

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143009/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 21 July 2025
Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extension.
Address: 62 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: Mr Asghar
Agent (if any): Mr M Farooq, Building Design Services
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 6 November 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 28 August 2025

Standard consultations:

Printed: 28 July 2025 Expired: 18 August 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 28 July 2025 Expired: 18 August 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 62 Rudheath Avenue within the south Manchester ward of Old Moat. The application site relates to a semi-detached, two storey dwellinghouse, of an off white render and red brick construction. The site relates to a splayed plot and the property sits to the east of the plot which is triangular in formation with a pinch point and narrowest part of the site to the rear. Amenity space to the front consists of a grassed area, areas of hardstanding and an off street parking space and further amenity space to the rear consists of hardstanding and a grassed garden.

At the time of the site visit, works had begun on site.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature.

Description of development

The current application seeks planning consent for erection of part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extension.

At the time of the site visit, works had clearly begun on site. The works appeared to relate to the works shown within the current application (143009/FH/2025), although the fenestration within

the ground floor rear extension appeared to relate to details approved within the consent of 140381/FH/2024.

During the course of the application, the agent confirmed the works within the plans received 11 September 2025 are the plans the applicant wishes to seek consent for and the plans that would be implemented and built on the site.

The part single storey side extension would sit flush with the primary elevation of the host property and have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.5 x Length: 6.7 x Width: 3 metres. The part two storey side extension would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 1.5 metres and have a roof lower than that of the host property. This element would have approximate dimensions of Height: 6.7 x Length: 5.2 x Width: 3 metres.

The single storey rear extension would wrap into the proposed side extension and would follow the constraints of the boundary with neighbour no. 64 Rudheath Avenue. The rear extension would have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.3 x Length: 2.7 x Width: 9.5 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of two windows within the front elevation, a window at ground floor level within the cranked elevation relating to the WC and two windows and a door within the rear elevation.

Within the application form, materials have been listed to match those within the host property, however, on site it was clear the bricks used for the extension (multi red brick) did not match those within the host property (one colour red brick).

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The agent was advised the client must cease works on the site, until permission is granted for the works they appear to have began building.

The plans were amended to reflect what the applicant wishes to receive consent for. The agent confirmed a front porch was not being erected on the site, although it appeared as though a front porch was being constructed at the time of the site visit. The gable roof form proposed was amended to a hipped roof to overcome concerns of the LPA. Discrepancies within the site plan were addressed during the course of the application.

Concern was raised the development built so far was in breach of condition 5 of 140381/FH/2024 which states that the extension should be built of red brick and white render to match the host property. The bricks used offer a poor brick match and are not considered appropriate or acceptable in the locality.

On 6 October 2025, the agent confirmed the applicant is prepared to replace the existing bricks with an appropriate red brick and white render to match the existing dwelling.

Planning History

The current application does not have a medical exemption, but the plans do show an accessible toilet. The current application seeks additional built form at ground floor level to the side and rear extension beyond the amount of built form previously approved:

CDN/25/0139- Application to discharge condition 6 (Flood Risk Assessment) attached to planning permission 140381/FH/2024. Approved 9 April 2025.

CDN/24/1157- Discharge of condition 6 (Flood Risk) attached to planning permission referenced 140381/FH/2024. Refused 4 February 2025.

140381/FH/2024- Erection of a part single/part two storey side and single storey rear extension. Approved 28 October 2024.

This application sought additional space at ground floor level on the basis the extension would benefit the needs of the disabled resident.

138076/FH/2023- Erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension.

Approved 4 December 2023.

No medical needs were declared during this application.

098149/NMC/2011/S1-Land Bounded By Princess Road/Cavendish Road/Burton Road/Yew Tree Road And Mauldeth Road- Non-Material Amendment to planning approval ref 092620/FO/2010/S1 to allow elevational alterations to 515, 517, 565 and 567 Princess Road. Approved 16 January 2012.

092620/FO/2010/S1-Land Bounded By Princess Road/Cavendish Road/Burton Road/Yew Tree Road And Mauldeth Road, Withington-Overcladding of non traditionally constructed 'Diatomite' houses including exterior wall cladding, roof covering, new windows, doors and canopies. Approved 26 July 2010.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and one neutral comment was received. The neighbour raised concern as the building had been substantially built, but the planning application had only just been submitted and validated.

The application form states works commenced on 11 June 2025. The application was validated on 28 July 2025.

MCC Flood Risk Management

MCC Flood Risk Management Team were consulted on the application and reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Statement REV B.

The Team reviewed the documentation and on the basis of the 'Flood Risk Statement – Rev B' document, and the Product 4 data, details of finished floor levels/proposed flood resilience measures provided therein, the application can be approved with no further comment.

United Utilities Water PLC

United Utilities Water PLC were consulted but no response was received during the course of the application.

Issues

POLICY

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):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) 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 places.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

Policy DM1 (Development Management),

Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) (Deletions replaced by PfE Policy JP-S1)

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas)

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

Policy DC1 Residential extensions

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
- d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

DC1.5 The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

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 Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:

JP- S1- Sustainable development.

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted development application is for the erection of part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extension. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. The application seeks additional built form from the previously approved extension under 140381/FH/2024, which saw an increase in the amount of built form beyond that approved within 138076/FH/2023. Within the current submission, the amount of built form has increased. This relates to the ground floor side extension now sitting flush with the host property and the rear extension projecting 2.7 metres (1.5 metres previously approved). No medical exemption has been applied for as has been previously applied for. In this instance, it is considered the site can accommodate the additional built form. 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 extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

No.64 Rudheath Avenue:

The two storey side extension would sit to the west of the site boundary and would sit flush with the primary elevation of the host property at ground floor level and would have a set back of 1.5 metres at first floor level. Due to the triangular plot and diagonal boundary leading to a pinch point to the rear of the site, the side extension would be set 0.9 metres from the boundary at the closest point and 5.6 metres at the furthest point. The additional built form would look onto amenity space in connection with no.64 Rudheath Avenue, however due to the splayed nature of the plot, the side extension is not considered to create an overbearing feature to the neighbouring property. The additional built form to the front of the side extension at ground floor level would not alter the amount of built form that would be experienced by the neighbour beyond any harm approved previously under planning ref: 140381/FH/2024.

The bedroom to be created on the first floor of the proposal to the rear of the extension would look onto the rear amenity space of no.64 Rudheath Avenue. The window looking onto the neighbour's external space and proximity to the boundary could give rise to adverse overlooking implications. This is thought to be minimised by placing an obscure glazed and top opening window condition on any approval granted which would stop any overlooking implications from arising. Whilst obscure glazing is not preferable for a bedroom, it is considered necessary to ensure no overlooking. In addition, the bedroom benefits from a clear glazed window within the front elevation of the proposal and so adequate light is considered to be achieved for the proposed first floor bedroom. A further condition would be placed on any approval granted restricting the further insertion of windows and doors beyond those approved by this consent.

The rear extension would wrap into the ground floor of the proposed side extension. It is noted that as the projection of the rear extension is to extend to 2.7 metres (1.5 metre projection previously approved), the ground floor element would come closer to no.64 than previously approved. A window would be inserted in the disabled bathroom and would come closer to the common boundary than previously approved. However, given the window is set off the boundary by almost 1 metre, is at ground floor level and would be conditioned to be obscure glazed, it is not considered the placement of such window would be so harmful to warrant a refusal on the scheme. The rear extension would extend closer to the common boundary than previously approved. Although the LPA note the amenity space to the rear of the property is constrained and the rear gardens appear close in proximity due to the splayed nature of the plot, given the limited projection, the permitted development fallback allowing extensions up to 3 metres in projection and given the built form would be hipped away from the common boundary, the level of overbearing would not be so severe to warrant a refusal on the scheme.

No loss of light implications would be felt by no.64 given the orientation of properties in the streetscene as a result of the proposal.

No.60 Rudheath Avenue:

The rear extension would have a projection of 2.7 metres and sited 0.3 metres from the shared boundary with no.60 Rudheath Avenue. The projection of the extension has increased from the 1.5 metre rearward projections previously approved on the site. Given the projection would still conform with permitted development rights and given an approximate 7.9 metre gap would be retained from the rear of the proposal to the rear of the site, the projection is not considered to give rise to adverse amenity implications to the detriment of no.60 Rudheath Avenue.

Streetscene:

Given the side extension would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 1.5 metres at first floor level and the roof of the extension would be lower than that of the host property, the extension would be seen as a subservient feature and not give rise to adverse visual implications.

Overall, it is acknowledged that the planning permissions have sought to incrementally increase the amount of built form approved for the resident's use. However, it is considered that the proposal and increased amount of built form could be accommodated within the site, without giving rise to any significant visual residential amenity implications, namely overbearing, privacy nor loss of light implications. As such, the proposal is considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and JP-S1 of Places for Everyone.

Design, Scale and Appearance

Part single, part two storey side extension:

DC1.4 of the UDP requires the creation of domestic extensions which are subservient to the main house, do not cause a terracing effect and must provide a 1.53 metre gap to the shared boundary. In order to avoid the terracing effect and to ensure that subservience to the original dwellinghouse is achieved. In this instance it would be difficult to leave a 1.53 metre gap to the boundary at the rear of the development and create a viable side extension due to the splayed plot and pinch point to the rear of the plot. Although the 1.53 metre gap has been achieved to the front of the site, this is not possible at the point closest to no.64 Rudheath Avenue. No terracing would occur due to the splayed nature and relationship with neighbouring properties. Given there is a set back of 1.5 metres at first floor level and given the lowering of the ridge height, this element of the proposal is considered to be pursuant with Policy DC1.4 of the UDP.

Single storey rear extension:

The rear extension would have a projection of 2.7 metres and exceeds previous permissions where a projection of 1.5 metres has been approved. However, it is noted that an extension of up to 3 metres could be achieved in this location through the route of permitted development. The projection is still pursuant to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP as the projection does not exceed 3.65 metres. On balance, given the extension would not give rise to significant adverse amenity implications, the additional projection can be considered acceptable. The design respects the relationship with the splayed plot and existing boundaries. This element is therefore considered acceptable in size and form.

Materials:

Concern was raised the development built so far was in breach of condition 5 of 140381/FH/2024 which states that the extension should be built of red brick and white render to match the host property. The bricks used offer a poor brick match and are not considered appropriate or acceptable in the locality.

Within the application form, materials have been listed to match those within the host property, however, on site it was clear the bricks used for the extension (multi red brick) did not match those within the host property (one colour red brick).

On 6 October 2025, the agent confirmed the applicant is prepared to replace the existing bricks with an appropriate red brick and white render to match the existing dwelling. The LPA welcome such approach and a materials condition would be attached to any approval granted. Such condition would ensure finalised material details are provided for review by the LPA within a 3 month period and to ensure the bricks in question are removed from the site as per the confirmation within the agent's email. Given the applicant has agreed to overcome the LPA's concern in respect of materials, the application can be supported.

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.

Car Parking

The current off street parking space close to the shared boundary with no.64 Rudheath Avenue could still be utilised. No concern is raised in respect of off street parking provision.

Bin Storage

Space would still be retained for bins to be stored within the private amenity space to the side and rear of the property. No concern is raised in respect of bin storage.

Flood Risk

Flood Risk were consulted on the application as Flood Zone 2 encroaches the boundary.

The Team reviewed the documentation supplied to support the application and on the basis of the 'Flood Risk Statement – Rev B' document, and the Product 4 data, details of finished floor levels/proposed flood resilience measures provided therein, the application can be approved with no further comment. A condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

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

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

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:

-Flood Risk Statement, REV B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 21 July 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Floor Plans, numbered A2288/2, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 11 September 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Elevations and Site Plan, numbered A2288/3, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 11 September 2025.

-Correspondence- Approach to Existing Materials on Site, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 21 October 2025.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) Within three months of the date of this permission, details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with 'Flood Risk Statement, REV B', received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 21 July 2025, in relation to finished floor levels and proposed flood resilience measures provided.

Reason- To promote sustainable development and manage the risk of flooding. This condition is imposed in light of national policies within the NPPF and NPPG and local policies EN08 and EN14.

5) The window in the ground floor of the chamfered elevation and the window in the first floor of the rear extension 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. Any parts of the window that can be opened must be more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

6) 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 windows, doors or other openings shall be installed in the ground or first floor of the side elevation of the side extension 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

MCC Flood Risk Management
United Utilities Water PLC

70 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
64 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
58 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
77 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
69 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
63 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
24 Saltney Avenue, Manchester, M20 1DG
68 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
66 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
60 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
56 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PL
79 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
75 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
73 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
71 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
67 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
65 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ
61 Rudheath Avenue, Manchester, M20 1PJ

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 (More) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA