

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 142557/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 28 March 2025
Proposal: Erection of a part single/part two-storey rear extension and rear dormer in association with loft conversion.
Address: 114 St Werburgh's Road, Manchester, M21 0UL
Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr Khalid Ashraf
Agent (if any): Mr George Falzon
Case officer: Robert Tyrer
Tel: 0161 234 4068
Email: robert.tyrer@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 23 May 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 7 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 and area

114 St Werburgh's Road is a large, two-storey, semi-detached bay-fronted dwellinghouse constructed of red brick with a dark grey concrete tile roof. Located within the Chorlton Park Ward of Manchester, the property features both front and rear gardens, offering off-road parking and private outdoor space for residents. The front boundary consists of a low brick wall, while the side and rear shared boundaries are made of timber fencing. The property includes an existing a single-storey rear outrigger.

Chorlton Park Ward is a suburban area situated approximately 5 miles south of Manchester City Centre. Primarily residential, it features a diverse mix of housing types. Key amenities include several primary and secondary schools, supermarkets, and expansive green spaces such as Chorlton Park, Hough End, and Southern Cemetery. Chorlton Park is well-connected by major roads and public transport, including the Metrolink, with St Werburgh's Road and Withington stops located within the ward.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission to erect a part single/part two-storey rear extension and rear dormer in association with loft conversion.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity – Notification letters were sent to nearby residential properties (see appendix 1 for the list of properties).

Local residents/public opinion

Four objections to the application were received.

The main themes/issues raised were as follows:

1. Scale, Massing and Appearance:

- The grey tile dormer extension is very imposing and dark, dominating the view from neighbouring houses and gardens.
- The extensions dominate and overlook neighbouring gardens and rooms, with concerns about the magnolia tree being cut down.
- Black uPVC windows and doors add to the dark and imposing look of the back of both 112 and 114.
- Walls of extension and dormer are not a good match
- Originally, 112 and 114 were not identical. The second storey added to 114 makes the dormer more imposing.
 - The houses now mirror each other and are out of character with the area due to the large loft extension at 114.
- The loft conversions at 112 and 114 are very large and imposing, with no way to verify measurements.
- The site is visible from neighbouring roads.
- Unlike the modest dormer extension at 116, the extensions at 112 and 114 have a major impact on neighbouring households.

2. Garage Relocation?/Tree Removal?/Boundary Wall:

- The proposed garage placement may require severe pruning or removal of a large, mature magnolia tree that provides privacy for neighbours.
- The new garage must be built carefully to avoid damaging the magnolia tree, with concerns it might be used to justify tree removal.
- Existing garage demolished to make way for kitchen extension and started to remove boundary wall and has left an unsafe wall with no indication on plans about how the boundary wall will be secured or made good?

3. Privacy Concerns:

- Full-height transparent sliding doors in the loft conversion at 114 allow direct views into neighbouring houses and gardens.
- Use of the room as a gym raises questions regarding privacy.
- The extensions overlook neighbouring gardens and rooms, with concerns about the magnolia tree being cut down and its impact on privacy if removed.

4. Incorrect Roof Material:

- The roofs are made of grey tiles, not slate as stated in the application.

5. Retrospective Application:

- The application was submitted after work had begun, raising concerns about the timing and attempt to circumvent the planning system

6. Construction:

- Construction work/activity has ramped up, causing noise and disruption, with builders working seven days a week and late into the night.

7. HMO:

- Concerns the property will become a HMO.

Planning History

No previous planning applications at this property.

Legislative Issues

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF (updated December 2024) sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, i.e., the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and accompanying policies, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasizes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-making, this means:

- Approving development proposals that align with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the key policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 1. Policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusal.
 2. The adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the NPPF as a whole

Regional Policy

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039

On the 21st of March 2024, nine of the ten Greater Manchester Councils voted to adopt the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039 (PfEJDP); Manchester City Council is one of the Council's that has voted to adopt the plan. The PfEJDP has superseded parts of some of the policies contained within the Council's Core Strategy.

The relevant PfEJDP policy is as follows:

JP-S1: Sustainable Development

Focuses on ensuring that all new developments contribute to sustainable development. This means balancing social, economic, and environmental objectives to create resilient and thriving communities.

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Aims to create places that are not only sustainable but also resilient, safe, and capable of adapting to major environmental and economic changes. This policy emphasizes the importance of designing out crime, reducing opportunities for anti-social behaviour, and ensuring that developments make appropriate provisions for emergencies.

Local Policy

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant Core Strategy policies for this application are as follows:

Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

Development in all parts of the City should make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including creating well designed places that enhance or create character and protect and enhance the built and natural environment.

DM1 – Development Management 1

Focuses on ensuring high-quality design in new developments. It sets out criteria to assess the design, scale, and appearance of proposals to ensure they enhance or create character and protect the built environment. Key considerations include:

- **Design Quality:** Ensuring developments are visually appealing and contribute positively to the local area.
- **Context Appropriateness:** Making sure the design, scale, and appearance are suitable for the surrounding context.
- **Sustainability:** Promoting sustainable design and construction practices.
- **Amenity Protection:** Safeguarding the amenity of existing and future occupants

The relevant UDP policies for this application are:

DC 1.1 – 1.4 – Residential Extensions

Focus on residential extensions and set out criteria for assessing proposals.

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

Adopted in 2007, the SPD provides comprehensive planning guidance to support and enhance the development of the city. For example, the SPD aims to ensure attractive, well-designed, and well-maintained neighbourhoods that support sustainable development and community well-being.

Retrospective Application

During the site visit conducted on 7 May 2025, it was observed that the external works relating to the part single-storey/part two-storey rear extension and rear dormer were either completed or nearing completion. Internally, construction was ongoing, and it was noted that the refurbishment involved stripping the property back to brick, indicating a substantial renovation.

As such, the application may be considered a part-retrospective submission, seeking to retain works that have already been completed or are close to completion.

According to Paragraphs 012 and 013 of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 17b-012-20140306 and 17b-013-20140306), a local planning authority can invite a retrospective application ([section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#)). If the Council, as the local planning authority, believes that an application is the appropriate way forward to regularise the situation. In this case, the applicant was asked to submit a planning application following an investigation into complaints about unauthorised development at the property.

Whilst the Council may invite an application, it cannot be assumed that permission will be granted, and the local planning authority must be careful not to limit its ability to make decisions before reviewing any planning permission application – such an application must be considered in the normal way.

A person who has undertaken unauthorised development has only one opportunity to obtain planning permission after the event. This can either be by means of a retrospective planning application or by means of an appeal against an enforcement notice on the ground that planning permission ought to be granted or the condition or limitation concerned ought to be discharged – this is referred to as a ground (a) appeal.

Principle – Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) aim to ensure that new developments enhance or create character, protect and enhance the built environment, and that their design, scale, and appearance are appropriate to their context.

Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) specifically address residential extensions, outlining criteria for assessing such proposals. Despite their age, these policies align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which advocates for high design standards in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

In this case, the applicant seeks to retain the part single-storey/part two-storey rear extension and rear dormer built without prior planning permission and to approve the proposed works.

To assess the proposal's acceptability, considerations will include siting, scale, massing, design, and appearance. Additionally, the impact on surrounding residential amenity, particularly the effect on neighbouring occupiers, will be evaluated.

Finally, any other matters raised in response to the notification letter, which have not been addressed in the previous sections of the report, will be discussed.

Siting, Scale and Massing

As shown in photograph 1, the applicant has extended the rear of the property with a single-storey rear extension.

Siting at the rear of the property is a common and appropriate location for an extension. In fact the property previously had a conservatory attached to the rear according to the existing drawings. The extension does not extend beyond the existing side of the property that faces 116 St Werburgh's Road, maintaining a gap of 2.41 metres from the shared boundary. In relation to 114 St Werburgh's Road, the distance to the shared boundary is 1.445 metres. This property also has a single-storey rear extension, which is part of the development that was considered and approved under a separate planning application reference: 142360/FH/2025

The extension has a maximum rearward projection of just over 4 metres and a width of just over 5 metres (see image 1). It features a dual-pitched roof with two slopes meeting at a central ridge.

This ridge aligns with the rear windowsill of the first-floor rear window, giving the extension a maximum height of 3.83 metres and an eaves height of 2.87 metres.

Although the rearward projection exceeds the 3.65 metres specified by saved policy DC1 of the UDP, the policy uses the term "normally," allowing for the approval of larger extensions. The orientation of the property ensures that none of the neighbouring properties sharing a boundary with 112 St Werburgh's Road is overshadowed by the rear extension.

Single-storey rear extensions are generally not considered overbearing to neighbouring properties due to their typical siting, scale, and massing. In this case, the proposed extension has a height of less than 4 metres, which ensures it is not overly dominant and does not result in overshadowing of adjacent properties. The scale of the extension is proportionate to the existing dwelling, and the boundary treatment, approximately 1.8 metres in height, further mitigates any potential impact on neighbouring gardens.

The height of the outrigger has been increased to align with that of 112 St Werburgh's Road, and the dormer situated above it is similarly designed to reflect the form of the adjoining property. With a rearward projection of 1.35 metres and a width of 3.3 metres, the extension maintains a sufficient gap to the shared boundary with 116 St Werburgh's Road, and therefore raises no concerns in terms of overbearing impact or loss of amenity.

Although the dormer spans the full width of both the original roof and the new outrigger, its form and proportions are consistent with those previously assessed and deemed acceptable at 112 St Werburgh's Road under permitted development rights. While this particular dormer does require planning permission, it is noted that, had the applicant exercised their permitted development rights without any other additions, a dormer of similar scale and massing could have been constructed. As such, the visual and spatial impact of the proposed dormer is considered to be broadly comparable to what could be achieved under permitted development.

It is therefore considered that the extensions to the property accords with policies with SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.



Photograph 1 The extensions and dormer as built Image 1 Ground and First Floor Plan

Design and Appearance

The single-storey rear extension, while simplistic in design, adopts an L-shaped form that incorporates the ground floor of the single-storey outrigger and features a dual-pitched roof. The external materials used are consistent with the existing dwelling and, as observed during the site visit, are expected to weather and blend in over time. The windows and doors, finished in dark grey uPVC, are similar in style and colour to those previously approved at 112 St Werburgh's Road. The brickwork and roof tiles are also considered appropriate in colour and texture, complementing the character of the property.

Similarly, there are no concerns regarding the design and appearance of the outrigger. The brickwork matches that of the existing dwelling, and the window design is consistent with the existing fenestration in terms of colour and shape.

It is also noted that planning permission is not required to re-roof the property. In this instance, the property has been re-roofed using modern dark grey concrete tiles, which are visually compatible with the existing structure. The face and cheeks of the dormer have been finished in a material that closely resembles the new roof tiles, resulting in a cohesive and acceptable appearance.

Overall, there are no concerns with the design and appearance of the proposed extension and would not be out of keeping with other residential extensions found within the area or the City as a whole.

Therefore, the proposal, in terms of visual amenity, accords with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Residential Amenity

As noted, the property is currently unoccupied due to the extensive internal refurbishment works required to bring it up to modern, habitable standards. The submitted floor plans indicate that the property will become a four-bedroom family dwellinghouse. However, there are no planning restrictions preventing some rooms from being used as additional bedrooms, depending on the household needs of future occupiers.

The single-storey rear extension provides an enlarged kitchen/dining area, enhancing the functionality of the ground floor. The first-floor addition to the outrigger creates a more spacious bedroom, while the dormer extension adds valuable living space, including a study, bedroom, and gym/recreation room.

There are no concerns with this layout, as both Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy DC1 of the UDP support alterations that respond to the evolving needs of households. While not explicitly stated, it is evident that the extensions have significantly improved the internal layout and usability of the property, to the benefit of both current and future occupiers.

Importantly, the property remains a single-family dwellinghouse, and the proposed extensions are not expected to result in a level of activity that would be materially different from that of neighbouring residential properties.

In terms of residential amenity, the development is not considered to result in any significant adverse impacts. The proposal is therefore deemed to be in accordance with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved UDP Policy DC1.

Other Matters

Boundary Treatment, Outbuilding, and Tree Considerations

Clarification was sought regarding the boundary treatment along the shared boundaries with 116 St Werburgh's Road and 118 Egerton Road South, as the site visit revealed gaps in the existing boundary. Additionally, the site plan indicates the construction of a new garage in a different position from the previously demolished structure. This raised questions about its potential impact on the existing magnolia tree in the rear garden, which currently provides a degree of natural screening.

The proposed garage falls within the scope of permitted development rights for outbuildings, particularly as its height complies with the limitations set out in the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO). Similarly, the proposed 2-metre boundary treatment is within the tolerances permitted under the GPDO and does not require planning permission.

The application site is not located within a designated conservation area, and there are no protected trees on site. While the magnolia tree is not subject to any statutory protection, the applicant has confirmed that it will be retained. It should be noted, however, that the owner would be within their rights to remove the tree without the need for formal consent.

HMO/Flats

Concerns have been raised that the property will become a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The floor plan indicates that the property will be a family dwellinghouse.

Both Council tax records and Energy Performance Certificates for this property have been reviewed, and there is no separate address or indication that the property has been converted.

In Manchester, an Article 4 Direction is in place that affects Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). This legal measure removes the "permitted development" rights to convert a family dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) into an HMO (C4), meaning that property owners must obtain planning permission.

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:

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively and positively to issue the decision without delay. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the NPPF.

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

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

1161/11 Revision A

1161/13

1161/15

1161/16

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

110 St. Werburghs Road, Manchester, M21 0UL
118 Egerton Road South, Manchester, M21 0XJ
69 St Werburgh's Road, Manchester, M21 0UN
71 St Werburgh's Road, Manchester, M21 0UN
37 Chandos Road South, Manchester, M21 0TH
35 Chandos Road South, Manchester, M21 0TH
116 St Werburgh's Road, Manchester, M21 0UL
112 St Werburgh's Road, Manchester, M21 0UL

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