

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141828/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 2 January 2025
Proposal: Erection of two storey front and side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension.
Address: 18 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

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

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 20 March 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 16 January 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 18 February 2025 Expired: 25 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 18 Boardman Road within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The application site relates to a two storey, semi-detached red brick dwellinghouse with a staggered primary building line with a large set back of the gable elevation of the property with gable roof formation, front bay windows and a steep rear roof plane. The property sits close to the junction of Boardman Road and Highclere Road. Amenity space for the property spans the front, side and rear amenity space and at the time of the site visit, the amenity space was home to construction materials. At the site visit, a PVC rear dormer was present sitting within the rear roof plane of the host property and a white UPVC barge board visible from the gable elevation of the property. The side extension and garage that previously sat to the side of the property had been demolished.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey front and side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey front extension would infill the existing open area of the staggered front elevation, resulting in one continuous primary building line. This would have approximate dimensions of Height: 6.9 x Length: 2.6 x Width: 2.6 metres.

The two storey side extension would be set back from the new continuous building line of the property by 2.5 metres and would have dimensions of Height: 7.7 x Length: 5.5 x Width: 3.5 metres.

The part single rear extension would wrap into the two storey side extension and would have a splay at the rear at the point closest to the boundary with no. 20 Boardman Road and would have a flat roof. At the largest part, it would have approximate dimensions of Height: 2.7 x Length: 4 x Width: 10.5 metres.

The part two storey rear extension would have a staggered projection. The central bathroom element would have a projection of 2.5 metres and bedroom 4 at the point closest to no.20 Boardman Road would have a reduced projection of 1.9 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of a door and five windows within the front elevation, a door and two windows within the side elevation and a window, a rooflight and a set of sliding doors within the rear elevation.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed as:

- Bricks to match existing
- Tiles to match existing for pitched roof, for flat roof insulated warm roof system
- Double glazed UPVC window to match existing
- UPVC external doors to match existing.

It is noted a PVC white roof dormer is present at the site. The same dormer was present when conducting the site visit for 140487/FH/2024. The LPA has decided that the unauthorised dormer structure would be dealt with by colleagues in Planning Enforcement. The proposed plans do not show the inclusion of such development to the existing roof plane. Via email on 4 February 2025, the agent confirms the applicant's intentions to remove the dormer. Via email on 13 February 2025, the applicant confirmed they were willing to work with the LPA to remove the structure. This matter will be picked up separately to this application, and no assessment will be made of the dormer element. The assessment of the scheme will relate to the front, side and rear extensions only.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The initial plans submitted for review were not considered to overcome the stated reason for refusal under 140487/FH/2024. Revised plans were received to sought to overcome the previous reason for refusal. The proposal also included a window within the first floor extension facing in the direction of the adjoining semi which would have resulted in direct overlooking.

The description of development was amended to more accurately reflect the proposed development.

The agent was asked to clarify the proposed parking, bin store provision and materials to be used for the proposal.

Planning History

The current application seeks to overcome the reason for refusal for the previously determined application of:

140487/FH/2024-Erection of a two storey front and side and part single, part two storey rear extension.

Refused 4 September 2024.

The application was refused on the grounds of:

1) The erection of the part single, part two storey rear extension and the insertion of the first-floor rear bedroom window due to its close proximity to the adjoining boundary with no.20 Boardman Road, results in overlooking. Therefore, the extension results in an overly dominant feature at first floor level creating an unsatisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties resulting in overbearing and overlooking, which would be detrimental and unduly harmful to residential and visual amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), Places for Everyone policies JP-S1 and the provisions within the NPPF.

139265/FH/2024-Proposed double storey extension wrap around.

Refused 1 May 2024.

036372-Single storey side extension to dwellinghouse to form new breakfast room.

Approved 1 June 1990.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and two responses were received during the initial consultation. The following concerns were raised:

- The proposal would result in an overbearing impact to the neighbouring property due to the proximity of the built form.
- The proposal would result in adverse privacy implications, and loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- Concern with the existing unauthorised dormer structure at the site, and whether it would remain at the site following any approval granted.
- Concern with works to the chimney that have impacted the adjoining property.
- Neighbour states they have suffered damage to their fence, caused by the applicant.
- Concern was also raised that the unauthorised dormer structure and construction works at the applicant site were hindering the sale of neighbouring properties.

One comment was received during the first re-notification period. No further issues were raised to those outlined above.

Two comments were received during the 2nd re-notification period. Similar comments were outlined to those above.

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).

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 development application is for the erection of two storey front and side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and adapt homes rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. Consideration must be given to the grounds for refusal for the previous applications of 140487/FH/2024 (refused 4 September 2024) and 139265/FH/2024 (refused 1 May 2024). As the property is to remain a single family dwelling house, it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

Potential impact to no.20 Boardman Road:

The application of 140487/FH/2024 was refused for the insertion of the first-floor rear bedroom window due to its close proximity to the adjoining boundary with no.20 Boardman Road, resulting in overlooking, to the detriment of residential amenity. The previous submission was also refused for the close proximity of built form which would have resulted in an overbearing feature.

The revised scheme received 16 February 2025 removes the insertion of windows within the rear elevation of the first floor rear extension, following a change to the internal layout of the first floor extension. Bedroom 4 results in a window in the front elevation and a further window in the side elevation. The submitted plans show the window within bedroom 4 as obscure glazed. Whilst this is not considered completely necessary given the view would primarily look onto the road and onto the front drive of no.20 only, given it has been referenced in such a way within the plans, a condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted. A roof light would be inserted in the proposed bathroom at first floor level to ensure some level of ventilation for the applicant. As such, the relocation of the windows would mitigate harm to no.20 Boardman Road in terms of overlooking.

Whilst a window at ground floor level facing the shared boundary with no.20 would be installed, given the high boundary treatment and ground floor location, it would not give rise to any harm to no.20. Whilst it is acknowledged the ground floor would be sited 2 metres from the shared boundary and not result in the best desirable outlook for the applicant, this was not recognised to warrant a refusal for previous submissions and rather a design preference from the applicant.

The proposal has been designed in a way to minimise harm in terms of creating an overbearing feature to no.20 Boardman Road. Due to the high boundary treatment separating the two properties, no.20 would be primarily impacted by the first floor extension. On 5 March 2025 the first floor plan was amended to ensure a greater separation of built form from the shared

boundary by reducing the projection of bedroom 4 to only 1.9 metres. Given the built form at first floor level has a reduced projection, this helps to create a sense of space for no.20 Boardman Road. The impact to no.20 would be most felt to the neighbour's existing garage which does not involve any windows in the side. Whilst it is noted that the neighbour sits to the north of the applicant site and the neighbour benefits from three windows within their gable elevation, the neighbour's two first floor windows appear to be obscure glazed. Given this and given the applicant site sits at a splayed angle, any loss of light to the neighbour's gable windows would not be considered to constitute a refusal on the scheme. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would be sited close to the boundary of no.20, given the splayed nature and given the majority of built form would be sited to the side of the neighbouring property, the overbearing feature caused would not be so severe to warrant a refusal on the scheme given the increased set away from the boundary with no.20 following the amendment to the first floor.

Potential impact to no.33 Highclere Road:

Impacts to no.33 Highclere Road were considered to be acceptable under the previous application of 140487/FH/2024, following amendments to the built form against the shared boundary at first floor level.

The previous application gave rise to concerns that the first floor rear extension against the boundary with the adjoining neighbour would have a detrimental impact upon the residential and visual amenity to the occupiers at no.33 Highclere Road. However, as the current plans show the first floor rear extension being sited 3.5 metres from the shared boundary, the set away proposed is considered adequate to ensure the proposal does not give rise to overshadowing to the neighbour's rear first floor window and the set away ensures the extension does not create an overbearing feature to the neighbouring property when looking out of their rear window.

Further, the form, bulk and massing of the first floor rear extension was identified as a reason for refusal within the previously refused scheme (139265/FH/2024). This is also considered to be overcome within the current application, as the built form is set adequately away from the shared boundary and the roof formation of the two storey rear extension has changed from a gable to hipped roof, reducing massing and bulk of the scheme. There is also a reduction in the projection of built form at first floor level of 2.5 metres and first floor level and 4 metres at ground floor level. This is considered acceptable to not create an overbearing feature to no.33 Highclere Road.

Potential impact to streetscene:

The streetscene would feel the additional built form at the side and the front of the applicant site. The development to the side and front, due to its positioning and relationship with surrounding properties is not considered to give rise to any adverse overlooking, overbearing or loss of light implications to the streetscene.

A ground floor bathroom would be created in the proposed side extension and a condition would be attached to any approval granted to obscure glaze this window to protect the privacy of the applicant and any passersby.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon residential or visual amenity, and harm has been mitigated within the revised drawings received. A condition restricting the further insertion of windows or doors would ensure no adverse privacy implications could occur as a result of the proposal. A further condition would result in two windows being obscure glazed to reduce any adverse overlooking implications. In short, the proposal is therefore considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1.

Design and Appearance

Two storey front extension:

The proposed two storey front extension would infill the existing open area of the staggered front elevation, resulting in one continuous primary building line. Whilst the proposal would result in the loss of the staggered primary building line, it is not considered that it would adversely harm the appearance of the property. The property does not sit within a Conservation Area nor is it listed. It is noted there are a number of different property types in the surrounding areas and there are examples of similar two storey front extensions approved in the immediate area including at no.27 Boardman Road (067970/FH/2003/N1) and 3 Ardern Road (140529/FH/2024). As such, the resultant two storey extension would be considered pursuant to Policy EN1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Two storey side extension:

DC1.4 of the UDP requires the creation of domestic extensions which are subservient to the main house, do not cause a terracing effect and must provide a 1.53 metre gap to the shared boundary. In order to avoid the terracing effect and to ensure that subservience to the original dwellinghouse is achieved. The side extension would be set back from the primary building line of the proposal by 2.5 metres and would be set 4 metres from the boundary at the closest point. As such, the form of the side extension is considered to be compliant with Policy DC1.4 of the UDP and therefore considered to create an acceptable two storey side extension.

Part single, part two storey rear extension:

The part single storey extension would have a projection of 4 metres. It is acknowledged that this exceeds the maximum rearward projection for extensions as specified within Policy DC1.3 of the UDP (3.65 metres). However, given the possibility of the Larger Homes Extension route under Prior Approval for extensions larger in size, the proposed projection is considered to be acceptable. As the first floor extension is restricted to 2.5 metres at the central point and 1.9 metres from the point closest with no.20 and set in from the boundary with the adjoining property by 3.5 metres, an attempt has been made to ensure the proposal is acceptable in size and form. Therefore, the proposal is considered sympathetic to the neighbouring properties and surrounding type of development, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Materials:

The materials to be used are considered acceptable and would match the host property, except for the use of the flat roof material for the part single storey rear flat roof extension. The materials chosen are considered appropriate for the residential setting and a materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

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.

Car Parking

No change to parking provision would occur as a result of the proposal.

Bin Storage

A bin store has been proposed to be sited within the front amenity space of the applicant property. Details of a timber bin structure to accommodate 4no. bins has been supplied for

review. The proposed bin store details are considered acceptable and the details would be conditioned accordingly within any approval granted.

Concerns raised during the Neighbour Notification

Local residents were consulted and the following concerns were raised:

- The proposal would result in an overbearing impact to the neighbouring property due to the proximity of the built form.
- The proposal would result in adverse privacy implications, and loss of light to neighbouring properties.

The above concerns are considered to be addressed within the visual/residential section of the report.

- Concern with the existing unauthorised dormer structure at the site, and whether it would remain at the site following any approval granted.

As stated previously within the report, the unauthorised dormer structure is to be dealt with by colleagues in Enforcement and does not form part of the application's assessment.

- Concern with works to the chimney that have impacted the adjoining property.
- Neighbour states they have suffered damage to their fence, caused by the applicant.
- Concern was also raised that the unauthorised dormer structure and construction works at the applicant site were hindering the sale of neighbouring properties.

These issues extend beyond the remit of planning and so cannot be addressed by the submission of the planning application. Any civil matters should be dealt with by civil/ legal advisors. Private benefits cannot be considered through the planning process.

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

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 and a revised scheme considered to overcome issues raised has been provided in a timely manner. Appropriate conditions have been attached to any approval granted.

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:

-Application Form, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 4 February 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Ground Floor Plan, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 February 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Bin Store Elevations, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 February 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- Elevations, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 5 March 2025.

-Drawing- Proposed- First Floor Plan, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 5 March 2025.

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

3) 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 openings, including windows and doors, shall be inserted within the elevations of the extension, other than those shown on the approved drawings, unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellinghouse, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Before first occupation, the ground floor bathroom window within the side elevation of the proposal and first floor bedroom 4 window within the side elevation of the proposal as shown on the approved 'Drawing- Proposed- Elevations, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 5 March 2025', 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 properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) The materials to be used throughout the proposal hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details as set out in the Application Form, specified in Condition 2 of this approval.

Reason- In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with 'Drawing- Proposed- Ground Floor Plan', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 February 2025 and 'Drawing- Proposed- Bin Store Elevations', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 February 2025, in relation to a secure and ventilated bin storage area. The bin storage area shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and be in place prior to the first use of the development and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the provision of off-street car parking, and the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

Informatives

1) This consent does not grant consent for the rear roof dormer at the site.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

33 Highclere Road, Manchester, M8 4FJ
31 Highclere Road, Manchester, M8 4WH
35 Highclere Road, Manchester, M8 4FJ
20 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4FH
27 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WS
20 Boardman Road, Crumpsall, Manchester, M84FH
33 Highclere Road, Crumpsall, Manchester, M8 4fj

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