# Planning

## Growth & Development

## Delegated officer report for planning application

| | |
|---|---|
| **Application no.** | 144845/FH/2025 |
| **Date registered valid:** | 7 January 2026 |
| **Proposal:** | Erection of single-storey rear extension, rear and front flat roof dormers with alterations to existing elevations. |
| **Address:** | 36 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW |
| **Ward(s):** | Cheetham Ward |
| **Applicant:** | Mrs Zahida Parveen |
| **Agent (if any):** | Mr Subhan Saleem, Saleem Architects |
| **Case officer:** | Katie Raw<br>Tel: 0161 234 4164<br>Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk |
| **Recommendation:** | Approve |
| **Date of recommendation:** | **26 February 2026** |

**Application details**

**Type of application:** Full Householder Application

**Development type:** Householder

**Date of site visit:** 22 January 2026

**Standard consultations:**
Printed: 14 January 2026 Expired: 4 February 2026

**Neighbour notifications**
Printed: 14 January 2026 Expired: 4 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**

**Listed building:** Not applicable

**Conservation area:** No

**Tree Preservation Order:** No

The application site relates to 36 Greenford Road within the north Manchester ward of Cheetham. The application site relates to a semi-detached bungalow. The property is characterised by gable roof form and red brick construction. Amenity space for the property is available to the front, side and rear, with a mix of soft landscaping and areas of hardstanding.

**Description of area**
The surrounding area is residential in nature. To the rear of the site sits the Woodville Sure Start centre. Greenford Road and the surrounding streets are characterised by bungalows with a precedence of front and rear dormers.

**Description of development**
The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of single-storey rear extension, rear and front flat roof dormers with alterations to existing elevations.

The rear extension would create an open plan kitchen/ living area and would have approximate dimensions of Height: 2.9 x Length:3.6 x Width: 6.4 metres, and a have a GRP flat roof.

The rear flat roof dormer would be set back from the eaves of the roof by 0.4 metres and have a volume of approximately 32 cubic metres.

The front roof dormer would be set back from the eaves of the roof by approx. 1 metre, would be set in from the edges of the roof (1.3 metre set in from the adjoining property and 1.5 metres from the gable elevation of the property).

The proposal would involve the insertion of a window within the front elevation, three windows and a door within the rear elevation. Elevational alterations to the existing property would take the form of a further window within the gable elevation at ground floor level and obscure glazing the existing window at first floor level within the gable elevation of the host dwelling.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed as:
-brickwork to match existing
-PVC window to match existing
-glazed French door
-roof tiles to match existing
-GRP flat roof

*Negotiations during the Course of the Application*

Concern was raised that the projection of the rear extension (originally 4 metres) could not be accommodated within the site without giving harm to neighbours in respect of the projection and orientation of the properties. The projection of the rear extension was subsequently reduced.

The scale of the front roof dormer was amended to be in keeping with the existing front dormers seen in the streetscene.

Discussions took place in respect to the scale of the proposed rear dormer.

Inaccuracies within the drawings were addressed.

Further information was supplied in respect of proposed materials.

*Planning History*

No planning history exists for this site.

**Consultations & Notification Responses**

*Local Residents*

Local residents were consulted and no responses were received.

*MCC Flood Risk Management Team*

The MCC Flood Risk Management Team recommended an approval with no conditions required. The Team requested an informative be attached to any approval granted.

*Environmental Health*

Although not formally consulted, Environmental Health made contact during the course of the application and requested a gas membrane condition be attached to any approval granted.

**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.

*Draft National Planning Policy Framework (16th December 2025)*

The government has published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework which is intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making.

Of relevance to the application proposals the draft NPPF makes it clear that local planning authorities should amongst other things:
-Work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, where necessary seeking solutions to problems arising from initial proposals, to enable a timely decision.
-Take account of planning matters raised during any pre-application engagement, including any positive responses to this engagement, as well as representations on the proposals.
-Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and this means that for development within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:
DP3: Key principles for well-designed places (Chapter 14. Achieving well-designed places)
HC1: Planning for healthy communities (Chapter 16. Promoting health communities)

*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.*

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),
Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas),
Policy EN14 (Flood Risk),
Policy NE18 (Contaminated Land and Ground Stability).

*Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies*

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:
DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:
a. The general character of the property;
b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:
a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:
a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

*Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.*

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABE 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*

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 erection of single-storey rear extension, rear and front flat roof dormers with alterations to existing elevations. During the course of the application, a revised scheme was considered which was considered to overcome concerns raised during the course of the application. The extension would offer additional built form to support the changing needs of the family. 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. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

*Residential Amenity*

No.34 Greenford Road:
No.34 Greenford Road is the adjoining property to the applicant site and would experience the 3.6 metre single storey rear extension along the boundary. It is noted that an extension with a projection of 3 metres could be achieved through the route of Permitted Development. The extension would have a height of 2.9 metres and would leave an approx. 3.7 metre gap to the rear boundary. Given the height of the extension and given the roof form would be flat to reduce massing, it is not considered the rear extension would create an overbearing feature to no.34. Whilst the applicant site sits due south of the neighbouring property, given the limited height of the proposal and the projection is compliant with specifications within Policy DC1.3 of the UDP, any loss of light would be minimal.

Due to its positioning at height, the rear roof dormer would not give rise to overbearing or overshadowing implications to no.34 Greenford Road. It is noted that the addition of the 2no. windows within the rear elevation of the roof dormer would give opportunities to overlooking into the neighbour’s rear amenity space, given there is not a view at first floor as existing given the properties are bungalows. However, the LPA acknowledge that if the dormer is not constructed through this application, it could be constructed through PD rights and so on this understanding, the level of overlooking would not be so severe to warrant a refusal on the site.

Properties to rear- Woodville Resource Centre:
The property to the rear of the applicant site relates to the Woodville Resource Centre and would look onto the service areas. As such, no adverse privacy implications are caused to the rear.

No.38 Greenford Road:
No.38 Greenford Road sits to the south of the applicant site. The development would be sited, at a minimum, 3.3 metres from the boundary with no.38. Given the distance between the development, it is not considered the proposal would give rise to adverse residential implications to no.38.

A window would be inserted within the gable elevation of the ground floor, facing in the direction of no.36 Greenford Road. Given the separation to the property at this point, given the window at ground floor level and given the permitted development fallback, any overlooking would not be considered severe. Further, the window to be inserted at first floor level would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and would therefore align with permitted development rights. As such, any overlooking from the window would not be considered severe.

Properties within the cul-de-sac of Greenford Road:
A front dormer would be installed to the front roof plane of the property and reflect many others within the streetscene. Given the introduction of first floor windows are prominent within the streetscene already, any level of overlooking would not be beyond the existing levels of overlooking already established within the area.

In short, the proposal is not considered to give rise to significant residential amenity implications, and so is considered pursuant to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

*Visual Amenity*

The proposals are considered appropriate in scale and design and given the dormers would follow the existing precedence in the area, it is not considered the proposal would give rise to visual harm to the surrounding properties.

As such the proposal is pursuant to the City Council's Planning Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

*Design, Appearance and Scale*

The materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed and would mostly match the properties within the streetscene. A materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Rear extension:
Concern was raised the projection of the rear extension (originally 4 metres) could not be accommodated within the site without giving harm to neighbours in respect of the projection and orientation of the properties. The projection of the rear extension was subsequently reduced to 3.6 metres. As such, the projection is in accordance with Policy DC1.3 which states that

rearward projections should not exceed 3.65 metres and so this element is considered acceptable in size and form.

Rear dormer:
Discussions took place in respect to the scale of the proposed rear dormer. The agent advised that whilst the dormer would encompass much of the rear roof plane, such dormer could be achieved through the route of Permitted Development, as it has a volume of 38 cubic metres. Further, the hanging dormer material would match the roof tiles in the host property and so is considered to result in an acceptable appearance. Given this, the design and appearance of such element can be supported.

Front dormer:
Greenford Road and the surrounding streets are characterised by bungalows with a precedence of front and rear dormers. Within the streetscene, front dormers are a common architectural feature. Given the existing precedence, the introduction of a front dormer would not be considered out of keeping with the existing form of development. The scale of the front roof dormer was amended to be in keeping with the existing front dormers seen in the streetscene, and as such, the proposal results in an adequate set in and set back to create a feature that is in keeping with others in the streetscene. Many of the dormers of the front are constructed in a white PVC facing material. The proposed dormer would be constructed of hanging tiles to match the host property and so would be less visible than others in the streetscene.

In short, the proposed design and scale of the proposal is considered pursuant in regard to the resultant appearance and so would be considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and EN1.

*Car Parking*

The proposal would not impact the current parking arrangements at the site and so no further information is required.

*Bin Storage*

Adequate space would remain for bins to be stored along the side of the property. No information is required in respect of bin storage.

*Flood Risk*

The site is identified as being susceptible to surface water flooding. Given the proposed development is a residential extension, a full Flood Risk Assessment was not required as it would be disproportionately onerous given the limited scale and nature of the works, and the LLFA was satisfied that suitable Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures can be incorporated to mitigate residual risk. An informative has been attached to the decision advising the applicant to incorporate PFR measures.

*Ground Conditions*

Although not formally consulted, Environmental Health made contact during the course of the application and requested a gas membrane condition be attached to any approval granted. A condition to this effect 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 polices 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, guided the applicant through issues arising with the application and appropriate conditions have been attached to the 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:

Documents:

-Application Form, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 24 December 2025.

Drawings:
-Location Plan- Sheet 1, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 24 December 2025.
-Proposed- Plans, numbered Sheet 4 REV B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 2 February 2026.
-Proposed- Elevations, numbered Sheet 5 REV B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 2 February 2026.
-Site Plan- Proposed, numbered Sheet 6 REV B, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 2 February 2026.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, pursuant to policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) Prior to the commencement of development appropriate and comprehensive construction designs for the installation of a proprietary gas membrane, in order to alleviate any possibility of landfill gas ingress to the building, shall be submitted for approval to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall then be implemented as part of the development.

Reason- The development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill gas pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

4) The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be those as specified on approved plan ‘Proposed- Elevations, numbered Sheet 5 REV B’.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5) The window in the first floor of the gable elevation of the development (relating to a bathroom) hereby approved 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 be retained as such thereafter.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

6) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be installed in the ground or first floor of any elevation of the development hereby approved, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

**Informatives**

1)Flood Resilience (PFR) measures
The applicant is advised to incorporate Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures to a minimum of 150mm above the surface water flood level or a minimum of 600mm above the fluvial flood level.

**Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified**

MCC Flood Risk Management

28 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
22 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
Woodville Resource Centre, Shirley Road, Manchester, M8 0NE
32 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
24 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
38 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
34 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
30 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
26 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
20 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW
1 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NA

**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
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA