MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Delegated Officer Report

Summary of application details

Application reference:	PLA-2026-001128
Application type:	Householder planning permission
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey side and part-single / part-two storey rear extension together with associated elevational alterations
Site address:	10 South Meade Manchester M21 8EB
Ward(s):	Chorlton
Date application valid:	11 August 2026
Applicant name:	Mr Robert Kenyon
Agent (if any):	Mr Arran McMahon
Case officer:	Holly Wright
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	13 October 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 tile hipped roof (with a gable end roof form to the front). The property appears to feature white timber-framed windows, including a ground-floor bay to the front, a paved front driveway and modest garden bordered by a mid-level brick wall, a front canopy overhang, a part-single / part-two storey rear outrigger, a timber shed structure, a pergola/canopy to the rear, and a spacious rear garden.

South 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.


S Meade
S Meade
10
8
3
7
9


10









Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and part-single / part-two storey rear extension together with associated elevational alterations.

The original proposal also included a hip-to-gable roof conversion together with a rear dormer extension. These have since been omitted from the proposal following negotiations with the applicant and their agent.

Consultation, notification and publicity responses

Three letters of objection were received from local residents; the comments are summarised as follows:

- The dormer to the roof would overlook surrounding properties and infringe upon privacy.
- The use of black materials would be very overbearing and out-of-keeping with the unique character of Chorltonville.
- The black window and door frames would not fit in with the rest of the property.
- No objection to the ground-floor plans.
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- Its scale, form and proportions would appear overbearing in the street scene.
- There would be significant visibility from the public road (roofline and side extension).
- All the properties on this residential road have maintained their original appearance and roofline from the street view.
- As a whole, but particularly from the public road, the proposed property would be incohesive with the other properties on the street.
- Due to the scale of the proposal, the hierarchy would be tipped away from the original dwelling design.
- The hip to gable proposal is not sympathetic to the architectural style of the existing property and would impact on the public realm.
- The example provided of similar development (54 Claude Rd) falls outside the conservation area, yet this does demonstrate disproportionate development and the impact from the public road.
- In summary, the proposal would not enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- It would significantly alter the street character and does not respect the scale or form of the existing dwelling.
- Object to the proposed rear extension up to the shared boundary as access would need to be retained for any repointing of the wall, roof maintenance, shared drain pipe and drainage.
- The current design represents an overdevelopment that severely impacts the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in terms of privacy and daylight.
- Loss of privacy and direct overlooking - the height, size, and position of the proposed dormer windows create a direct, elevated line of sight into surrounding gardens and properties. This intrusive level of overlooking results in a severe loss of privacy in outdoor spaces which are currently enjoyed without continuous surveillance.
- Overshadowing and loss of natural daylight - the excessive bulk and scale of the dormer roof structure will significantly block direct sunlight and ambient daylight reaching surrounding gardens and windows. This substantial reduction in light will leave outdoor spaces predominantly in shade, losing a significant amount of light in the mornings, and noticeably diminish the brightness of primary indoor living areas.

- Visual overdominance and scale - the massing of the rear dormer is disproportionate to the host property and appears visually intrusive when viewed from neighbouring boundaries. The design dominates the rear roofline rather than remaining a subtle, subordinate feature, directly conflicting with local design guidance on roof extensions.

Chorltonville Owners' Committee – no response received.

Chorlton Civic Society – no response received.

Relevant policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

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 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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026)
- 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 of heritage assets
- Policy HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets
- Policy HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets
- Policy HE9: Conservation areas



Submitted proposed elevations

Assessment

Principle – the principle of the proposal, to erect a single storey side and part-single / part-two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation for a dwellinghouse, is acceptable. Notwithstanding this, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale, and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity, the Chorltonville conservation area, waste storage, and parking, amongst other matters.

Siting, scale, and massing – the proposal would be sited at the side and rear of the property, replacing the existing outrigger present on site.

At ground-floor level, the proposed extension would project approximately 4.1m rearwards from the host dwellinghouse, with a length of 9.5m, a sideward projection of 1.8m, a width of 8.7m, a part-pitched / part-flat roof height of 3m, with an eaves height to the front of 2.3m. It would be sited adjacent to the boundary shared with No.12 with a gap of approximately 0.7m maintained to the boundary shared with No.8.

At first-floor level, the proposed extension would project approximately 3.4m rearwards from the host dwellinghouse, with a width of 3.4m, a dual-pitch roof height of 6.3m (set 4.2m below the existing ridge), with eaves to match the existing. A gap of approximately 3.3m would be maintained to the adjoining property (No.12), whilst a gap of approximately 2.5m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.8.

Overall, the siting, scale, and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable. The 4.1m rearward projection of the extension would exceed the limit specified within saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (of 3.65m), however, this is considered acceptable in these circumstances given that this would be by a relatively modest amount (0.45m), together with the fact that the neighbouring properties (No.8 and No.12) also feature rear additions with broadly comparable rear projections. Further to this, the proposed extension would remain visually subservient to the host dwellinghouse on account of its appropriate scale, width and height, together with the considerable setback from the principal elevation, adequate gaps to the shared boundaries, and reduced ridge height at first-floor level. As a result, the extension would not appear excessively large, dominant or bulky in relation to the original dwellinghouse. The proposal is therefore considered unlikely to create an overbearing presence within the street scene or result in unacceptable visual impacts for neighbouring occupiers. Adequate private amenity space would also be retained to the rear of the dwellinghouse.

Appearance and visual amenity – the proposed extension would be constructed using materials that are similar to and complement the existing dwelling. At ground-floor level, the extension would be constructed in red brick to match the existing house, with composite timber cladding incorporated within the rear canopy area. The roof would comprise a black anthracite flat roof with a pitched roof element to the front, finished with roof tiles to match the existing dwelling. Black anthracite rooflights, windows and doors are also proposed. At first-floor level, the extension would be finished in white render with roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse, together with black anthracite-framed windows.

At ground-floor level, the front and side elevations would be blank, whilst the rear elevation would incorporate a set of sliding doors. At first-floor level, the side elevations would be blank, with the rear elevation featuring a set of windows. In addition, a rooflight is proposed within the front-facing roof slope of the existing dwellinghouse.

The proposal is considered to be relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Sited at the side and rear of the property, elements of the proposal would be visible within the street scene and public realm. However, its use of matching

materials should ensure a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse. As such, the extension is not considered to form an overly prominent or incongruous visual feature, and the overall character of the property and surrounding area would not be significantly harmed by the proposed works.

Impact upon Chorltonville conservation area – the application site is located within the Chorltonville Conservation Area and, as such, the impact of the proposal upon the character, appearance and significance of this designated heritage asset must be carefully considered.

The proposed single storey side extension would be set back approximately 3.8m from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse. This considerable setback together with its single storey nature would ensure that the extension remains clearly subservient to the application property. The inclusion of a part-flat / part-pitched roof form would further reinforce its subservient appearance through a more sympathetic roof form. As a result, the extension would not appear unduly prominent within the street scene and would be read as a sympathetic addition to the existing property.

The part-single / part-two storey rear extension would be located wholly at the back of the dwellinghouse. Due to its position, it would have limited visibility from surrounding highways and public footpaths and would therefore have little impact upon wider views within the conservation area. Its impact upon the character and appearance of both the immediate street scene and the wider conservation area would therefore be minimal.

In terms of appearance, the extension would be constructed using materials that reflect those already present on the dwellinghouse, including brickwork, render and roof tiles. This would ensure that the proposal blends with the existing building and maintains a consistent appearance throughout. The scale and design of the proposal are also considered to be proportionate to the host dwellinghouse and would not appear excessive or overbearing.

It is also relevant that the scheme originally included a hip-to-gable roof enlargement and rear dormer extension. These elements were removed following discussions with the applicant's agent, resulting in a revised proposal that is less visually intrusive and more sympathetic to the character of the conservation area.

Taking all of the above into account, the proposal's setback position, appropriate scale, subservient form and use of matching materials would ensure that it does not detract from the established character of the area or undermine the architectural qualities that contribute to the significance of the Chorltonville Conservation Area.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Chorltonville Conservation Area and would not result in harm to its significance. The proposal therefore accords with saved policy DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policy EN3 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-P2 of Places for Everyone, and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

Residential amenity – given that the side extension would be single storey in form, sited to the north of the existing dwellinghouse, with subservient dimensions and adequate gaps maintained to the plot’s shared boundaries, this element of the proposal is not considered to give rise to significant issues of overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook. Moreover, as the side extension would not feature any side-facing windows or windows in close proximity to shared boundaries, it should also avoid causing significant issues associated with overlooking and loss of privacy.

The proposed rear extension would be positioned to the north of No.12 South Meade, adjacent to the shared boundary at ground-floor level, with a gap of approximately 3.3m maintained at first floor level. Given this relationship with the adjoining semi-detached property and taking into account the gaps maintained to the plot's shared boundaries, this element of the proposal is not considered to give rise to an unduly harmful impact upon the residential amenity of these neighbouring occupiers. In particular, it is not expected to result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing, loss of outlook, or loss of daylight.

Moreover, whilst the extension would be sited to the south of No.8 South Meade and would therefore have a greater potential to affect the amenity of these occupiers, the degree of impact is not considered to be significant or harmful enough to justify refusal of the application. This is on the basis that the proposed extension would not project substantially beyond the existing outrigger of the application property, nor beyond the rear outrigger of No.8. Further to this, the extension's modest rearward projection of 3.1m (4.1m when considered together with the proposed canopy area at ground-floor level), combined with its reduced ridge height (set approximately 4.2m below the existing) would further soften its perceived scale and massing, thereby mitigating potential impacts. For these reasons, it is not considered to result in an unduly harmful impact upon the residential amenity of these occupiers, in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook, or loss of light.

In terms of privacy, the proposed rear-facing windows would be located approximately 10m from the rear boundary of the plot and around 19m from the opposing properties on South Drive. These distances are considered sufficient to safeguard against overlooking and loss of privacy. Furthermore, as the extension would not include any side-facing windows, no additional overlooking towards neighbouring dwellings is anticipated.

Waste storage – the proposal would not affect existing waste storage arrangements as a 727mm-wide pathway providing access to the rear garden from the front of the property would be retained along the side of the dwellinghouse. This would allow bins to continue to be moved between the front and rear of the site and stored out of view of the street scene.

Parking – unaffected by the proposal as the existing driveway space to the front would be retained.

Other matters – concerns have been raised regarding the use of black anthracite window and door frames, with objectors considering that they would be out-of-keeping with the existing appearance of the property. However, it is noted that the windows within the original dwellinghouse could be replaced with black anthracite-framed windows under permitted development rights. As such, the proposed use of black anthracite window and door frames is not considered to give rise to significant harm and would not justify refusal of the application.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the proposed rear extension being constructed up to the shared boundary, particularly in relation to future access for maintenance works, including repointing, roof repairs, and the maintenance of drainage infrastructure. These matters relate to private property rights and access arrangements between neighbouring landowners and are not material planning considerations. They do not therefore carry weight in the assessment of the application.

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, the Chorltonville conservation area, waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with saved policies DC1 and DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies DM1, SP1, and EN3 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the

Places for Everyone joint development plan document, and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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

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

1) 3-year time limit:

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

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

2) Specified plans:

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

- ‘PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN’, numbered ‘BW_01’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 October 2026.
- ‘PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN’, numbered ‘BW_02’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 October 2026.
- ‘PROPOSED ATTIC FLOOR PLAN’, numbered ‘BW_02’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 October 2026.
- ‘PROPOSED ELEVATIONS’, numbered ‘BW_04’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 October 2026.
- ‘PROPOSED SITE BLOCK PLAN’ numbered ‘SP_01’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 October 2026.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) Materials:

The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be those as specified on approved plan titled ‘PROPOSED ELEVATIONS’, numbered ‘BW_04’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 7 October 2026.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) Restriction on additional openings:

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 installed in the elevations of the development hereby approved, without planning permission being granted by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.