

Planning

Delegated Officer Report

Summary of application details

Application reference:	145336/FH/2026
Application type:	Householder planning permission
Proposal:	Erection of single-storey side extension; single-storey rear; hip to gable roof extension and associated rear dormer including installation of solar panels and rooflights and external wall insulation to all external walls and associated elevational alterations.
Site address:	15 East Meade Manchester M21 8GA
Ward(s):	Chorlton
Date application valid:	20 April 2026
Applicant name:	Mr and Mrs Nathan and Cora Fordham
Agent (if any):	Mrs Paula Butterfield Groves
Case officer:	Holly Wright
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	11 June 2026

Description of site, building and/or area

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of redbrick and white render with a red concrete tile hipped roof with gable end roof forms to the front and rear. The property features white timber-framed windows, including a ground floor projecting bay to the front, an inset front porch, a front garden bordered by a mid-level brick wall, a two-storey rear outrigger, and a detached outbuilding situated within a modest rear garden.

East Meade is a residential street situated within the Chorltonville Conservation Area in the Chorlton ward of Manchester, close to Chorlton Park, Barlow Moor Road (A5145), and Chorlton Green. The area is predominantly residential in terms of its character, consisting of detached and semi-detached dwellinghouses, and benefits from its proximity to public outdoor amenity and green spaces.

The Chorltonville Conservation Area consists of a small garden village constructed in the early 1900s, predominantly characterised by detached and semi-detached family dwellinghouses of brick and render in the Arts and Crafts style.







Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the “Erection of single-storey side extension; single-storey rear; hip to gable roof extension and associated rear dormer including installation of solar panels and rooflights and external wall insulation to all external walls and associated elevational alterations”.

It is noted that the planning permission was previously granted under 143377/FH/2025 for the “Erection of single storey rear extension, installation of dormer with hip to gable conversion, and associated elevational alterations and demolition of existing detached garage”, however, as these elements have not yet been substantially completed at the site, they have been included within the current application.

Consultation, notification and publicity responses

One objection was received from **a local resident** in response to the application; the comments are summarised as follows:

- No objections with the ground floor side elevation and other aspects, as previously approved.
- My objections are centred on the alterations to the roof comprising the formation of half-hip and erection of large box dormer, and the ground floor infill extension between nos.13 and 15 East Meade.
- I consider the alterations to the roof form would have a deleterious impact on the original house, the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and wider street scene.
- To me, this would introduce an alien and jarring form on a prominent corner plot with an insensitive dormer clearly viewed from public vantage points along Southgate.
- By removing much of the rear roof slope and formation of half hip and box dormer, this would adversely impact the character, significance and appearance of the Chorltonville Conservation Area.
- The significance of the Conservation Area has already been adversely affected by the placement of other box dormers; but none appear as prominently placed on a corner plot as the one now proposed.
- I consider the cumulative impact of the current scheme would magnify the harm already caused.
- The proposed infill extension to the rear could have a tunnel effect on the rear lounge window of the adjoining property. The proximity, depth and height of the extension could be overbearing and cause undue overshadowing to the occupants of this property.
- In addition, the proposed dormer window would likely have a direct impact on the properties located to the south of the site, in terms of actual or perceived significant loss of privacy.
- The Heritage Statement submitted with the application is silent on the ground floor rear extension and the alterations proposed to the roof. The public version is a resubmission of the

document submitted for an earlier scheme. This would indicate no proper analysis of the significance of the Conservation Area including its setting, has informed the development of the proposals and there is no publicly available justification to support the proposal.

- My objections are that the scheme is unsympathetic to the original dwelling, pair of semi-detached houses, the wider streetscene and the character, appearance and significance of the Chorltonville Conservation Area.
- It would cause significant harm to the health and wellbeing of neighbouring residents through a loss of privacy and overbearing impact.
- I feel this harm is not outweighed by any aspect of the submission.
- I consider there are no public benefits to the scheme and nothing in the balance to outweigh the harm it would cause.
- There is no Heritage Statement that can be viewed on line to show any analysis of the impact has been undertaken by the agent, compounding my concerns with the scheme.

Chorltonville Owners Committee – no response received.

Chorlton Civic Society – no response received.

Negotiations

Not required.

Relevant policies

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 – Residential Extensions
- Policy DC18 – Conservation Areas

The Manchester Core Strategy – Development Plan Document 2012-2027 (“the Core Strategy”) was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012:

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN19 – Waste
- Policy EN3 – Heritage

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.

- Policy JP-P1 – Sustainable Places
- Policy JP-P2 – Heritage

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024)

- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2025)

The Government has published a consultation draft of the NPPF, intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making. While this draft is not yet adopted, it is a material consideration.

- Chapter 4 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Policy S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Chapter 12 – Making Effective Use of Land
- Policy L4: Residential extensions
- Chapter 14 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places
- Chapter 20 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Policy HE4: Securing the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets
- Policy HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets
- Policy HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets
- Policy HE9: Conservation Areas

Assessment

Principle – the principle of erecting a single storey side extension, a single storey rear extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion with associated rear dormer, including the installation of solar panels and rooflights and external wall insulation to all external walls and associated elevational alterations, is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes to meet changing household needs rather than move. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity, the Chorltonville Conservation Area, waste storage, and parking.

Siting, scale, and massing – the single storey side extension would project southwest-wards from the host dwellinghouse, measuring to approximately 1.15m in width, and 2.3m in length with a pitched roof height of 2.658m and an eaves height of 1.82m. A gap of approximately 2.814m would be maintained to the boundary bordering Southgate.

The single storey rear extension would be sited at the back of the property, facing south/southeast. It would act as an infill extension between the existing outrigger and the boundary shared with the adjoining semi. It would project 2.9m rearwards from the host dwellinghouse, with a width of 2.8m, and a flat roof height of 3.3m. It would be sited adjacent to the boundary shared with the adjoining semi (No.13 East Meade).

The partial hip-to-gable roof conversion would be sited along the western/southwestern edge of the property's roof, featuring subservient dimensions to the host dwellinghouse, projecting no higher than the existing ridge line, with a length of 4.4m, and a width of 2.2m.

The rear dormer extension would be sited on the rear-facing roof slope of the property, facing south/southeast. It would measure to 3.4m in length/depth, with a width of 3.5m, and a height of 3.1m. It would be set 0.63m below the existing ridge, 0.513m above the eaves, and 0.268m from the adjoining property.

The proposed single storey side extension would represent a modest addition to the host dwellinghouse, with dimensions that remain clearly subservient to the scale and form of the existing building. As such, it is not considered to result in an overly large or bulky addition. Further to this, its siting away from neighbouring residential properties should ensure that the extension would not appear overbearing or visually intrusive and would therefore not give rise to undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in relation to the siting, scale, and massing of the proposed rear extension, however, the 2.9m rearward projection of the single storey rear extension would not exceed the limit stipulated within saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and is therefore considered acceptable. Further to this, given that the extension would be relatively minor in terms of its scale and massing, with a maximum height of 3.3m, and would project no further than the property's existing two storey outrigger, it is considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of its dimensions, would avoid resulting in an excessively large or bulky addition to the property, and would not cause undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of introducing an overbearing feature into the area. Sufficient private outdoor amenity space would also be retained to the side and rear of the dwellinghouse, especially given that the existing detached garage would be demolished as part of this proposal.

It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in relation to the siting, scale, and massing of the proposed roof alterations (including the hip-to-gable roof conversion and rear dormer), however, the roof conversion would only affect a small portion of the property's existing hipped roof form

to the southwest and would not alter the entirety of this roof slope and, as such, would read subserviently to the host dwellinghouse, particularly given that it would not project above the existing ridge and would be in line with the ridge of the existing rear outrigger. Further to this,

the dormer extension would be sited below the property's ridge, above its eaves, and away from the roof edges and adjoining property and is therefore considered to feature subservient dimensions and would avoid reading as an excessively large or bulky addition.

Appearance and visual amenity – the single storey side extension would be built of red brickwork, textured white render, and clay roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse. Its front and rear elevations would be blank, whilst its side elevation would feature a set of outward-opening timber doors. Its roof would be blank.

The single storey rear extension would be built of red brickwork and textured white render to match the existing dwellinghouse in addition to a zinc clad flat roof form with zinc coping and metal-framed doors. Its rear elevation would feature an outward-opening door, whilst its side elevation would be blank, and its roof would feature a flat skylight.

The hip-to-gable roof conversion would be built of red roof tiles to match the existing

dwellinghouse, with hanging red tiles (to match the main roof) to the side. Its front roof slope would feature a conservation rooflight, whilst its side and rear roof slopes would be blank.

The rear roof dormer would be clad in metal cladding (red zinc patina by Traditional Textures) with black metal-framed windows. Its rear elevation would feature 1no. window, whilst its side elevations and roof would be blank.

It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in relation to the proposal's impact upon the visual amenity of the area. However, it is considered that the single storey side and single storey rear extension are relatively standard in terms of their design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Sited at the side of the property, the side extension would be visible from viewpoints along East Meade and Southgate, however, its use matching materials (including red brickwork, white textured render, and clay roof tiles) should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature. Sited at the rear of the property, between the existing outrigger and boundary shared with the adjoining semi, the rear extension would not be highly visible within the street scene or public realm. Further to this, its use matching materials (including red brickwork and white textured render) should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature.

The hip-to-gable roof conversion would be sited along the southwestern roof slope of the property and, as such, would be visible from viewpoints along both East Meade and Southgate. It should be noted however, that gable end roof forms are a common feature of both of these streets and, as such, an intervention of this type is not considered to be unduly harmful or out-of-keeping with the appearance of the surrounding area. Further to this, its use matching materials (including red roof tiles) should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature.

The rear roof dormer would be sited at the back of the property and would be visible from specific viewpoints along Southgate and The Thorns, given that the property is located on an end/corner plot. The dormer would represent a contemporary addition to the dwellinghouse, given its use of metal red zinc patina cladding which would contrast with the Arts and Crafts style of the Chorltonville Conservation Area, however, is considered acceptable in this instance

given that a precedent for works of this type and material has previously been accepted in the surrounding area (i.e., 130575/FH/2021 at No.3 East Meade – rear dormer clad in vertical zinc sheeting). The dormer proposed under the current application 143377/FH/2025 would not be as visually obtrusive as the one approved at No.3 East Mead given its red colour (rather than black/dark grey). It would therefore be unreasonable to refuse the current application given that it would be less obtrusive than previously approved developments nearby.

Impact upon the Chorltonville Conservation Area – given that the single storey side extension would be modest in scale, utilising matching brickwork, render, and roof tiles to the host dwellinghouse (which would provide a blended appearance with the existing property), it is considered that the degree of harm caused to the visual amenity of the area and the character of the Chorltonville Conservation Area would be limited.

Similarly, given that the single storey rear extension would be sited at the back of the property, utilising matching brickwork and render to the host dwellinghouse (which would provide a blended appearance with the existing property), it is considered that the degree of harm caused to the visual amenity of the area and the character of the Chorltonville Conservation Area would be limited.

It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Chorltonville Conservation Area, particularly in relation to the proposed roof alterations. These concerns centre on the potential for the half-hip roof design and the siting of solar photovoltaic panels on the side elevation to disrupt the established rhythm and architectural cohesion of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the wider area, thereby eroding elements of its special interest. However, it is important to note that these aspects of the scheme have already been considered and approved under 143377/FH/2025. In the absence of any material changes to planning policy or significant alterations to these elements of the proposal since that approval was granted, it would be unreasonable to revisit or seek to resist these elements of the development. Accordingly, the previously approved works are considered to have established the acceptability of the roof alterations within the context of the Conservation Area.

It should also be noted that though the hip-to-gable roof conversion would be more visible given its siting, it is not considered to be unduly harmful to the character of the Chorltonville Conservation Area given that gable end roof forms are already an established feature of the street scene and are present in the vicinity of the application site both along East Meade and Southgate. Further to this, its use matching materials (including red roof tiles) should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature.

The contemporary style rear dormer would have the capacity to cause a degree of harm to the Conservation Area given that it would contrast with its overarching Arts and Crafts style, however, is considered acceptable in this instance given that this harm is regarded as less than substantial on account of the established precedent for works of this type and material in the nearby vicinity, as previously discussed.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, which stipulates that “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use”. The extension would provide benefits in the form of improved and enlarged living accommodation for the property’s occupiers, which would outweigh the potential harm caused to the Chorltonville Conservation Area as a result of the works.

It should also be noted that the proposal would also not affect the most significant aspects of the Conservation Area as the appearance of the surrounding dwellinghouses, existing street patterns, tree-lined streets, and leafy green character would remain largely unaffected.

Residential amenity – it is acknowledged that concerns were raised in relation to the proposal's impact upon the residential amenity of the area. However, given the side extension's siting away from neighbouring residential properties, it is considered that it should not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, loss of privacy or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area.

Similarly, given that the rear extension would be single storey with a maximum flat roof height of 3.3m, and would represent an infill extension, it is considered that it should not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. Moreover, its blank side elevations should ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers is not compromised as a result of the works.

The roof alterations' (including the hip-to-gable roof conversion and rear dormer) siting on the roof of the property, set below or at the same level as the existing ridge, above the existing eaves and away from the roof edges, should ensure that they do not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, particularly given that their mass and bulk would not impact the path of light to neighbouring properties beyond that of the application property itself. Further to this, the dormer's rear-facing windows would be set back from the eaves and, as such, should provide no further degree of overlooking than any existing windows at first-floor level.

Waste storage – the current waste storage arrangements would be unaffected by the proposal.

Parking – the current parking arrangements would be unaffected by the proposal

External wall insulation – no objection is raised to the proposed external wall insulation and render system, subject to the works being carried out in a manner that preserves the character and architectural detailing of the host property.

The proposal involves the removal of the existing render and its replacement with a 40mm EPS external wall insulation system finished in Johnstone's Trade Stormshield Full Silicone Render. The limited insulation thickness has been carefully selected to provide improved thermal performance whilst ensuring that important architectural features, including eaves detailing, decorative tiled motifs at the front and rear apex, tiled window cills and reveals, and the bell mouth drip at the render/plinth junction, remain clearly expressed and are not obscured or visually flattened.

The submitted details confirm that appropriate construction methods, including the use of reveal beads, stop profiles and bellcast detailing, will be incorporated to retain the legibility of these features. In addition, the treatment of the party wall with the adjoining property has been considered, with the modest insulation depth and suitable edge detailing ensuring a neat and visually sensitive junction that maintains material consistency, particularly as both properties are already rendered.

Further to this, the proposed render system is vapour permeable, allowing moisture to escape from the wall construction and thereby reducing the risk of condensation and trapped moisture, which could otherwise harm the building fabric. As such, the proposal is considered to achieve an appropriate balance between enhancing energy efficiency and preserving the character and appearance of the property.

Other matters – the proposal also includes the following alterations:

- The existing windows at ground and first floor level in the front elevation of the host dwellinghouse would be replaced with PVC counterparts.
- The existing front door would be replaced.
- The existing windows at ground and first floor level in the southwest side elevation of the host dwellinghouse would be replaced with PVC counterparts.
- An existing window at ground floor level in the southwest side elevation of the host dwellinghouse would be replaced with a smaller PVC counterpart.
- The existing window and door set at ground floor level in the southwest side elevation of the host dwellinghouse would be replaced with a PVC window.
- Photovoltaic panels would be installed on the southwest and southeast facing roof slopes of the host dwellinghouse/outrigger.
- The ground floor window in the rear elevation of the host dwellinghouse/outrigger would be replaced with two metal-framed doors.

The above alterations are considered acceptable given their minimal impact upon the visual and residential amenity of the area. The replacing of the existing timber-framed windows with PVC windows and metal-framed doors, whilst discouraged in Conservation Areas (in the interest of preserving their character), is able to be undertaken through permitted development rights, without the need to apply for planning permission and is therefore considered acceptable. Similarly, the installation of photovoltaic panels is also considered acceptable on the basis that this could be undertaken through permitted development rights, without the need to apply for planning permission.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity, waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with saved policies DC1 and DC18 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, and EN3 of the Core Strategy, chapters 12 and 16 of the NPPF, and policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the PfE joint development plan document.

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.

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. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the agent to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Recommendation: Approve

Conditions attached to this decision

- 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Act Planning Act 1990.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

'PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN', numbered '2306/2-P-100' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN', numbered '2306/2-P-101' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR/ATTIC PLAN', numbered '2306/2-P-103' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED ROOF PLAN', numbered '2306-P-100' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION', numbered '2306/2-P-105' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED SIDE/WEST ELEVATION', numbered '2306/2-P-106' REVISION B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION', numbered '2306/2-P-108' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED SIDE/EAST ELEVATION', numbered '2306/2-P-107' REVISION A, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

'PROPOSED SITE PLAN', numbered '2306.2 P-001' REVISION 00, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th April 2026.

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) Notwithstanding the details included within the documents listed under condition no.2 of this approval, the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those specified below.

For the single storey side extension:

- Brickwork similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the front, side, and rear elevations of the extension.

- Render similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the front, side, and rear elevations of the extension.
- Red roof tiles similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the roof of the extension.
- Timber doors on the side elevation of the extension.

For the single storey rear extension:

- Brickwork similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the rear and side elevations of the extension.
- Render similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the rear elevation of the extension.
- Zinc flat roof with zinc coping on the extension.
- Metal-framed doors on the rear elevation of the extension.

For the hip-to-gable roof conversion:

- Red roof tiles similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the front and rear roof slopes of the hip-to-gable roof conversion.
- Hanging red roof tiles similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture on the side elevation of the hip-to-gable roof conversion.

For the rear dormer extension:

- Red Zinc Patina metal cladding by Traditional Textures on the elevations of the rear dormer extension.
- Black metal-framed window in the rear elevation of the rear dormer extension.

For the external wall insulation:

- Johnstone's Trade Stormshield Full Silicone Render similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be developed is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the development, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

- 4) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5387 (Trees in relation to construction)

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with policies EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

- 5) 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 additional windows, doors or other openings shall be inserted into the elevations of the development 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.