

PLANNING

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

Application no. 143605/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 31 July 2025

Proposal: Erection of a two-storey side and part two/part single storey rear extension with rear roof dormer, together with outbuilding to rear garden for ancillary living accommodation.

Address: 211 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ

Ward(s): Sharston Ward

Applicant: Mr Andy Flynn

Agent (if any): Mr James Scott, SKY Design and Consulting Limited

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 01 October 2025

APPLICATION DETAILS

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	05 September 2024 as part of the previous application.
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications:	Printed: 11 August 2025 Expired: 2 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 relates to a semidetached dwellinghouse on Peel Hall Road. The property features an existing single storey side and rear sheltered patio area. The property features hardstanding to the front for off street vehicle parking and a garden with detached garage to the rear.

Description of area

The property is in a mostly residential part of the Sharston ward of Manchester. The property sits within the Noise and Nuisance Index Zone (40-49) for Manchester Airport.

Description of development

Erection of a two-storey side and part two/part single storey rear extension with rear roof dormer, together with outbuilding to rear garden for ancillary living accommodation.

Two storey side extension

The proposed two storey side extension replaces the existing single storey side extension. The proposed side extension projects 4050mm from the main side elevation to leave a 1500mm gap to the boundary at the front and 2078mm at the rear. The two-storey extension runs the full 12762mm meeting the rear of the proposed rear extension. The roof eaves height matches the main dwelling, and the side is gable ended. The side extension features gazing to the front and side.

Part two/part single storey rear extension

The proposed ground floor rear extension projects 4592mm from the existing rear elevation and spans the full 10238mm from a 200mm gap of the shared boundary to meet the proposed side extension. The ground floor features large sliding glass doors, and the single storey part features a flat roof with rooflight.

The first-floor rear extension projects the same 4592mm from the main rear elevation and spans 4350mm to sit in line with the proposed side elevation. The proposed rear extension features a new window.

Rear roof dormer

The proposal features a roof dormer spanning the main roofline to create a larger bedroom and living space at third floor level.

Outbuilding to rear garden

The proposed outbuilding would sit close to the rear boundary. The outbuilding measure 4500mm x 9000mm with a lower eaves' height of 2364mm at the rear sloping up to 3360 and the front (facing the garden) The proposed outbuilding has a flat sloping roof and large sliding glass doors and is finished in off white render.

PLANNING HISTORY

140559/FH/2024

Description: Erection of a two-storey side and part two/part single storey rear extension with rear roof dormers, together with outbuilding to rear garden for ancillary living accommodation.

Decision: Refused 12/09/2024

The proposal would, by reason of the scale, position and design of the two storey side extension (notably the continued roof ridge line and lack of setback), be detrimental to the street scene and thereby to the visual amenity of the area: in particular because of the potential terracing effect it would create and as such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and DC1 of the Extant UDP.

Appeal decision: Dismissed 23/01/2025

The general layout of semi-detached properties in Peel Hall Road includes single storey side extensions or garages, which provides a sense of spaciousness between neighbouring pairs of semi-detached houses. The scale of the proposed two storey side extension, its minimal set down from the house ridgeline, roof form and small setback from the front elevation would result in an excessively large extension with potential for creating a terracing effect with the neighbouring dwelling. The sense of spaciousness between the appeal building and 213 would also be significantly reduced when compared to other buildings in the area.

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Notifications

Local Residents

4no residents commented in objection to the proposal with concerns regarding:

- Loss of privacy (new dormer windows)
- Size of the extensions
- Use of the property (concerns on use as a C4 HMO)

1no resident commented neither objecting nor supporting the proposal with comments regarding

- Advocating the installation of a Swift Brick

Relevant planning concerns have been taken into consideration and addressed in the following sections of this report.

NEGOTIATIONS

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

The distance to the boundaries were different in the refused application (1303mm) and current application (1500mm) even though the proposed side extension projects the same 4592mm from the existing side elevation.

The Agent clarified that the digitally downloaded OS map from which the dimensions were taken on the original submission were not actually reflective of the physical on-site dimensions and that the dimensions demonstrated within the new application reflect the physical on-site dimensions.

Following this clarification there were further amendments required to make the scheme acceptable.

- The set back at first floor would need to be 500mm with a lower roofline on the extension to ensure subservience of the extension to the existing dwellinghouse.
- A hipped roof would be required to the side extension to help reduce massing and ensure the property fits into the character of the area.
- The side facing window on the rear extension would need to be removed

The Agent replied evidencing an approved application for 217 Peel Hall Road (141526/FH/2024) which features a similar two storey side extension with continuous roof line and hipped roof end.

Given the similarities the continuous roofline was deemed acceptable, and the agent was asked to hip the roof on the proposed side extension to make the proposal acceptable.

Updated proposed development

The updated scheme removes the gable end for a hipped roofline into the main roofline following to a hipped rear extension. The side facing window on the rear extension was also removed.

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 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
 - 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

Principle

The City Council recognises many people want to extend and develop their existing homes to provide more space and/or better living accommodation. There is nothing to suggest that the property is currently in use or is intended for use as a C4 HMO and the application has been assessed on the basis the property is a C3 dwelling. 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, a set back to the side extension elevation and a lower roof height to the rear extension.

The 1500mm gap to the shared boundary and 300mm set back of the front elevation of the proposed side elevation help minimise the terracing effect to the street.

The effect to No. 209 is minimal given the rear extension is ground floor (and flat roofed) on this boundary and No209 has an existing rear extension on this boundary.

The effect to No. 213 is greater with most of the massing on this side. The proposal maintains a minimum of 1500mm gap to the shared boundary, with the angle of the properties opening the gap to the rear. No. 213 have a large ground floor side extension which projects beyond their rear elevation which would further minimise the massing effect. The hipped roof helps reduce the massing effect further.

The proposed dormer sits within the main roofline and below the main ridge height. It is noted that hip to gable conversion and rear roof dormers are often allowed under permitted development, notwithstanding this the impact would be minimal.

The proposed outbuilding is single storey with the maximum eaves height being just 860mm above permitted development (3360mm) sloping to 2364mm at the rear (below permitted development). The materiality is like other outbuildings locally.

Due to its, size, position and location in relation to neighbours, the proposal would not create and 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 features such as a hipped roof, together with the use of proposed materials, the character of the street would not be unduly affected.

The proposal is similar in size and scale to other buildings nearby, notably an extension approved at 217 Peel Hall Road (141526/FH/2024) which features a similar two storey side extension with continuous roof line and hipped roof end.

Effects on amenity

Privacy

The proposal adds 1no window in the front of the building. It doesn't unduly affect privacy because there are other windows to this elevation.

The proposal includes adding windows and large doors at the back of the building. These doors face the gardens of properties on Holliney Road. The design of the boundary and its distance help reduce privacy concerns.

It is noted that the dormer and associated windows would most likely be permitted development notwithstanding this the impact to overlooking, given the existing rear facing windows and distances to boundary would not be significantly harmful to warrant refusal.

The out building has windows to the elevation facing back towards the applicants property only. This would not provide a differing impact than an out building that could be constructed utilising permitted development rights.

Light

Given the position of the extension in relation to the path of the sun and given the distances to the boundaries the impact to light would be not cause undue harm. The outbuilding is designed to slope down in height to the rear boundary. There is sufficient separation and screening to neighbouring properties either side to negate any undue impact on light / prevent any overbearing impact.

Noise

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

Accessibility

The proposal does not change how people can get in and out of the building.

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 itself has little impact on waste from the site. It uses the current storage and collection methods on site and maintains external access to the rear of the property.

Vehicular access and car parking

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

Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage

Biodiversity

The inclusion of swift bricks has been considered in light of a public comment received. While their use is encouraged, it is not a statutory requirement, and no specific local policy mandates their provision. Given the scale and nature of the development, and in the absence of a clear policy basis for enforcement, it is not considered reasonable to impose a condition requiring swift bricks in this instance.

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 site is not located in a flood risk area and therefore does not require a flood statement or assessment. The proposal has a negligible impact on drainage using the existing drainage on site.

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 development has been assessed against relevant local and national planning policies and is considered acceptable in terms of design, scale, and impact on neighbouring properties. The amendments made during the application process ensure the extension is subservient to the host dwelling and respects the character of the area. The proposal would not result in significant harm to residential amenity or the street scene. Subject to the recommended conditions, the application is considered to comply with policy and is therefore recommended for approval.

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. Application Form	31 Jul 2025	APPLICATION FORM
b. Drawing - Site Plan	14 Aug 2025	101 REVA BLOCK PLAN OF THE SITE
c. Drawing - Proposed	01 Oct 2025	102 REVB FLOOR PLAN
d. Drawing - Proposed	01 Oct 2025	103 REVB ELEVATIONS
e. Drawing - Proposed	31 Jul 2025	104 REVA SUMMER HOUSE PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

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. Specified materials

The materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form in type, size, colour, and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the structure. Pursuant to policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-S1 and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone

4. Outbuilding

The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental to the residential use of the dwelling identified as 211 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ.

Reason - To ensure the proposed use remains incidental to the principle use on the site. In the interest of residential amenity, in accordance with the policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

5. Fenestration

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extensions or outbuilding hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

6. C3 Use Class

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no part of the development shall be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) other than the purpose(s) of C3(a). For the avoidance of doubt, this does not preclude two unrelated people sharing a property.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to policies DM1 and H11 of the Core Strategy for Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES & NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED

34 Holliney Road, Peel Hall, MANCHESTER, M22 5JE

209 Peel Hall Rd, Peel Hall, Manchester, M22 5HJ

36 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

174 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HD

36 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

34 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

176 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HD

178 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HD

213 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ

209 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ

42 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

40 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

38 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

38 Holliney Road, Manchester, M225JE

APPENDIX 2 – PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Airport Noise Index Zone - Noise and Nuisance Index - 40-49

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (More) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA