

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142357/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 10 March 2025
Proposal: Raising of the existing roof and installation of two dormers
Address: 1 Thetford Drive, Manchester, M8 0NH
Ward(s): Cheetham Ward

Applicant: Mr Attique Mazhar LP
Agent (if any): Mr Naeem Dalal ADA Plans _ Architectural Services Ltd
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 1 May 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10 April 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 20 March 2025 Expired: 10 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

The application site relates to 1 Thetford Drive within the north Manchester ward of Cheetham. The application site sits close to the junction of Greenford Road and Thetford Drive. Thetford Drive has a change in topography, and so the application site lies at a lower level in relation to the neighbouring properties to the south. The site is characterised by a brick detached bungalow with a pitched roof, incorporating dark coloured roof tiles. The bungalow has dark wooden clad gable to the front facade and brown coloured window frames. Amenity space consists of grassed and hardstanding elements surrounding the bungalow, including space related to the demolished garage, and off street parking space to the north east of the site.

Description of area

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.

Description of development

Consent is sought to raise the existing roof and install two dormers, one to each roof slope.

The roof height would be raised by 1 metre to allow additional head height of the installation of the 2no. dormers. The dormers would be sited on both roof slopes and would have approximate dimensions of Height: 1.5 x Length: 9.4 x Width: 2.8 metres. Each dormer would have a volume

of approximately 20 cubic metres, therefore a cumulative total of 40 cubic metres for both dormers.

Both dormers would include the installation of 3no. windows. The roof extensions would facilitate the creation of 3no. bedrooms, a study and bathroom in the roof space.

Materials to be used for the proposal have been listed as matching the existing bungalow.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

During the course of the application, the agent was advised that the LPA could not support the application.

In this case, there was not considered to be amendments which could be made to the scheme that would overcome the concerns raised, and the agent was advised that the applicant should give further consideration to implementing the approved consent of 135283/LP/2022.

The applicant responded on 23 April with a response to concerns raised. The applicant did not advise that they wished to withdraw the application. As such, the application is progressed with a recommendation for refusal.

Planning History

135283/LP/2022- Enlargement of dwellinghouse with 2no.dormers.
Approved 6 March 2023.

134706/FH/2022- Installation of side roof dormers, together with alterations to the existing garage involving alterations to its ground level and roof.
Withdrawn 18 October 2022.

118325/FH/2017- Erection of outbuilding to replace existing outbuilding.
Approved 26 April 2018.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and no responses were received.

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.

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).

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 (2022-2039)

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 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 application seeks planning permission for the raising of the existing roof and installation of two roof dormers. Extending a residential property, via extensions including roof dormers in order to provide additional living accommodation is often acceptable in principle.

In the case of this site, a householder application was submitted and withdrawn in 2022 for proposed roof dormers. The application was withdrawn as concern was raised that the insertion of side roof dormers would create an overly dominant feature in the streetscene and give rise to adverse visual and residential amenity implications. It was suggested at that time that the two dormers for which consent was sought were progressed through the route of Permitted Development. An application for a lawful certificate was subsequently approved under planning reference: 135283/LP/2022 (approved 06.03.2023). As such, the fallback position of the installation of two roof dormers has been established with the approval of 135283/LP/2022.

The current application, however, seeks consent again for the two dormers, with an increase in the roof height of the existing dwelling by 1m. It is not possible to achieve the raising of the

existing roof height through the route of Permitted Development and so this element of works requires consent. In this instance, this element of works is not considered acceptable, as the proposal would result in an overly dominant and incongruous feature and would appear overbearing to the neighbouring properties.

In this instance, the agent was advised to withdraw the current application and implement the scheme which was considered as part of application ref: 135283/LP/2022. No instruction to withdraw the application was received. The development is not considered to be acceptable, as the benefits to the applicant do not outweigh the potential harm in relation to visual/residential amenity and design and appearance.

Visual/Residential Amenity

Given the existing consent for the 2no. roof dormers, the principle of this element of the proposed development is already established. As such, the assessment of impacts to visual and residential amenity is based on the raising of the roof, in addition to such dormers.

The immediate neighbour to be impacted by the raising of the roof height and roof dormers would be no.3 Thetford Drive. due to the applicant's corner plot resulting in only one immediate neighbour. The space between the applicant's and neighbouring property consists of a hardstanding passage which sits within the neighbour's ownership. However, due to the nature of this passageway, it is not considered the neighbour would be impacted by adverse loss of light implications nor privacy implications.

The increase in roof height would increase the proportions of the existing dwellinghouse and raise the overall height of the building by 1 metre. It is noted the applicant site sits in a prominent location and such development would be seen from within Thetford Drive and Greenford Road with views afforded to the applicant site from both the east and west of Greenford Road. Within the applicant's email response dated 23 April 2025, they explained the height increase is a practical response to internal space requirements. The intention behind raising the roof is purely to provide sufficient headroom within the proposed upper floor layout. It is not to increase the perceived scale or height of the building when viewed externally.

Whilst the intention is noted, the proposal does change the scale and height of the building which leads to visual harm. Such increase in ridge height with the dormers would be considered to create an overly dominant feature in the streetscene. As such, the enlargement of the existing building would create an incongruous design which would be considered to create a visually intrusive feature. This is exaggerated by the siting of the applicant site in a corner location which makes it more prominent from Greenford Road, emphasising the visually harmful feature.

Due to the scale, height and massing, the proposal, including the raising of the ridge height by 1 metre is considered to create an overbearing and visually intrusive feature and so would be contrary to Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1 and policy DC1.1 and DC1.2 of the UDP, on the basis of visual amenity.

Design and Appearance

The side dormers have been established to constitute Permitted Development as determined and approved through planning reference 135283/LP/2022. As such, consideration to design and appearance will be mainly given to the raising of the roof height in this assessment.

The proposal would result in the height increase of the existing roof of 1 metre and would be constructed in materials to match. There is no permitted development fallback to consider for this element. The increase in roof height would increase the proportions of the existing property and result in an overly large development, with the inclusion of the already approved dormer windows. Whilst it is recognised that the surrounding area is characterised by front and rear dormers constructed in a variety of materials, the dormer windows have not required the raising of the host property roof. As such, this would introduce a design feature not prominent within the streetscene.

Whilst the applicant argues that the applicant property sits at a lower topography, this variation in levels follows the topography across the street. The increase by 1 metre would alter the pattern and heights of ridge height levels across the streetscene and so the proposal would appear out of character with the existing streetscene and established pattern of development.

Similar development incorporating increases to the ridge height of dwellinghouses has been tested at appeal as seen at no.38 Greenford Road (500ft from the applicant site) (see planning ref: 132864/FH/2022), where the appeal was dismissed. Within the Inspectorate's appeal decision, such increase in eaves and ridge height of the host property was considered to create an incongruous feature in the streetscene. Whilst it is noted that the Inspectorate links this to the fact that all the neighbouring properties are at one level, it still provides precedence that the increase in ridge height is not a design feature that would be acceptable in the immediate residential context.

In short, the increase in the existing roof height cannot be supported. The proposal would result in an overly dominant and incongruous feature, contrary to Policy DC1.1, DC1.2 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies EN1 and SP1.

Acceptable Design Solutions

Within the applicant's response dated 23 April 2025, the applicant sought clarification as to the level of increase in ridge height that would be considered acceptable. In this case, it is not considered that any level of ridge height would be considered acceptable given the neighbouring context and given increasing the ridge height is not a design feature that has been previously approved in the surrounding context. The applicant is advised to implement the consent of 135283/LP/2022.

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

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 proactive manner. In this instance, no revised scheme was supplied to the LPA in a timely manner. No instruction was given from the agent to withdraw the application so the application is therefore refused in a timely manner.

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

1)The proposed raising of the existing roof and installation of two dormers by reason of its scale, height and massing, would create a visually intrusive feature to the detriment of visual amenity for the neighbouring properties. The resultant increased height of the dwellinghouse and massing forms an overly bulky feature, which is out of character with, and fails to contribute positively to, the local area. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD, policy JP- S1 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

4 Thetford Drive, Manchester, M8 0NH
85 Cardinal Street, Manchester, M8 0WP
81 Cardinal Street, Manchester, M8 0WP
2 Thetford Drive, Manchester, M8 0NH
8 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
6 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW

4 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
2 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
83 Cardinal Street, Manchester, M8 0WP
6 Thetford Drive, Manchester, M8 0NH
5 Thetford Drive, Manchester, M8 0NH
3 Thetford Drive, Manchester, M8 0NH

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
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA