,
Erection of front extension with new pitched roof.

127389/FH/2020

Recv: 13.07.2020

Application Approved - 20.08.2020
39 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
Erection of a single storey front porch together with roof over existing bay window and
application of external render to the front and rear elevation

F17431

Recv: 22.03.1982

Application Approved - 26.05.1982
Site of 27-43 Cresswell Grove,, West Didsbury.,
Erection of 8 no. dwellinghouses on vacant land.

Residential Amenity

The characteristics of the properties along this row of houses have projecting single storey structures to the front of the property. The applicant proposes to erect a single storey front porch together with roof over existing bay window. This would adjoin the existing projection to the front at a measurement of 4.6 metres approximately across the front and 1.6 metres forward of the front wall. The total height of the porch and new roof over would be 3.5 metres at its highest point. This is considered an acceptable addition to the property, especially given that other properties along this row of properties have already set a precedent in adding a structure to tie in with the front projection.

The area is made up of different houses which vary in height and style. The predominant house type on this stretch of Cresswell Grove however is the red brick Victorian villa style. Some of the later additions to the property types have had rendering added to the properties, however those that have, are either semi-detached or detached, and have followed an approach where both halves of the semi have been rendered giving a balanced cohesive appearance. The applicant initially proposed to render the front and rear of the property however in the case of the proposal site, all 4 of the properties are of a brick construction, to both the front and rear elevations, and as the brick is in good condition it is considered that to render one property would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and the character of the property and terrace. It is considered that introducing render to the application property would not be acceptable in this instance. Following negotiations this has now been removed from the proposal. It is not anticipated that the remaining element of the proposal in the form of the single storey front extension would give rise to undue harm caused by the introduction of an extension to the front including from issues such as overlooking or loss of privacy.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene, however, the character of the remainder of the 4 properties within the terrace have

changed over time as the houses in the immediate vicinity have themselves altered to some extent, therefore the appearance of the extension is considered acceptable when read in the context of the neighbouring properties and the wider area.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is modest and at single storey not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposal is in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the materials, these following the elimination of the originally proposed render to the front and rear elevations, are now considered to be in keeping with the property itself and those within the immediate area. The design is typical of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area within which it is located.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Impact on the Albert Park Conservation Area

In terms of its size, the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the conservation area. Material choice is set to be brick with the small render panel around the door/ porch and in such a small amount being introduced as detailing, is considered acceptable for a property within the conservation area, and therefore the proposal accords with Core Strategy Policy EN3 and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC18.

Refuse

The storage of refuse bins is not affected by the proposal.

Parking

There is off street parking provided by the driveway at the front of the property, which accords with the principles for residential extensions set out in policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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 / Agent in a positive and proactive manner in order to guide the application through all stages of the planning process and have resolved issues that have arisen whilst dealing with the Planning Application. The proposal has been assessed in accordance with both national and local policies and determined in a timely manner.

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:

03- Proposed Roof Plan received 7th July 2025

05A- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations received by email from the agent 18th December 2025

Location Plan received 7th July 2025

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the 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) 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 plans.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

5) The grey render proposed to the porch on the front elevation shall be a colour through render.

To ensure that the character and appearance of the building and the Albert Park Conservation Area is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1 and DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Heritage & Urban Design

Flat 2, 40 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
38 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
40 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
Flat 4, 40 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
Flat 3, 40 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
Flat 1, 40 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
41 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
37 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
35 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
38A Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
36 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH
34 Cresswell Grove, Manchester, M20 2NH

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) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA