

PLANNING

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

Application no. 143610/FO/2025

Date registered valid: 31 July 2025

Proposal: Retention and recladding of rear roof dormer to form additional living accommodation.

Address: 206 Moseley Road, Manchester, M14 6PB

Ward(s): Fallowfield Ward

Applicant: A Kelso

Agent (if any): Stephen Lamb

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 29 September 2025

APPLICATION DETAILS

Type of application:	Full Application Consent
Development type:	Minor Dwellings
Date of site visit:	04 September 2025
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications:	Printed: 19 August 2025 Expired: 10 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 related to a two mid terrace dwellinghouse on Moseley Road. The property features an original two storey outrigger and small rear yard to front and rear with no off-street parking

Description of area

The property is in a mostly residential part of the Fallowfield ward of Manchester. The University of Manchester's Armitage Sports Centre sits on the other side of Moseley Road.

Description of development

Retention and recladding of rear roof dormer to form additional living accommodation.

The dormer extension for retention sits within the existing roofline of the main dwelling and outrigger leaving a 300mm gap to the rear of the outrigger.

The total cubic content of the development would be 18.255m³.

The dormer would be clad in Slate Grey Bitmet Tile to have a similar appearance to the existing roof tile.

PLANNING HISTORY

143078/LP/2025

Description: Anthracite shiplap cladding to existing dormer to be removed and replaced by slate grey Bitmet Tiles.

Decision: Refused 23/07/2025

The existing dormer as shown in drawings number 1 - 8, is unauthorised as it was not built in full compliance with the conditions and limitations of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) when it was erected or constructed, specifically Part 1, Schedule 2, Class B.

The Town and Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) does not grant retrospective planning permission, therefore the proposed replacement materials could not be undertaken lawfully, as planning permission is required for the entirety of the development.

141811/LE/2024

Description: Part A - Single-storey rear extension and Part B - the installation of a rear dormer.

Decision: Split 14/02/2025

The rear dormer, as shown on drawings 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 dated 'Amended Plan Feb 23,' does not constitute permitted development. The rear dormer does not comply with Part 1, Schedule 2, Class B.2(a) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), as the grey uPVC shiplap cladding is not of a similar appearance to the materials used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.

136834/LP/2023

Part A - Enlargement of dwellinghouse with a rear dormer roof extension; Part B - Installation of a soil and vent pipe; and Part C- Erection of a single storey rear extension

Decision: Split 06/07/2023

Refuse Part A on the basis that the proposed rear dormer as shown on drawings 2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8 dated as "Amended Plan Feb 23" and as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 28 April 2023, does not constitute permitted development and is not in accordance with Part 1, Schedule 2, Class B.2(a) of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), as the proposed grey uPVC shiplap cladding and rendered cement board would not be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.

134249/LE/2022

Description: Use of property as a small House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4)

Decision: Approved 16/09/2022

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION & PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Notifications

Local Residents

No representations received.

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 3 - Housing
 - H 11 – Houses in Multiple Occupation
 - 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
 - o Environmental Improvement and Protection
 - E3.3 – City major radial and orbital roads and rail routes.
- [Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039-](#)
 - o Strategy
 - JP-Strat5: Inner 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 dormer for retention has only been previously refused as a lawful development due to the material choice and later procedural matters. This scheme is the same as the lawful development but with clarity on the materials. Substantial weight has been placed on this fallback position with the principle of the development being accepted. It is noted that the property is a lawful Class C4 HMO and although the dormer would enable an increase to 6 no. bedrooms the existing use class would have allowed this through internal subdivision and is therefore of minimal weight when making the decision. The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle.

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 tile to the existing dwellinghouse and matching window fenestrations. It is noted that the dormer (as of the site visit) was clad in UPVC shiplap which is to be replaced.

The proposal is designed to be subservient to the original dwelling house by being entirely within the roof slope of the original dwelling.

Given the dormer sits in the roof slope of the original dwelling the impact on massing to neighbours is minimal.

It is noted that the dormer to be retained would likely be permitted development (with the extension only failing a certificate of lawful development due to materials). Notwithstanding this 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.

Only minimal views of 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 proposal is similar in size and scale to other buildings nearby, notably 168 Moseley Road which is a C4 HMO with single storey rear and rear dormer extension (134248/LE/2022)

Effects on amenity

Privacy

The proposal includes adding windows to the new side and rear elevation however given these are like windows on this elevation the impact to privacy is minimal.

Light

Given the proposal is entirely within the main roof slope the impact to light from the added massing is minimal.

Noise

The proposed extension is not expected to generate any noise beyond what would be reasonably expected of a Class C4 HMO 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, notably increasing the bedrooms to 6no. It is noted that the property is a lawful Class C4 HMO, and this would allow up to 6no bedrooms with or without the extension (through subdivision etc). It is also noted that the dormer for retention would likely be permitted development (failing a certificate due to the materials).

The property has minimal external space however this is an accepted level for these terrace properties, and it would be onerous to refuse based on lack of external amenity given the fallback position.

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

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private

The proposal has no impact on green infrastructure.

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 retention and recladding of the rear roof dormer is considered acceptable in principle. It respects the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area, has minimal impact on neighbouring amenity, and aligns with relevant local and national planning policies. Given the fallback position and the

improvements in material specification, the development is deemed appropriate 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. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and therefore determined within a timely manner.

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 | 13 Aug 2025 | APPLICATION FORM |
| b. Drawing - Location Plan | 31 Jul 2025 | |
| c. Drawing - Proposed | 31 Jul 2025 | DRAWING PACK PLANS AND ELEVATIONS |
| d. Supporting Information | 31 Jul 2025 | MATERIALS |

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 material to be used on the facades of the dormer hereby permitted shall be Slate Grey Bitmet Tile as specified in a supporting document and cover letter received 31 July 2025. All other 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.

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES & NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED

208 Moseley Road, Manchester, M14 6PB

204 Moseley Road, Manchester, M14 6PB

121 Braemar Road, Manchester, M14 6PN

117 Braemar Road, Manchester, M14 6PN

119 Braemar Road, Manchester, M14 6PN

APPENDIX 2 – PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

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

Regulation 7 Direction (Control Advert) - Control Of To Let Boards (Moseley Road/Ladybarn Lane)

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA