

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142518/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 25 March 2025
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, hip to gable roof conversion and installation of front and rear roof dormers
Address: 27 Brooklands Road, Manchester, M8 4JH
Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Schwarz
Agent (if any): Mr Sam Golding, Gold Sketch Studios Ltd
Case officer: Harriet Aidoo
Tel: 0161 234 4532
Email: harriet.aidoo@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 19 May 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 23 April 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 7 April 2025 Expired: 30 April 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

Description of site / building / area

The application relates to a two-storey, bay-fronted, hip roof, semi-detached dwellinghouse within the Crumpsall ward of north Manchester.

The application site benefits from its proximity to public outdoor amenity and green spaces and is within close proximity to Middleton Road (A576), Blackley Vale Fields, and Cheetham Hill Sports Club.



(Site photos - 23.04.2025, 01.05.2025)



The application dwellinghouse is of redbrick construction with a concrete roof tiles and features white uPVC windows, including a ground floor bay to the rear, a paved driveway and spacious garden to the front bordered by a mid-level redbrick wall and hedging, a single storey front and side extension, a two-storey side extension, a timber canopy/sheeting to the side, a single storey rear extension, and a detached outbuilding situated within a spacious rear garden

The Brooklands Road street scene is residential in character, consisting of a mix of terraced, semi-detached, detached dwellinghouses and three/four storey block of flats with varying design features. Therefore, whilst there appears to be no continuous pattern or similarities in terms of housing type, there is no strong precedence of front roof dormers along the street.

Whilst it was noted at the time of the planning officers site visit that both no. 57 Brooklands Road and no. 41 Brooklands Road have existing front roof dormer extensions - no. 57 Brooklands Road is of quite some age (and from street view images the dormer has been in place since at least 2009 and represents a much smaller intervention than that proposed in this instance). Front dormers were approved at No. 41 in 2022. Both properties are within the administrative area of Bury and are of a different style and era to the application dwellinghouse and it is not considered that they set precedent for the development proposed.

Site History

- 142165/FH/2025 - Erection of a single storey rear extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion together with the installation of 1no. rear roof dormer, APPROVED 09.04.2025
- 028972 - Extension at side of house to form extended kitchen and w.c. with an en suite bedroom over existing garage, APPROVED 25.06.1987

Description of development

The submitted application proposes a single storey rear extension, hip to gable roof conversion and installation of front and rear roof dormers.

The planning agent was advised early on during the application that whilst the principle of the submitted plan, in-part could be considered as acceptable, coupled with the decision in planning application - (reference number: 142165/FH/2025); however, on the basis of the submitted sets of plans, the application could not be fully supported by virtue of the proposed front dormers, and the resultant visually incongruous and undue harm they would cause to the visual amenity and character of the area.

In this instance, officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the planning agent, although these concerns have not been overcome. The proposal is considered to be unacceptable and therefore refused in a timely manner.

Consultations & Notification Responses

1. Local residents

Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. No objections, comments, or representations were received.

POLICY

The following guidance, policy and legislation are considered to be relevant to the proposed development.

1. Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (2021) -

This Framework came into effect on 27th March 2012 and was amended and updated in February 2019. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It defines the Government's requirements for the planning system 'only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so'. It provides a mechanism through which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities'.

The Framework has been related to the proposed development, with particular emphasis given to the following:

- Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places.

3. Places for Everyone (2022 - 2039)

The Places for Everyone Plan is a Joint Development Plan Document, providing a strategic plan and policies in relation to jobs, new homes and sustainable growth for nine of the 10 boroughs which make up Greater Manchester. The Plan and its policies are a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications and therefore be given significant weight in the planning balance. The following policy is considered to be relevant:

- JP-P1 - Sustainable Places

4. Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ('the Core Strategy') was adopted by the Council on 11th July 2012.

It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy 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. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.' The following Core Strategy policies are relevant to the proposed development:

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

5. Saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP), (1995)

- Saved Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions.

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

- Chapter 2: Design

Section 2 Design - Discusses the importance of the design of new development in relation to surrounding neighbourhoods and the character of its streets, in terms of its layout, design, scale, massing and orientation of its buildings to achieve a unified urban form to enliven the neighbourhood and its sustainability. The density of the development should also be informed by the characteristics of an area and the specific circumstances of the proposals.

ISSUES

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects, and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale, and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context.

Policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks a high standard of design in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers.

Principle of development

The principle of extending one's home is generally acceptable in circumstances where there is no overriding unduly harmful impact upon either the character of the property, or upon the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. In this instance however, the principle of the proposal is considered unacceptable by reason of the proposed front dormers, and the resultant visually incongruous and undue harm they would cause to the visual amenity and character of the area, which means the application cannot be approved. It is therefore believed that there are factors of sufficient weight that would warrant the refusal of this application.

Residential and Visual Amenity

Having assessed the submitted plan, and on balance, the submitted plan is deemed to conflict with saved policy DC1 of the UDP, and policies DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy as well as the general requirements set out under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Consideration has been given as to whether the scale, massing, design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable. In addition, consideration has been given to any impact the development may have on the residential and visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

(Front roof dormers) - In the case of this application, as previously stated, the Brooklands Road street scene is residential in character, consisting of a mix of terraced, semi-detached, detached dwellinghouses and three/four storey block of flats with varying design features. Therefore, whilst there appears to be no continuous pattern or similarities in terms of housing type, there is no strong precedent for front roof dormers along the streetscene.

Moreover, whilst it was noted at the time of the planning officers site visit that both no. 57 Brooklands Road and no. 41 Brooklands Road these properties are of a different style and era to the application dwellinghouse. The properties lie in Bury.

It is considered that the dormers approved by Bury Council at No.41 Brooklands Road are to a fundamentally different house type - a Victorian double-fronted tall semi-detached villa property, whereas this application relates to a post-war semi-detached property, therefore on this basis, the example in situ along the Brooklands Road street scene is therefore not considered to represent a precedent for works of this type, for properties of this type, in this area.

No. 57 is a historic small scale intervention, that does not represent the same scale of intervention in the character of the street scene.

Therefore, if the proposed front dormers were to be approved, it is considered that they would cause undue harm to the visual amenity and character of the area; contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and chapter 2 of the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007).

Conclusion

In this instance, it is considered that the submitted plan does not sufficiently accord with the principles of the policy documents outlined above. Although the proposed development would allow the adaptation of the existing house to meet changing residential needs, on balance, it is considered that the if the proposed front dormers were to be allowed, they would unduly harm the visual amenity and character of the area; which is contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and Chapter 2 (Design) of the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007). The proposal, therefore, cannot be supported by the Local Planning Authority.

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal during the course of the planning application, but these concerns have not been overcome. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and therefore refused in a timely manner.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposed front dormer extensions by reason of their siting, scale and design would significantly detract from the character of the original property and would unduly harm the visual amenity and character of the area; contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995) and Chapter 2 (Design) of the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

20 Huntley Road, Manchester, M8 4JF
16 Huntley Road, Manchester, M8 4JF
14 Huntley Road, Manchester, M8 4JF
29 Brooklands Road, Crumpsall, Manchester, M8 4JH
25 Brooklands Road, Crumpsall, Manchester, M8 4JH
18 Huntley Road, Manchester, M8 4JF
15 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
13 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
11 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
9 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
7 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
5 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
3 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG
1 Tixall Walk, Manchester, M8 4JG

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA