

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143304/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 1 October 2025
Proposal: Retention of single storey outbuilding.
Address: 31 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Shahzia Rafiq
Agent (if any): Mr Sam Iqbal, Savoy Town Planning
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 21 November 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 2 September 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 3 October 2025 Expired: 24 October 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 31 Celia Street within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The applicant site relates to a three storey, red brick, new build, terraced dwellinghouse. The property benefits from a Juliet balcony on the rear elevation. The conversion of the existing garage has taken place, although this has been undertaken without the necessary consent (see planning history section for further details). Amenity space to the front takes the form of an off street driveway bounded by low black metal railings. Amenity space to the rear takes the form of hardstanding and the outbuilding subject of this application.

Description of area

The immediate context is residential in nature and relates to the new build estate to the west of Waterloo Street. Further new build accommodation sits further west of the applicant site.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the retention of single storey outbuilding.

The supporting information advises the building is used for the benefit of the applicant and their medical needs.

The applicant wishes to retain the current outbuilding on the site. The construction works for the outbuilding started on 01/02/2024 and finished on 01/06/2025.

The outbuilding provides a bedroom, kitchen and bathroom for the applicant's use. The Enforcement Officer gained access inside the outbuilding and facilities of a boiler, oven, hob and washing machine were available for use.

The outbuilding has dimensions of Height: 2.5 x Length: 8.5 x Width: 3.78 metres. The outbuilding sits against the common boundary with no.29 Celia Street and sits 1.33 metres from the shared boundary with no.33 Celia Street. The outbuilding extends up to the most rearward point owned by the applicant.

The outbuilding is constructed of red brick, white uPVC windows and doors and a flat roof system.



Figure 1, Outbuilding as Seen on Site on 2 September 2025

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The application was validated on 31 July 2025. However the application then had to be made invalid on 3 September 2025, as there were significant issues that rendered the scheme invalid.

It came to light the site edged red included land that was not owned by the applicant. On site, it was apparent that land had been taken in curtilage. Such issue is considered a civil matter and has not been pursued further as part of this application. A revised location plan and site edged red was provided for review.

It also came to light the submitted plans were inaccurate and did not show the full scale of the built outbuilding. The LPA attended the site to re-measure and the agent provided a new scheme which accurately reflected the scheme as built on site.

The agent was advised the scheme could not be supported. Whilst the agent provided written justification to support the current outbuilding as seen on site via email on 8 September 2025, no revised scheme was supplied during the course of the application.

Planning History

ENF/16024/25- Enforcement- Breach of Building of Works- Outbuilding fitted out for independent living.
Complaint received 9 June 2025.

ENF/15942/25- Enforcement- Breach of Building of Works- The erection of an unauthorised outbuilding at the rear.
Complaint received 13 February 2025.

ENF/13999/18- Enforcement- Breach of Building of Works Conversion of garage to habitable room.
Complaint received 25 June 2018.

108884/FH/2015-Conversion of the garage door to change into french doors to able to use the garage for study/play room.

Such application was returned on 11 November 2015 and was never validated.

The applicant was advised consent for such development should be sought via a section 73 variation application. However, no further application was submitted for this piece of works and works have now been undertaken without the necessary planning consent. Such piece of development was undertaken sometime between June 2016- June 2019 and due to the time passed, such works have immunity from enforcement action.

The most recent parent application for the development of the estate relates to:
099306/JO/2012/N1-Variation of condition number 4 (specified plans) of planning permission 092648/FO/2010/N1 to allow for external alterations due to changes in levels on site.
Approved 16 May 2013.

No permitted development rights were removed in respect of installing outbuildings within residential gardens.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and no written 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:

Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.

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-S1)

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:

Policy DC1 Residential extensions

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).

DC1.5 The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

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.

Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (2016)

The City Council's Executive has endorsed the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance. As such, the document is now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications and weight should be given to this document in decision making.

The purpose of the document is to outline the consideration, qualities and opportunities that will help to deliver high quality residential development as part of successful and sustainable neighbourhoods across Manchester. Above all the guidance seeks to ensure that Manchester can become a City of high quality residential neighbourhood and a place for everyone to live.

The document outlines nine components that combine to deliver high quality residential development, and through safe, inviting neighbourhoods where people want to live. These nine components are as follows:

- Make it Manchester;
- Make it bring people together;
- Make it animate street and spaces;
- Make it easy to get around;
- Make it work with the landscape;
- Make it practical;
- Make it future proof;
- Make it a home; and

Make it happen

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:
JP- S1- Sustainable development.

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the retention of single storey outbuilding. The applicant wishes to retain the current outbuilding on site. The construction works for the outbuilding started on 01/02/2024 and finished on 01/06/2025. The outbuilding provides additional accommodation to support the applicant's medical needs. Outbuildings within residential settings have been approved previously across the City. However, in this instance, whilst the LPA has due regard to the applicant's needs, the LPA cannot support the application. The benefits to the applicant, including disabled access requirements, do not outweigh the potential harm in relation to residential and visual amenity. No revised scheme was supplied for consideration during the course of the application and as such the proposal is considered to be against the provisions of policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1. Such issues will now be discussed.

Not Incidental

The outbuilding provides a bedroom, kitchen and bathroom for the applicant's use. The Enforcement Officer gained access inside the outbuilding and facilities of a boiler, oven, hob and washing machine were available for use.

Due to the individual needs of the applicant, the outbuilding has been erected for the intended purpose to provide independent accommodation when required by the applicant. During such times, the outbuilding allows the resident to remove themselves from the main dwellinghouse and live for sustained periods independently, without reliance on the main dwellinghouse. This is materially different to other outbuildings that have been approved previously by the LPA, as the intention of this outbuilding is to provide independent accommodation when required to support the needs of the applicant.

Given the characteristics of the outbuilding and the private access to the rear that is afforded to the applicant site from Gartland Walk, the outbuilding could be lived independently and accessed from the private road off Celia Street. As such, there would be no reliance on the main dwellinghouse, and so is not considered incidental.

The establishment of a separate dwellinghouse in this location would be at odds with the local pattern of development and introduce activity and associated noise and disturbance in close proximity to neighbouring properties, which would undermine the living conditions of these occupiers. This is contrary to the provisions within the NPPF, Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1 and UDP policies DC1.

Residential and Visual Amenity

The outbuilding sits against the common boundary with no.29 Celia Street and sits 1.33 metres from the shared boundary with no.33 Celia Street. The outbuilding sits against the rear boundary of the site owned by the applicant. Further land to the rear has been brought in curtilage, although this does not benefit from the necessary planning consent.

No.29 Celia Street sits to the east of the applicant site and the site photos as shown within Figure 1 show the extent to which the outbuilding runs against the majority of the common boundary with no.29. As such, this results in a blank elevation with a height of 2.5 metres that can be felt by the neighbour when utilising their rear garden. As a result, the sense of openness previously enjoyed by the timber fences has been lost resulting in a cramped and 'hemmed in' feeling for the neighbour. This results in an overbearing and visually intrusive feature to the detriment of the neighbouring property. Whilst it is noted that this neighbour would feel some loss of light in the afternoon to the ground floor windows, given the properties are south facing any loss of light would not be so significant to warrant a refusal in its own right.

The outbuilding is sited 1.33 metres from the common boundary shared by no.33 Celia Street. The entrance to the outbuilding faces onto such boundary and two windows and a door face in this direction. Given the high timber fence separating the two properties and given both windows relate to top opening and obscure glazed windows, the proposal does not give rise to adverse privacy implications to the neighbour. However, such windows in connection with the length, scale, height and proximity to the common boundary does result in an overdominant feature and creates an overbearing feature to the detriment of residential amenity. This in turn creates a visually intrusive feature to the enjoyment of the neighbour's private space. Whilst it is noted that this neighbour would feel some loss of light in the morning to the ground floor windows, given the properties are south facing any loss of light would not be so significant to warrant a refusal in its own right.

In short, the scheme is considered to give rise to impacts to the surrounding neighbours which are not outweighed by the benefits of the additional accommodation for the application property. 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design, Scale and Appearance

Whilst the materials used which match the host property are considered acceptable and do not give rise to concern, the scale of the outbuilding cannot be supported.

The outbuilding has dimensions of Height: 2.5 x Length: 8.5 x Width: 3.78 metres. The outbuilding has an area of approximately 32m². The rear garden has an area of approximately 48m². As such, the outbuilding encompasses the majority of the rear garden (67% of the rear garden).

The outbuilding leaves a small gap of hard amenity space for the applicant's use- a 1.5 metre gap between the rear elevation of the property and the outbuilding, and a 1.3 metre gap between the outbuilding and the common boundary with no.33 Celia Street. Such space felt larger on site given the applicant had taken in land that was not within their ownership. However, omitting such area to the rear of the outbuilding, the resultant amenity space is restricted to the side of the outbuilding and in between the outbuilding and the main dwellinghouse.

Given the limited private amenity space available as a result of the proposal, the structure is considered overly large and bulky. This is considered to provide an incongruous feature which would be considered detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and furthermore would lead to inadequate amenity space retained within the rear resulting in overdevelopment of the site.

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

Comparable Applications

Within the supporting planning statement, reference is made to several outbuildings approved by Manchester City Council, which are considered comparable to the proposed development. The LPA have reviewed each application and do not consider the examples comparable. The main difference between the cited approved examples and the current proposal is the intended use of the proposal. To support the applicant's needs, the outbuilding needs to offer facilities that can be used independently for certain periods of time. Such use is designed to not rely on the main dwelling for such specified reason, which differs to the other examples. In addition to this, the following differences are present:

21 Troydale Drive Manchester, M40 2FG- 141305/FH/2024

>The siting of the extension results in a less prominent structure with less harmful overbearing impacts for the surrounding neighbours given it sits at the bottom of the garden, than the current application.

341A Wilbraham Road Manchester, M16 8GL- 141401/FH/2024

>The site of 341A Wilbraham Road benefits from a larger amenity space than the applicant site. The scale of the outbuilding was considered to be accommodated given the outbuilding resulted in a decent amount of rear amenity space being available for the applicants use. In the case of the current application, there is limited amenity space retained that can be purposely used. No private access is available for the outbuilding as per the current proposal.

98 Claude Road Manchester, M21 8DF- 139978/FH/2024

>No kitchen is created and so the proposal does not create facilities for independent living. No private access is available for the outbuilding as per the current proposal.

25 Dennison Avenue Manchester, M20 1AE- 139513/FH/2024

>The application did not offer facilities for independent living accommodation. No private access is available for the outbuilding as per the current proposal.

3 Queens Park Close Manchester, M9 5TS- 139371/FH/2024

>No kitchen is created and so the proposal does not propose independent living. No private access is available for the outbuilding as per the current proposal.

30 Sandacre Road Manchester, M23 1AF- 133631/FH/2022

>No kitchen is created and so the proposal does not propose independent living. No private access is available for the outbuilding as per the current proposal.

27 Celia Street Manchester M8 5UB- Existing outbuilding on the site

>Such outbuilding does not benefit from consent. Whilst the LPA acknowledge the outbuilding is now immune from enforcement action, it does not form an example of an acceptable outbuilding.

Consideration to Policy DC1.5 of the UDP

Policy DC1.5 of the UDP relates to residential extensions and states the Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

The LPA recognise and sympathise with the needs of the applicant, and the circumstances that have resulted in the outbuilding being erected. However, in this case, the LPA are unable to support the extent of facilities provided as this creates an independent dwellinghouse by its intended purpose. Whilst consideration has been given to Policy DC1.5 of the UDP, the harm of the proposal exceeds the benefit to the resident and in this case, the structure cannot be supported.

Permitted Development Fallback Position

The application references a permitted development fallback position that can be used to support the application.

Under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), the applicant could build a similar outbuilding with a maximum height of 2.5 metres; this providing it was to be used incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, and not include some form of primary accommodation. This would be considered the fall-back position, which is a material consideration in the decision-making process, of which the permitted development rights given by the Order comprise an element. Therefore, when deciding a planning application, it may be argued with some effect that a development carried out to reduced dimensions or at a marginally lesser level, or perhaps in a revised location nearby, could be implemented using permitted development rights. The weight to be given to such a material consideration varies according to whether what could be built using the GPDO would have a broadly similar or worse impact to what is proposed; and the reasonable likelihood or possibility that, if permission were refused, permitted development rights would in fact be resorted to.

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 proactive manner. The LPA raised concerns with the application to the agent, but no revised scheme was provided for review. The proposal is considered contrary to the development plan and so refused in a timely manner.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The size of the outbuilding has the appearance of a physically separate unit of residential accommodation, which is out of keeping with the character of the area; its residential design, separate rear entrance and internal layout has all the characteristics and potential to incorporate the facilities so that it may be occupied as an independent form of residential accommodation, rather than being incidental or ancillary to the primary building.

The relationship of the proposed additional living accommodation to that of the principal building, increases the potential for noise, activity, and disturbance that would be detrimental to the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of the main property, and that would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and advice given in the Guide to Development in Manchester, Manchester Residential Quality Guidance and National Guidance.

2) The outbuilding to be retained by reason of its scale, massing, design and its relationship close to the common shared boundaries with nos.29 and 33 Celia Street would form an overly dominant and visually overbearing feature to the detriment of the current and future occupiers of neighbouring properties, and as such is contrary to the provisions of saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the NPPF.

3) The impact of the proposed outbuilding would result in the loss of useable amenity space to the original dwellinghouse. The proposal therefore represents an over development of the site to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the NPPF.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

16 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
28 Brightside Road, Manchester, M8 5XJ
25 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
27 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
29 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
33 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
35 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
43 Brightside Road, Manchester, M8 5XJ
41 Brightside Road, Manchester, M8 5XJ
14 Celia Street, Manchester, M8 5UB
25 Gartland Walk, Manchester, M8 5UT
23 Gartland Walk, Manchester, M8 5UT
21 Gartland Walk, Manchester, M8 5UT
19 Gartland Walk, Manchester, M8 5UT

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