

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 144189/JO/2025

Date registered valid: 6 January 2026

Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 (specified plans) attached to planning permission 140649/FH/2024 to allow rooftop extension and elevational alterations.

Address: 15 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG

Ward(s): Brooklands Ward

Applicant: Mr Aqib Saeed

Agent (if any): Mr Thomas Chivers

Case officer: Jake Walther
Tel: 0161 234 1632
Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: **24/02/2026**

Application details

Type of application: Variation or Removal of Condition

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 05/02/2026

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 12 January 2026 Expired: 2 February 2026

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The application relates to a detached bungalow located within the cul-de-sac on Penryn Avenue in the Brooklands Ward of Manchester. The building is constructed of bricks with white framed windows, with an open gable roof and grey roof tiles. The property benefits from a front garden, hardstanding for vehicle parking, an internal garage and a garden to the rear with soft landscaping boundary treatment.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Penryn Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac within the Brooklands area of Manchester. The area is predominantly residential in terms of its character, consisting of a mixture of housing types including bungalows, two-storey semi-detached and detached residential dwellings. The site benefits from its proximity to Baguley Brook and Maple Woods public green spaces.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to amend the approved plans to incorporate a larger dormer occupying both sides, as well as various elevational alterations to the approved plans.

Application History

140649/FH/2024 – Approved 30/09/2024 - Erection of roof extension to create first floor and single storey rear extension, addition of dormer windows and installation of outbuilding in rear garden

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – 6no. objections received to the proposal, reasons for objection can be summarised as follows:

- Aesthetically unpleasing proposal, not in line with the other bungalows on the street.
- Overlooking and privacy concerns with dormer windows overlooking neighbouring property.
- All of the objections have the same perception that adding a first floor to the bungalow would reduce the 'affordable' housing stock for the elderly.

Policy

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 –

The City Council adopted the core strategy on July 11, 2012. It is the key document in the Manchester Local Plan. The plan determines how Manchester will grow and forms the framework that planning applications are assessed against. We consider the following Core Strategy Policies relevant to this proposal.

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- Policy EN19 – Waste

Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

The Core Strategy replaced much of the UDP, but some UDP Development Control policies are extant (remain). The following extant policy is still considered relevant to this proposal.

- DC1 - Residential Extensions

Places for Everyone

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 following policies are relevant:

- S1- Sustainable development

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):

- an economic objective
- a social objective and
- an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places.

The National Planning Policy Framework December 2025 (Draft)

The Government published a draft update to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in December 2025. While the draft has not yet been formally adopted, it is a material consideration and weight can be afforded to its policies. The following emerging policies from the draft NPPF are considered relevant to this application:

Chapter 3 – Decision-making policies

- DM1: Preparing development proposals

Chapter 4 – Achieving Sustainable Development

- S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Chapter 12 – Making Effective Use of Land

Principle

The principle of varying a condition to amend plans is generally limited to where the amendments result in only a minor change in scale or a modest alteration that does not materially depart from the original approval. However, consideration must be given to the proposals impact on the appearance, the wider visual amenity of the street scene, and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

In this case, the nature and extent of the proposed amendments exceed what could reasonably be considered a minor variation. The changes introduce new and elements that are not present within the original approval, thereby altering the character and scale of the approved development. As such, the proposal does not remain consistent with the permission it seeks to vary and is not acceptable in this instance.

Visual Amenity

The amendments include enlarging the previously approved dormer, increasing its height beyond the existing roof ridge, and introducing an additional dormer on the opposite roof slope. Collectively, these changes read not as dormer additions but as a substantial rooftop/first-floor extension.

In addition to this various other elevation alterations are proposed including changing window arrangements and removal of the front porch in favour for a small canopy. These changes are minor and are considered to be acceptable in terms of their impact on residential amenity.

The proposed dormer alterations are to be finished in hanging roof tiles with black-framed windows to blend. However, the increased bulk and the projection of approximately 0.4 m above the ridge result in an incongruous and visually dominant feature. This creates an unfitting relationship with the host building and disrupts the established roofline of neighbouring bungalows along Penryn Avenue. The scale and position of the dormers would therefore be harmful to the visual amenity of the area.

Residential Amenity

The introduction of a new dormer on the western roof slope would create additional windows facing No. 13 Penryn Avenue. These windows would increase chances for overlooking and would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for the neighbouring occupiers.

The changes to the ground floor windows and front porch would not result in increased chances for overlooking nor result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for neighbours and are therefore acceptable.

In contrast, the originally approved scheme included only skylights on this elevation, which due to their angle and height, does not result in the same level of overlooking as a dormer window and were therefore considered acceptable. The proposed amendment would significantly alter the degree of intervisibility between properties and would result in a demonstrable impact on residential amenity contrary to DM1 of the Core Strategy.

For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with UDP Policy DC1 and Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, as it would adversely affect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residents.

Sitting Scale and Mass

Under the original approval, two small and separate dormers were permitted on the western roof slope. The amended plans seek to merge these into a single, substantially enlarged dormer and to increase its height above the existing roof ridge. In addition, a second, similarly large dormer is now proposed on the eastern roof slope.

The cumulative effect of these large-scale additions is that they read as a first-floor extension rather than dormer structures. The 0.4m increase in height above the roof ridge significantly increases the perceived massing of the property and results in a development out of keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding bungalows. The amendments therefore introduce an unacceptable increase in both bulk and visual dominance.

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. The application has been considered to be contrary to the development plan.

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

1. Visual Amenity

The proposed side dormers, by reason of scale, design, and positioning, fail to integrate with the host dwellinghouse. It appears as an incongruous and visually intrusive addition that does not blend with the existing roof form or overall design of the property. The resulting harm to the character of the building and the visual amenity of the street scene is considered unacceptable. As such, the proposal is contrary to saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, and the design principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Residential Amenity

The proposed side dormer would create additional windows facing 13 Penryn Avenue, resulting in an increased potential for overlooking and leading to an unacceptable loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers. This would have a demonstrable and harmful impact on residential amenity. The proposal therefore conflicts with saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, as it would adversely affect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

56 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
9 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
52 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
50 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
46 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
5 Emsworth Drive, Manchester, M33 3PR
3 Emsworth Drive, Manchester, M33 3PR
24 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
20 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
18 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
44 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
22 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
16 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
13 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
19 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
54 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
48 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
42 Cranleigh Drive, Manchester, M33 3PS
9 Emsworth Drive, Manchester, M33 3PR
7 Emsworth Drive, Manchester, M33 3PR
11 Emsworth Drive, Manchester, M33 3PR
17 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG
11 Penryn Avenue, Manchester, M33 3PG

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA