

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141990/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 27 January 2025
Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, front and rear roof dormers and hip to gable roof alterations
Address: 10 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Mr Ahmed
Agent (if any): Mr Subhan Saleem
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 21 March 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 24 February 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 29 January 2025 Expired: 19 February 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 10 Dobroyd Street within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The application site relates to a semi-detached, red brick, two storey dwellinghouse sited on the western side of Dobroyd Street. Whilst the western side of Dobroyd Street is characterised by pairs of semi-detached properties, properties to the east of the street are characterised by terraced properties, older in age. Amenity space to the front of the property is characterised by a paved area with varying levels of topography, and amenity space to the rear is characterised by a grassed garden with some areas of hardstanding.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, front and rear roof dormers and hip to gable roof alterations.

The part single storey side extension would align with the primary elevation of the host property with approximate dimensions of Height: 3.5 x Length: 7.7 x Width: 2.1 metres.

The part two storey side extension would have a significant set back of 2.7 metres with approximate dimensions of Height: 7.7 x Length: 5 x Width: 2.1 metres.

The part single storey rear extension would extend the width of the side extension and host property with approximate dimensions of Height: 3 x Length: 4.5 x Width: 8.3 metres.

The part two storey rear extension would have a projection of 2 metres. The extension at first floor level would be sited close to the boundary with no.12 and 4 metres from the shared boundary with adjoining property no.8 Dobroyd Street.

The front roof dormer would have a gable roof formation with approximate dimensions of Height: 1.7 x Length: 2.3 x Width: 3.8 metres.

The rear roof dormer would sit within the roof of the host property with approximate dimensions of Height: 2 x Length: 6 x Width: 3.8 metres.

The roof of the host property would be altered from a hip to gable formation.

The proposal would involve the insertion of three windows within the front elevation, 5 windows and set of sliding doors within the rear elevation and a roof lantern within the single storey flat roof element of the proposal.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal would include:

- To match existing- brick, roof tiles, PVC windows
- Different to existing- dormer cladding, roof lantern/skylight, glazed bi-fold door.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The agent was advised via email on 28 February 2025 that the application could not be supported.

The application was refused under previous iteration 139159/FH/2024 and was tested at appeal which was dismissed.

Having reviewed the Inspectorate's report, it is not considered the revised scheme goes far enough to mitigate harm as raised by the LPA and the Inspectorate.

The following amendments were suggested to the agent as an acceptable way forwards:

- Provision of a correct site setting out plan to be able to assess the impact of the ground floor wrap round rear element to no.12 Dobroyd Street, as the 4.5 metre extension raises concerns so close to the boundary, exaggerated by the change of levels between the two properties.
- Reduce the projection of the ground floor extension to attempt to overcome the Inspectorate's comments.
- Part first floor rear extension- Whilst the loss of the built form at first floor level against no.8 is welcomed, the first floor element close to the neighbour of no.12 would feel an overbearing impact, given the change in levels and the constrained site. This element needs to be set off the shared boundary with no.12.
- Consider hipping the roof of the first floor rear extension to reduce massing of the first floor extension for the neighbouring properties.
- Further information required in relation to the cladding to be used for the front and rear dormer window.

Whilst the agent confirmed receipt of the comments and stated verbally they would produce a revised scheme, no acceptable revised scheme was provided at the time the report was written.

Planning History

The current application is a re-submission of:

139159/FH/2024- Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, front and rear roof dormers and hip to gable roof alterations.

Refused 4 April 2024.

Appeal dismissed 12 December 2024.

136888/FH/2023- Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension, front and rear roof dormers and hip to gable roof alterations.

Approved 13 June 2023

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. Updated March 2024 following adoption of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

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) (Deletions replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)

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 (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 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 application seeks planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, front and rear roof dormers and hip to gable roof alterations. The principle of development is not acceptable, as the benefits to the applicant do not outweigh the potential harm in relation to visual/residential amenity and design and appearance. Despite the agent confirming receipt of the email containing the Local Planning Authority's concerns with the application, no revised plans or further correspondence took place with the agent. The current application seeks to overcome the reasons for refusal as determined through 139159/FH/2024. However, the current scheme does not go far enough to mitigate harm as raised by the LPA and the Inspectorate.

Visual/Residential Amenity

The proposed two storey side extension is not considered to create any harm in terms of visual/residential amenity given the ridge height of this element of the proposal would be lower than the host property, the first floor would have a significant setback of 2.7 metres and no

windows would be inserted within the side elevation facing onto the neighbouring property no.12 Dobroyd Street.

Further, the front and rear dormers, in connection with the hip to gable roof conversion would be very similar to the built form approved under the previous planning reference: 136888/FH/2023 and is not considered to give rise to any adverse amenity implications.

However, the proposed ground and first floor rear extension gives rise to concerns. As shown within the images below, some attempt has been made to reduce the harm to the neighbouring properties.



Left hand image- floor plans (139159/FH/2024), right hand image- floor plans (current application)

Whilst the ground floor projection (4.5 metres) remains the same, at first floor, the extension is set 4 metres from the adjoining neighbour and so the first floor extension sits against the shared boundary with no.12 Dobroyd Street only.

Within the revised scheme, the harm to the adjoining property, no.8 Dobroyd Street has been considered. The 4.5 metre ground floor projection has been approved under 136888/FH/2023 previously. Given the first floor extension is pulled substantially away from the shared boundary (4 metres away) and then projects 2 metres, an attempt has been made to reduce tunnelling to the neighbour's first floor rear window. However, due to the constrained site and the use of the gable roof, there is still a level of overbearing considered unacceptable given the tight relationship with the neighbouring properties. As such, the accumulation of the single and first floor extension with proposed massing and roof form creates an overbearing feature to the

detriment of the neighbour's ability to utilise the space to the rear of their property, contrary to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Although no.12 Dobroyd Street benefits from a single storey outrigger which offers some screening and protection, the revised scheme would still be considered overbearing to no.12. No.12 Dobroyd Street would feel an additional 4.5 metres rear projection at ground floor level and 2 metres at first floor level. The applicant property sits at an elevated topography than no.12 Dobroyd Street and the relationship between the properties along Dobroyd Street and those properties along Limestead Avenue is considered tight, given as existing only a 17 metre distance exists between the rear building line of the host property and properties along Limestead Avenue. Whilst it is acknowledged no.12 would not be impacted by any loss of light/overshadowing due to the orientation of the properties within the streetscene, nor any adverse privacy implications since no windows would be placed within the side elevation of the proposal, the proposal is considered overbearing. It is acknowledged that the neighbour benefits from a small 2.5 metre approx. outrigger. However, at ground floor, the neighbour would feel an additional 2 metres. This in addition to the 2 metres at first floor level is considered excessively large sited against the boundary, giving rise to an overbearing feature. This is exacerbated by the change in levels at the site and the gable roof formation which would create an overpowering feature and detrimentally impact the neighbour's enjoyment to their rear amenity space. Further, the additional built form is considered to create an adverse tunnelling impact to the neighbour's rear window closest to the shared boundary.

No attempts to amend the scheme to overcome harm to no.12 Dobroyd Street has been made- as the ground and first floor rear extension still have the same projections, as seen within previous submission 139159/FH/2024. As such, the LPA and Inspectorate's concerns have not been addressed. The proposal's height, extent of projection (including both two storey and single storey elements) and its overall mass would be overbearing and would have an adverse effect on the outlook from the non-adjoining neighbours and their gardens.

In short, the scheme does not go far enough to overcome tunnelling and overbearing for the two immediate neighbours. As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 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.

Design and Appearance

The proposed two storey side extension is considered pursuant with Policy DC1.4 of the UDP and is considered a subservient feature within the streetscene due to the decent set back at first floor level of 2.7 metres.

The front and rear dormers, in connection with the hip to gable roof conversion would be very similar to the built form approved under the previous planning reference: 136888/FH/2023 and are mainly considered acceptable in design and appearance.

However, further information was required in relation to the cladding to be used on the front and rear dormers. No information was supplied during the course of the application. However, it is considered that if this application were to be recommended for approval, such details could be dealt with via the use of a materials condition.

The design and appearance of the rear extension is not considered acceptable, and the scheme does not go far enough to overcome the LPA and Inspectorate's concerns as per the decision of 139159/FH/2024.

The existing rear garden of the property is relatively small and the proposal would be an excessively dominant and visually intrusive feature that would fail to integrate with its surroundings. Whilst the current scheme reduces the projection of the first floor extension only against the boundary with the adjoining neighbour, the projection of the ground nor first floor extension has been reduced.

As such, the current scheme is still considered overly large and bulky. The ground floor projection of 4.5 metres, whilst it was considered acceptable for a rear extension only as approved under 136888/FH/2023, is considered excessively large when the projection relates both to a rear and side extension extending up to the shared boundary with no.12 Dobroyd Street. As such, this element is considered contrary to Policy DC1.2 of the UDP. Whilst the projection of the first floor (2 metres) is considered appropriate in terms of projection, its placement against the shared boundary with no.12 Dobroyd Street again creates an overly dominant structure, contrary to Policy DC1.2 of the UDP.

In addition, the gable roof element of the first floor extension would be considered to increase negative impacts to the neighbour in terms of overbearing and therefore be considered bulky in form and design, contrary to Policy DC1.2 of the UDP.

Bin Store

Bin storage details were also requested from the agent during the course of the application; however, no details were received. However, it is acknowledged this is not a reason for refusal and if an approval was granted on the scheme a condition requesting further bin store details would be attached to 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: 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 positive and proactive manner, but a revised scheme which overcame concerns raised was not received.

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

1) The proposed part single, part two storey rear extension, by reason of its projection, scale, height and massing, in close proximity to the common boundary with the adjoining properties, no.8 and no.12 Dobroyd Street, would give rise to an overbearing, overly dominant and tunnelling impact to the two properties resulting in an adverse effect on the neighbours outlook. As such the proposal is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 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.

2) The proposed part single, part two storey rear extension, by reason of its scale, design and relationship to the neighbouring property, no.8 and no.12 Dobroyd Street, and surrounding properties form an overly bulky and visually obtrusive feature, which is out of character with, and fails to contribute positively to, the local area. The proposal would therefore have an unduly harmful impact in relation to design and appearance, which is contrary to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1, EN1 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

8 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
29 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
21 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
10 Limestead Avenue, Manchester, M8 5AA
25 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
23 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
1 Wellfield Road, Crumpsall, Manchester, M8 5GD
8 Limestead Avenue, Manchester, M8 5AA
6 Limestead Avenue, Manchester, M8 5AA
27 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
19 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD
12 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD

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