

PLANNING

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

Application no. 143428/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 12 August 2025

Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension, gable to front elevation and dormer to rear

Address: 63 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WF

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr Kamran Nadeem

Agent (if any): Mr Muthahar Khan, Studio Tashkeel Architecture

Case officer: Joshua Lee
Tel: 0161 219 2851
Email: joshua.lee@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 05 November 2025

APPLICATION DETAILS

Type of application:	Full Householder Application	
Development type:	Householder	
Date of site visit:	04 September 2025	
Standard consultations:	Printed: 20 August 2025	Expired: 11 September 2025
Neighbour notifications:	Printed: 20 August 2025	Expired: 11 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	
Listed building:	Not applicable	
Conservation area:	Not applicable	
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable	

Description of site/building

The proposal is related to a two-storey semidetached dwelling house on Manley Road. The property features an existing single storey rear extension and further conservatory extension along with an attached side garage and detached garage to the rear of the garden. The property features hardstanding to the front for off street vehicle parking.

Description of area

The property is in a mostly residential part of the Chorlton Park ward of Manchester. The site is within Flood Zone 2.

Description of development

Erection of two storey side extension, a part two storey, part single storey rear extension, gable to front elevation and dormer to rear

PLANNING HISTORY

121911/FH/2018

Description: Erection of part single, part two storey side and part single, part two storey rear extension, dormer to rear to provide additional living accommodation and outbuilding in rear garden

Decision: Approved 05/02/2019

104054/FH/2013/S1

Description: Erection of part 2 storey part single storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation including a bin store.

Decision: Refused 28/10/2013, Allowed at Appeal 04/04/2014

076923/FH/2005/S1

Description: Retrospective application for the erection of 800mm wall with 1600mm brick supporting piers, 1000mm metal railings and 1.86 m metal gate.

Decision: Approved 29/12/2005

074580/FH/2005/S1

Description: Erection of a 2-storey side extension to form car port with bedroom and bathroom over

Decision: Approved 21/06/2005

072155/FH/2004/S1

Description: Erection of single storey side extension to form garage and front porch.

Decision: Approved 24/08/2004

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Consultations

Manchester City Council Flood Risk Management

Manchester City Council Flood Risk Management were consulted on this application and required the applicant to provide EA Product 4 data. The applicant provided the product 4 data and on further review Flood Risk had no objections.

Notifications

Local Residents

No representations received.

NEGOTIATIONS

Issues have arisen in the consultation phase which required negotiations in positive and proactive manner.

- Set back to first floor side at front - given the proposed side extension is on the boundary we would expect a 2000mm set back at first floor to avoid terracing with No.65
- Set back to first floor side at rear - given the proposed side extension in on the boundary and projects beyond the existing side elevation a setback to the first-floor side extension would be needed to bring it in line with the existing rear elevation to minimise massing effect to No.65
- Dormer - the dormer would need to be reduced to sit within the main roof slope and not on the side extension part.
- Bin store - details of a proposed bin store including materiality is required.

Updated proposed development

The updated scheme

- Introduces a 2000mm set back to the first-floor side elevation.
- Pulls the side extension back to in line with the rear elevation of the main dwelling.
- The dormer is reduced so it sits wholly with the roofline of the original dwelling.
- A new bin store is introduced in the front garden.

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES TO UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Not required due to reduction in massing.

RELEVANT POLICIES & THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Relevant Policies

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 2004 states that applications for development should be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The following policies are considered relevant.

- [The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027](#)
 - o Development Management and Planning Obligations
 - DM 1 - Development Management
 - o Objective 1 - Spatial Principles
 - SP 1 - Spatial Principles (Partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)
 - o Objective 6 Environment

- EN 1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- EN 14 – Flood Risk (partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 4)
- EN 19 – Waste
- [Extant Unitary Development Plan \(UDP\)](#) –
 - o Citywide Development Control Policies
 - DC1 - Residential extensions
 - DC26 - Development and Noise
- [Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039-](#)
 - o Strategy
 - JP-Strat9: Southern Areas
 - o Sustainable and Resilient Places
 - JP-S1: Sustainable Development
 - JP-S4: Flood Risk and the Water Environment
 - o Places for People
 - JP-P1 Sustainable Places
- [The National Planning Policy Framework \(The NPPF\)](#) –
 - o Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
 - o Section 4 – Decision-making
 - o Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
 - o Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Principle

The City Council recognises many people want to extend and develop their existing homes to provide more space and/or better living accommodation. The principle of a residential extension is accepted.

ISSUES

Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials, and detail

The new addition is designed to match the style and features of the current building by using matching brick and tile to the existing dwellinghouse and matching window fenestrations.

The proposal is designed to be subservient to the original dwelling house by using matching materials and having lower rooflines.

The two-storey side is sufficiently set back (2000mm) from the principal elevation to prevent a significant terracing effect.

The two-storey side does not project beyond the existing rear elevation which helps to maintain a sense of openness to No65, furthermore No65 features an existing single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension further minimising the harm.

The ground floor rear extension replaces an existing conservatory and is alongside and existing ground floor extension at No. 61 minimising the effect to this neighbour. The first-floor extension at the boundary would match the first-floor rear extension at No61. Overall, the effect to No.61 is minimal given the significant extensions present at No61.

The dormer sits with the main roofline and would likely be accepted as permitted development. Notwithstanding this the impact on massing is minimal especially considering the dormer to No.61. It is noted that the dormer is to be clad in timber composite to match the existing roof tile colour. Although not the usual hanging tile, this is similar to the adjacent No.61 and is acceptable.

The property features large rear garden meaning there is a negligible effect to properties on the rear boundary.

Due to its size, position and location in relation to neighbours, the proposal would not create an over-dominant or overbearing feature.

Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale, and appearance of the proposed development.

The main proposed works are capable of being seen from the street. Given the position of the extension and the limited massing, together with the use of proposed materials, the character of the street would not be unduly affected.

The set back to first floor helps avoid a terracing effect to the semidetached character of the area.

The proposal is similar in size and scale to other buildings nearby, notably significant extensions at No61 and other properties in the area and would not therefore disrupt the area's existing features.

Effects on amenity

Privacy

The proposal includes adding bifold doors to the new rear elevation however given these are at ground floor and replace similar windows on this elevation the impact to privacy is minimal.

The new first floor and dormer rear facing windows sits within the original side elevations and given the distance to boundaries along with extensions to both No61 and No65 the impact on overlooking is minimal.

The new front gable windows would be no more harmful than existing windows to this elevation and similar to those at No.61.

The rooflights would not present a privacy concern given their location and limited viewing aspect.

Light

Given the two-storey side extension sits within the main elevations and the existing extensions to No61 and No65 the impact to local light is not significant enough to warrant refusal. The rear of these properties are also south facing so the properties get a good amount of light throughout the day.

Noise

The proposed extension is not expected to generate any noise beyond what would be reasonably expected of a residential dwelling.

Accessibility

The proposal introduces a new porch however doesn't create an accessibility issue to the property.

Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.

The proposal adds space inside the property with minimal effect to the outdoor area and maintains a good level of external amenity space post development.

Refuse storage and collection.

The proposal removes external access to the rear of the property, and the applicant has confirmed that waste bins are to be stored in the garage/bin store as denoted on the submitted plans. A condition has been attached to maintain this feature in perpetuity.

Vehicular access and car parking

The proposal doesn't change how vehicles access and park at the property.

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private

The dwelling benefits from a garden beyond the siting of the proposed development and maintains a good amount of private green space post development.

Flood risk and drainage.

The proposed development lies within Flood Zone 2 and constitutes a minor household extension of less than 250 square metres. According to the submitted Product 4 Data, the estimated flood level at the site is 51.71m. The applicant has proposed the implementation of flood-resilient measures to safeguard the property against potential flooding.

MCC records indicate that the underground Longford Brook/Nico Ditch culvert is located approximately 25 metres south of the application site. While the culvert is not directly affected by the proposed development, contractors should remain vigilant during excavation works. Any discovery of unknown drainage assets

should be reported to the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) immediately, and any alterations to an ordinary watercourse will require consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991. An informative has been included to this effect.

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.

CONCLUSION

The proposed extensions and alterations have been assessed against local and national planning policies. The design is considered acceptable in terms of scale, massing, and appearance, and would not result in undue harm to residential amenity or the character of the area. Flood risk and refuse storage have been appropriately addressed. Subject to the recommended conditions, the development is compliant with the relevant policies and is therefore considered acceptable.

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. There were minor changes required to meet the requirements for approval and the officer and applicant worked together to find an amicable solution.

CONDITIONS TO BE ATTACHED TO DECISION FOR APPROVAL

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 | 03 Nov 2025 | PL_04 C | GA GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR PLAN |
| b. | Drawing - Proposed | 03 Nov 2025 | PL_05 C | LOFT AND ROOF PLANS |
| c. | Drawing - Proposed | 03 Nov 2025 | PL_07 C | GA ELEVATIONS |
| d. | Drawing - Site Plan | 03 Nov 2025 | PL_08 C | EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN |

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 & of Places for Everyone.

3. Materials to match

The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to 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. Bin store

The secure and ventilated bin store for the storage of waste containers, including segregated and recyclable waste, as shown in drawing PL_08 B EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN, shall be implemented prior to the first use of the extension hereby approved and thereafter retained and maintained, in perpetuity.

Reason - In the interests of residential and visual amenity pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for Manchester.

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. Culvert

MCC records highlight that the underground Longford Brook/Nico Ditch is located within close proximity to the site (approximately 25 m to the south of the site), while our records are frequently updated to ensure the highest level of accuracy, the records cannot guarantee 100% accuracy for all culverted assets. Therefore, we would request that the applicant informs the onsite contractor to remain observant and to take the appropriate safety precautions during excavation works. If any major unknown drainage assets are found beneath the site, then further investigation works should take place to identify the asset and MCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) should be contacted immediately. Any alterations to an ordinary watercourse will require consent from MCC LLFA under Land Drainage Act 1991. The developer can apply for land drainage consent (if required) via the following link:

<https://manchester.civicapayforms.co.uk/Sales/LaunchInternet.aspx?saleform=drainage>

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES & NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED

MCC Flood Risk Management

74 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WB

Flat 2, 72 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8ND

108 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TU

Flat 1, 72 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8ND

76 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8ND

65 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WF

61 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WF

106 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TU

104 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TU

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 (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA