MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	143533/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	11 August 2025
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey side extension
Address:	8 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
Ward(s):	Northenden Ward
Applicant:	Mr Keiron Aldcroft
Agent (if any):	Mr Lukman Vika Watson Saunders & Associates Ltd
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date of recommendation:	**27/11/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit:

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 15 August 2025 Expired: 6 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 detached two-storey family dwelling on Beechpark Avenue in Northenden. The property is finished in white render with black roof tiles; boundary treatment is white walls. To the front there is hardstanding for off street parking and to the rear there is a good-sized garden.







Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
Beechpark Avenue is predominantly residential, consisting of large, detached family dwellings.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – 1no. objection received, reasons for objection summarised as follows:

- Loss of privacy
- Overshadowing/ loss of sunlight
- Visual Bulk and overbearing design
- Loss of amenity
- Rainwater goods and roof overhang (gutters could overhang boundary)
- Side extension would make detached houses 'semidetached'

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

This application seeks planning consent for the erection of a two-storey side extension. Extending a residential property, via extensions including two storey side extensions in order to provide additional living accommodation is usually acceptable in principle. However, in these circumstances, the proposal would extend directly up to the shared boundary with the neighbouring bungalow property, and therefore the principle of development cannot be supported due to adverse implications in terms of residential amenity.

Sitting, Scale and Mass

At ground floor, the proposed extension would project to the side by approximately 2100mm, infilling the gap between the front elevation of the dwelling and the existing flat roof single-storey extension. At first floor, the extension would project out from the main house by around 4675mm, with a hipped roof designed to match and appear symmetrical with the roof on the opposite side of the house. The proposal would extend directly up to the shared boundary with No. 6A Beechpark Avenue.

In terms of scale and mass alone, the extension could be considered acceptable, as the host property is substantial and sits within a generous sized plot. The extension would not read as overly bulky or disproportionate when compared to the main house. However, the lack of any gap on the application site to the boundary with the neighbouring property introduces a degree of visual enclosure, this continuous built form along the boundary reduces the sense of openness between these detached dwellings.

Residential Amenity

The proposed two-storey addition extends directly up to the shared boundary with the neighbouring bungalow and is considered to result in an unacceptable level of overshadowing and an overbearing impact on the adjacent property. The siting of the host dwelling directly to the south of the neighbouring bungalow means that a two-storey addition on the boundary would significantly reduce daylight to approximately 3-5 habitable room windows within the neighbouring property. This loss of natural light would materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers.

In addition to the loss of daylight, the proximity and height of the extension would introduce an undue sense of enclosure and visual dominance, creating a domineering relationship with the neighbouring bungalow’s side elevation and its front amenity area. This would erode the established character of the area, which is defined by generous spacing and setbacks between large detached properties. The proposal would also impact on the privacy for the neighbouring occupiers, as the rear windows so close to the boundary would allow for greater overlooking opportunities into the bungalow’s rear garden.

For these reasons, the development would result in an unacceptable overbearing massing, oppressive overshadowing, and harm to privacy and daylight, contrary to the principles of good design and residential amenity set out in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, and saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Visual Amenity
The proposed extension would be finished in render with a black tiled hipped roof to match the main dwelling, and it would be set back from the existing front gable to mirror the opposite side of the property. Given the large scale of the host dwelling, the extension can be accommodated without appearing incongruous or overly dominant in relation to the main house. However, the lack of any gap to the boundary with the neighbouring property erodes the established character of the area, which is defined by large detached dwellings set within spacious plots. This reduction in visual separation between properties would impact the sense of openness that contributes to the street scene, resulting in a modest but visible harmful impact on visual amenity.

Conclusion
While the scale and design of the two-storey extension could be considered proportionate to the host dwelling alone, its siting directly on the shared boundary results in significant harm to residential amenity through loss of daylight, overshadowing, and an overbearing relationship with the neighbouring property. In addition, the absence of any gap between buildings undermines the established character of the area, reducing the sense of openness that is prevalent within the street scene. Therefore, the proposal fails to accord with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, and saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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: Refuse

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. Officers have worked with the agent in a proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application, whilst some issues were overcome one remains outstanding, and a satisfactory resolution has not been reached.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

Reason:
The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its projection, scale, height and massing and its proximity to the boundary with property no.6A Beechpark Avenue would give rise to overshadowing, loss of daylight and have an overbearing impact to that property to the detriment of the residential amenity that the adjoining occupants could reasonably expect to enjoy. As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD, policy JP- S1 of Places for Everyone (2024) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

7 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
5 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
3 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
14 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
12 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
10 Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL
6A Beechpark Avenue, Manchester, M22 4BL

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

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