

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142577/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 28 March 2025
Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey rear and two storey side extension
Address: 11 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
Ward(s): Brooklands Ward

Applicant: Marshall
Agent (if any): Miss Rebecca Parnell, Extension Plans
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 20th May 2025



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 May 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 16 April 2025 Expired: 10 May 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

The site/building relates to a two storey end terrace property in the Brooklands ward area of Manchester. The site features an open plan garden to the front, garden to the rear and single storey extension to the side.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

This is primarily a residential area in nature

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey rear and two storey side

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. Six letters of objection have been received as a result of this proposal. Summary of comments as follows:

- Potential impact on my property and the surrounding area.
- Proposed Extension on the boundary line
- Require a formal Party Wall Notice under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996;
- Already been converted to include an additional bedroom
- Operating as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).
- The proposed extension, double the original capacity and would increase occupancy levels.
- Parking on Dominic Close is already severely congested
- The addition of another bedroom and potential increase in residents would exacerbate the already problematic parking situation.
- The number of occupants could have a significant impact on the surrounding residents, including issues related to noise, privacy, and general disturbance.
- The proposed changes would alter the character of the area, there are concerns regarding how the additional space will be utilised
- Parking and Access arrangements for the proposed development have not been properly addressed. There is insufficient parking and access to the property is extremely limited. The anticipated increase in residents will place further strain on local parking and traffic flow could become a serious issue
- Parking and Access during building work: There is extremely limited access to the Close and property. The disturbance and additional strain on local parking and traffic flow during the building works would be a serious issue.
- Privacy will be affected by the extension to the rear, any windows to the side must be opaque
- There is a large ash tree on the border at the back that will probably be touching the rear extension when it is built and is within falling distance of this house. There are also 2 large silver birch trees within falling distance of the house in the garden
- Loss of privacy to rear garden
- Overdevelopment in a Limited-Access Cul-de-Sac
- Intensification of Use

Local Members – Councillor Evans

- Several residents who are concerned about the over development as the property has already had the garage converted into a bedroom
- Already have 3 cars causing parking issue with neighbours and adding a further bedroom will exacerbate the problem
- Residents state this not being used as a family home more like a HMO
- The council installed double yellow lines at the top of this close because of parking issues
- Local resident worried the development is up to shared boundary

Trees – have no objection to the development.

Policy and Issues

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

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.

JP-S1: Sustainable Development
JP-P1 Sustainable Places

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Principle

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History

No previous planning applications relating to this site, however, the site forms part of a planning application to construct housing as part of a small housing estate constructed circa 1988.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey rear and two storey side. The enlargement would see the increase no. of bedrooms from 2 to 4 also accommodating ensuite facilities and enlarged kitchen.

Concerns have been raised by local residents including local members. Summary of the comments are set out above in the consultation and notification responses. The main concerns raised are in relation to car parking, location of the extension, Party Wall Act, HMO, increased footprint and occupiers, noise, loss of privacy, loss of character of the area, parking during construction works and trees.

Ground Floor

Following demolition of the existing side extension, the proposal would be set back from the principal elevation measuring 1.0m extending rearwards along the side with a projection beyond the rear wall measuring 1.8m. A gap would be retained to the rear boundary with no's 8 and 10 Colchester Close. The proposal would form a wraparound of the property extending across the rear up to the shared boundary with no. 9 Dominic Close. The windows would reflect that of the original property and would be located on the front and rear elevation together with double doors on the side elevation and a single door on the rear. Given the distance between the site boundary and properties opposite the side elevation, together with the boundary treatment, it is not anticipated that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by the introduction of doors to the side.

The roof to the rear would be sloping with the inclusion of a roof light in the rear.

First Floor

The first floor would be set back from the front wall of the property measuring 1.0m, extending rearwards with a projection beyond the rear wall measuring 1.8m. The extension would form a wraparound of the property extending partway across the rear wall to a width of 4.787m retaining a gap of 2.0m to the shared boundary with no. 9 Dominic Close. Windows are proposed on the front and rear with a window at first floor in the side elevation. Although this window would serve a walk in wardrobe, a condition for obscure glaze has been attached to ensure there is no overlooking. No windows are proposed along the side elevation of the extensions to the rear and therefore there is no risk of overlooking or loss of privacy. Windows to the rear are considered would provide no further view than an existing rear bedroom window at first floor. The roof would be set down and would be gable on the side to reflect the current style roof of the host dwelling and would be hipped to the rear.

Given the orientation of the property together with the gaps retained at either side of the property, it is not considered that there would be any overshadowing or loss of light to the adjacent properties.

Given the relationship of the host dwelling with no. 13 Dominic Close, together with the setback from the principal elevation of the property, there is no risk of terracing.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area has been retained, therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

Part single part two storey side and rear extensions are not an unusual addition to some properties within the immediate and wider area and on balance, the extension is considered can be acceptably accommodated at the application property. Adequate amenity space is retained to the front, side and rear of the site and therefore the development would not be considered to be overdevelopment. In terms of the projection at the rear of the property, should the applicant build a single storey rear extension independently, this can be done under permitted development up to 3.0m in projection without the need for planning permission subject to complying with relevant criteria.

Noise issues were raised as a concern by local residents. Given that the property is for a single residential use, it is not considered that the introduction of an extension to the side and rear would give rise to significant or adverse impacts beyond those that would normally be anticipated for such a use. General activity associated with the residential dwelling would be of a similar nature to those residential properties already in the area and would not be expected to lead to unusual or unacceptable levels of noise. In relation to construction noise, this is not anticipated to continue outside the normal working hours and would be a temporary imposition during the construction phase.

Further concerns were raised in relation to the use of the property and the increased occupancy resulting in intensification of the use as a result of development. Confirmation was sought from the agent/applicant who clarified that the property would be in use as a single residential dwelling house, a condition has been appended. With regard to the Party Wall Act, this would be a civil matter between the applicants and occupiers of the adjoining property.

Overall, in terms of residential amenity it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

The height of the proposed extension is set down from the original ridge height of the existing host dwelling. The size and footprint of the proposed extension is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and are considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy

Design

The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials by way of brick and tile as specified in the application form. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

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.

Trees

T1 as marked on the site plan numbered DC-R00-PR-101, is considered would not be affected by the development to the rear of the site. However, protection of the tree should be ensured during excavation works.

Bins

Bin storage to the rear of the property is unaffected by this proposal and therefore is considered would be acceptable.

Car parking

Concerns have been raised by local residents in relation to proposed parking as a result of the proposal. The City Council considers that the retention of an off road car parking space would not be affected as space would still be retained to the site on the front driveway. This is considered to be acceptable for the use of the property as a single residential use.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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

Positive and proactive working - 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 application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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:

Revised received on 22nd April 2025 numbered DC-R00-PR-102 Proposed Floor Plans

Revised received on 22nd April 2025 numbered DC-R00-PR-103 Proposed Roof Plan

Revised received on 22nd April 2025 numbered DC-R00-PR-104 Proposed Elevations

Revised received on 22nd April 2025 numbered DC-R00-PR-106 Proposed Sections

Revised received on 7th May 2025 numbered DC-R00-PR-101 Proposed Site Plan showing Tree

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application forms 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 policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Before first occupation the window in the side elevation at first floor facing the rear properties of no's 8 and 10 Colchester Close, 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 residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) 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 extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved plans.

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

6) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the

written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5387 (Trees in relation to construction)

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with policies EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

7) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no part of the development shall be used for any purpose other than the purpose(s) of Class C3(a) of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification). For the avoidance of doubt, this is use by a single person or by people living together as a family.

Reason - In the exceptional circumstances of a proliferation of HMOs and short term lets restricting housing choice and adversely affecting sustainability and in the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through the provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to paragraph 7.4 of the Guide to Development in Manchester: Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

14 Colchester Close, Manchester, M23 9QF
12 Colchester Close, Manchester, M23 9QF
10 Colchester Close, Manchester, M23 9QF
12 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
8 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
6 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
9 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
8 Colchester Close, Manchester, M23 9QF
17 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
15 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
13 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
10 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
6 Colchester Close, Manchester, M23 9QF
7 Dominic Close, Manchester, M23 9GA
10 Woodwise Lane, Manchester, M23 9QY

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA