

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143453/FH/2025

Date registered valid: 15 July 2025

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension

Address: 61 Brideoak Street, Manchester, M8 0AY

Ward(s): Cheetham Ward

Applicant: Mr Arslan Riaz And Mrs Madiha Ahmed

Agent (if any): Mr M Farooq, Building Design Services

Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: **29 August 2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 5 August 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 21 July 2025 Expired: 11 August 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

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 61 Brideoak Street within the ward of Cheetham in north Manchester. The applicant site relates to a semi-detached, red brick, hipped roof dwellinghouse, characterised with circular bay windows, front canopy with pillars and to the rear a rear outrigger which has been infilled up to the common boundary. A white garage with white roller shutters is sited to the rear of the site, detached from the main dwellinghouse. The amenity space surrounding the property consists of hardstanding.

Description of area

The surrounding context is residential in nature.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks permission for the erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension.

The two storey side extension would be set back from the primary elevation of the host property by 2 metres and at the largest point have approximate dimensions of Height: 7 x Length: 6.3 x Width: 2.2 metres.

The part single storey rear extension would extend the width of the host property and wrap into the proposed side extension and would have a projection of 3.6 metres. The part two storey

rear extension would have a reduced projection of approximately 2 metres. This element would be set off the shared boundary with the adjoining neighbour no.63 Brideoak Street by 3.3 metres and sited against the boundary with neighbour no.59 Brideoak Street.

The proposal would involve the insertion of two windows within the primary elevation and three windows and two doors within the rear elevation.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed to match the host property.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

Concern was raised that an off street parking space would not be retained as a result of the extension.

The quality of the drawings were amended to ensure the full scope of development could be seen.

Bin store information was provided during the course of the application.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and two objections were received. The following concerns were raised:

- Disturbance, noise and dust from the construction period. Concern access will be blocked from construction workers.
- The extension would block sunlight to the house and garden and create an overbearing feature.
- The proposal would result in adverse privacy implications.
- The extension proposed is overly large and would be out of character with the existing properties.
- The garage of 61 Brideoak Street has asbestos in the roof which is hazardous if disturbed or removed.
- Loss of off street parking as a result of the proposal.

Issues

POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three

overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective and
- c) an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- ii. Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

Policy DM1 (Development Management),
Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) and
Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
- d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public

highway;

- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

Places for Everyone

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.

The Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:
i.JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted development application is for the erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. Consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

Potential impact to no.59 Brideoak Street:

The non-adjoining neighbour relates to a detached property. This neighbour would feel the additional built form to the side and to the rear. Given the existing relationship between the two properties and the existing proximity, the side extension is not considered to give rise to any overbearing implications. Further, the 2 metre set back of the side extension at both levels would offer a sense of openness between the proposal and non-adjoining neighbour, mitigating harm of an overbearing feature. Whilst this neighbour benefits from 3no. top opening windows within their gable elevation, any loss of light is not considered to be so severe given the existing proximity between the two neighbours. No windows are proposed to be inserted in the side elevation of the extension and so no adverse privacy implications would be felt by no.59 from the side extension.

The ground floor rear extension would extend 3.65 metres between the rear building line of the neighbouring property against the shared boundary, and at first floor level this would be reduced to 2 metres. Given the extension has been designed to have a reduced projection at first floor level with a hipped roof, attempts have been made to reduce harm caused from an overbearing feature. Given the first floor would not project any further than the neighbours' rear outrigger, it is not considered the proposal at first floor level would impact the neighbour's enjoyment to utilise their rear amenity space. As the neighbour's first floor rear window is sited far away from the shared boundary with the applicant site, it is not considered the first floor extension would give rise to a tunnelling impact to the neighbour's first floor rear window. As both properties have south facing gardens, any loss of light from the extension at first floor level is not considered to be severe given the reduced 2 metre projection. The extension would involve 2no. windows at first floor level. One would be related to a bathroom window and such window would be conditioned as being obscure glazed within any approval granted. One window would relate to a bedroom. Whilst it is noted that such window could offer an opportunity to view into the neighbour's rear garden, given the existing close proximity to the neighbours, and given rear roof dormers offering views at an elevated position can be achieved through permitted development, in this instance such feature would not be so harmful to warrant a refusal on the scheme.

Potential impact to no.63 Brideoak Street:

No.63 is the adjoining neighbour and as existing feels the rear extension at the applicant's site. The extension at ground floor level would have a projection of 3.6 metres (as existing a 3 metre extension). Given the existing 3 metre extension, the additional 0.6 metres would not be considered to give rise to an overbearing feature and any level of tunnelling to the neighbour's rear window would not be considered so severe to warrant a refusal on the scheme. The first floor extension would be pulled off the boundary by 3.3 metres with a reduced projection of 2 metres and so attempts have been made to reduce the sense of overbearing to the adjoining neighbour. Any privacy implications to this neighbour are not considered to be severe. Any loss of light implications have been mitigated by pulling the built form at first floor level off the boundary.

Potential impact to neighbours to the rear:

Neighbours to the rear could feel the impact from the first floor rear development. Given the first floor would come no further than the existing outrigger at the site and given an approximate 21 metre distance at the closest point would be retained between the first floor rear extension and closest neighbour to the rear, any level of overlooking or overbearing is not considered to be severe.

Potential impact to properties to the front:

As the side extension has a setback of 2 metres, has a roof lower than the host property and has a roof form to match the existing, the proposal is considered to create a subservient feature. Thus, it is not considered this element would give rise to any adverse visual implications to the surrounding streetscene.

A bathroom window would face in the direction of the streetscene and to ensure no privacy implications, such window would be conditioned to be obscure glazed within any approval granted.

On balance, the proposal would not give rise to any significant visual residential amenity implications, namely overbearing, privacy nor loss of light implications. Whilst it is noted that the rear of the site is constrained and the development would be sited against the non-adjointing neighbour at both ground and first floor level, it is not considered so severe to warrant a refusal on the scheme, given the reduced projection to 2 metres. On balance, the proposal can be considered to be in accordance with Policy DC1 of the UDP, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and JP-S1 of Places for Everyone.

Design and Appearance

Two storey side extension:

Policy DC1.4 of the UDP states that in the case of two storey side extensions the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. In this instance, it is not possible to leave a 1.53 metre gap to the side wall and boundary of the site and create a viable side extension. As such, a 2 metre set back at both levels is proposed. Given this set back and the lower hipped roof form, the side extension reads as a subservient feature, in line with Policy DC1.4 of the UDP.

Part single, part two storey rear extension:

Given the existing 3 metre ground floor extension at the site, the increase in projection to 0.6 metres is considered to be accommodated within the site. Further, the ground floor projection of 3.65 metres would ensure compliance with Policy DC1.3 of the UDP which states rearward projections should not exceed 3.65 metres. At first floor level, the projection is reduced to 2 metres which is considered appropriate to sympathetically relate to the circumstances of the host property and neighbours. Given the reduction in built form at first floor level, this element can be considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Materials:

Materials to be used have been listed to match the host property and a materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Response to Neighbour Comments

Local residents were consulted and two objections were received. The following concerns were raised. Each concern will be discussed in turn.

-Disturbance, noise and dust from the construction period. Concern access will be blocked from construction workers.

The impact from the construction period is not considered to give rise to any adverse implications given the small scale of development proposed.

-The extension would block sunlight to the house and garden and create an overbearing feature.

-The proposal would result in adverse privacy implications.

Such residential amenity implications are discussed previously within the report. Given the orientation of properties in the streetscene, any level of loss of light is not considered to be severe. This is due to the attempt to reduce impact by reducing the projection of the extension at first floor level. Any privacy implications are not considered to be so severe to warrant a refusal on the scheme.

-The extension proposed is overly large and would be out of character with the existing properties.

Whilst it is noted that the extension would result in a decent amount of space added to the property, given the harm to residents are not considered so severe, such extensions can be accommodated within the site. The side extension is considered to create a subservient feature and so does not create an overly large feature to the detriment of the streetscene.

-The garage of 61 Brideoak Street has asbestos in the roof which is hazardous if disturbed or removed.

The proposals do not involve the removal of such garage, and such matter would not be considered a planning matter.

-Loss of off street parking as a result of the proposal.

The plans have been amended to ensure a parking space can be retained as a result of the proposal.

Car Parking

Concern was raised during the course of the application that the proposal would result in the loss of off street parking. It is noted that as existing off street parking is constrained by the existing canopy (a structure of such size appears to be in place historically). The proposal includes a 2 metre set back of the side extension which ensures a car can be parked off street. Whilst it is noted the width of such parking space would be tight, this is bound by the existing circumstances of the site and so in this case can be accepted.

Bin Storage

Plans provided during the course of the application shows space for 4no. bins to be stored in an enclosed structure to the front of the property. Such details are considered acceptable and would be conditioned accordingly within any approval granted.

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.

Recommendation: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, and a revised scheme has been provided which is considered to overcome issues raised. Appropriate conditions have been attached to the approval granted.

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

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

- Application Form, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 15 July 2025.
- Location Plan, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 15 July 2025.
- Drawing- Proposed- GF Plan, numbered 2298/3, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025.
- Drawing- Proposed- FF Plan, numbered 2298/4, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025.
- Drawing- Proposed- Elevations and Site Plan, numbered 2298/5, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) 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 openings, including windows and doors, shall be inserted within the elevations of the extension, other than those shown on the approved drawings, unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellinghouse, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) The ground floor bathroom window and first floor bathroom window as shown on the approved 'Drawing- Proposed- GF Plan, numbered 2298/3', received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025 and 'Drawing- Proposed- FF Plan, numbered 2298/4', received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) The materials used to construct the external elevations of the extensions hereby approved shall match the existing dwellinghouse, in terms of colour, type, and method of coursing and pointing.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

6) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with 'Drawing- Proposed- GF Plan, numbered 2298/3', received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025 and 'Drawing- Proposed- Elevations and Site Plan, numbered 2298/5', received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 August 2025, in relation to a secure and ventilated bin storage area. The bin storage area shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and be in place prior to the first use of the development and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the provision of off-street car parking, and the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Flat 5, 74 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
Flat 4, 74 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
Flat 3, 74 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
Flat 2, 74 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
Flat 1, 74 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
32 Brideoak Street, Manchester, M8 0AB
72 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
70 Bellott Street, Manchester, M8 0AZ
63 Brideoak Street, Manchester, M8 0AY
59 Brideoak Street, Manchester, M8 0AY
30 Brideoak Street, Manchester, M8 0AB

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA