

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143710/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 12 August 2025
Proposal: Erection of a first floor side extension
Address: 24 Farley Avenue, Manchester, M18 7WA
Ward(s): Gorton & Abbey Hey Ward

Applicant: Mr Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq
Agent (if any): Mr Rahat Anwar RA Design & Project Management Ltd
Case officer: Jake Walther
Tel: 0161 234 1632
Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 30/10/2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 21 August 2025 Expired: 12 September 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 application relates to a two-storey semi-detached class C3 dwellinghouse on Farley Avenue. The property is finished in brick with a hipped roof and features a single storey extension to the side and rear and conservatory to the rear.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Farley Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac next to Debdale Park in Gorton. The area is predominantly residential, consisting of semidetached family dwellings.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a first-floor side extension.

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 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

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

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

Principle

The submitted application is for a first-floor side 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 first floor side extension would project out by 2650mm, spanning almost the length of the main house at 6525mm with a set back from the front 1000mm. To match the main house, it would have a hipped roof with a maximum height of 7246mm, set below the ridge of the main roof by around 300mm to aid subservience.

The proposal does not project from the front side or rear of the house anymore than the existing ground floor extension, makes use of setbacks from the front of the main house and a reduced roof ridge and therefore overall, the scale of the proposal is considered to be acceptable for a property of this size.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension does extend up to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property to the north. However, in this instance the neighbour on this side has a two-storey flat roof side extension up to the same boundary. Therefore, the minor scale of the proposal and relationship to neighbouring building means that any overshadowing would be kept to a minimum and the addition would not be overbearing for any neighbour.

The proposal features a window on the front elevation, and one on the rear elevation, with the side elevation is to remain blank and featureless. It is not anticipated that the new glazing would give rise to overlooking or privacy concerns as they are forward and rearward facing adjacent to existing first floor windows.

In addition to the above, no objections to the proposal have been received following the neighbour consultation.

Visual Amenity

The proposal would be finished in brickwork, roof tiles on a hipped roof to match the main house, it is relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Set at the side of the property, the proposal would be visible within the street scene and, as such, will have an impact upon the visual amenity of the area. However, the use of matching materials to provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, as well as setbacks and reduced roof ridge help to ensure that it does not form a prominent visual feature.

The proposal is setback from the front of the main house and the existing ground floor side extension to help reduce its visual prominence and demonstrates a clear effort to mitigate visual massing and avoid a terracing effect. It is noted that the neighbouring property features a historic two storey side extension that does not incorporate a setback and extends directly up to the shared boundary.

The neighbouring plot is set slightly further back than the applicant's property, meaning the front elevation of the host dwelling sits forward of the adjacent house. This relationship further helps to reduce the visual impact of the proposed extension. While some degree of terracing may still be perceived due to the proximity of the neighbouring extension, the proposed setback and overall design quality are considered sufficient to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Policy DC1.4 seeks to prevent the creation of a terracing effect where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street, therefore it is relevant to consider the existing built form within the cul-de-sac. Several neighbouring properties including Nos. 26, 28, 31 and 32 feature historic two-storey side extensions that do not incorporate a front setback. The proposed extension, which includes a front setback and a reduced roof ridge, represents a more acceptable approach. While some degree of terracing may be perceived due to the proximity of the neighbouring extension, the proposal is considered to sit comfortably within the existing street scene.

The design and appearance of the proposed rear extension accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed first floor side extension is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting scale and mass, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as it broadly complies with policy DC1 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapter 12 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 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 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 – Location plan, site plan, floor plans and elevation – 14 October 2025 – Ref: RAD/3378/25/1 REV A

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. Specified materials:

The materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form and drawings in type, size, colour, and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the structure. Pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

4. Additional glazing restriction:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional glazing, windows, or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted at the property unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residences, pursuant to policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

26 Farley Avenue, Manchester, M18 7WA
25 Farley Avenue, Manchester, M18 7WA
23 Farley Avenue, Manchester, M18 7WA
22 Farley Avenue, Manchester, M18 7WA
7 Elford Grove, Manchester, M18 7NB
5 Elford Grove, Manchester, M18 7NB
9 Elford Grove, Manchester, M18 7NB

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