MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	144136/FH/2025
Date registered valid:	30 September 2025
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer
Address:	9 Brooklands Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JE
Ward(s):	Old Moat Ward
Applicant:	Mr S Bell
Agent (if any):	Mr P Anderton, B2 Architecture Ltd
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	18/05/2026
Date of recommendation:	**Refuse**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13/11/2025 & 08/04/2026

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 15 October 2025 Expired: 5 November 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
The application relates to a two-storey mid terrace class C3 dwellinghouse on Brooklands Avenue. The property is built from red brick with slate roof tiles, to the front there is a two-storey bay window, small front yard and brick boundary treatment, to the rear there is a single-story outrigger and a modest rear garden.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
Brooklands Road is a residential street between Withington and West Didsbury. The area is residential in character, consisting of terraced family dwellings. The site is in walking distance to Burton Road tram.

Description of development
Following the approval of application 142400/FH/2025 the works were not carried out in accordance with the approved plans; this subsequent application is to regularise the dormer and extension that was built.

Works carried out during the course of the application:
Following a site visit it became apparent the submitted plans did not accurately reflect what had been built, with the dormer appearing to connect to the eaves with no roof tiles between the bottom of the dormer and the eaves as indicated in the drawings, in addition an existing window on the first floor of the house had been infilled. Work was then carried out while the application was in flight to remove the ‘step’ structure at the bottom of the dormer and also amended plans were provided to show the infilled window as no longer present.

The as-built dormer structure photos taken November 2025:





The dormer following additional works photos taken April 2026:





Relevant Planning History
142400/FH/2025 – Erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer – **Approved 07.05.2025**

ENF/16106/25 – Enforcement Enquiry – Development not built in accordance with approved plans – **Subsequent planning application advised.**

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per Appendix 1 – 9no. objections from neighbouring residents, reasons for objection can be summarised as follows:

- Object to the Juliet balcony which overlooks neighbouring gardens and windows
- Objections to the size and scale of the dormer
- Objections to the cladding material use, which differed from the original proposal and is not sympathetic to the to the materials on the houses.
- Height and scale of the dormer
- Issues relating to the building works being disruptive and taking place outside of normal work hours as well as storing of building materials in communal alleyway.

Councillor Gavin White – Concern raised about the overbearing nature of the rear extension, notes the plans are not clear of what material is used on the dormer and concern as to whether the obscure glazing on the rear elevation would be complied with.

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 EN3 - Heritage

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:

- JP-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

This application seeks planning consent to regularise a rear dormer and extension that was not built in accordance with the previous approval (14200/FH/2025). Extending a residential property, via extensions including dormers and rear extensions in order to provide additional living accommodation is usually acceptable in principle. However, in these circumstances, the proposed rear dormer results in a development that is poor quality and visually incongruous to the host dwelling and row of terraces, therefore the principle of development cannot be supported due to adverse implications in terms of visual amenity.

Rear Extension

The single storey rear extension projects back by 2875mm and span a width of 6300mm, leaving gaps of 150mm to the shared boundary on either side, it has a flat roof with a height of 3800mm, finished in materials to match and a bifold glazed door on the rear elevation. Although included in the description of development due to the overall finish of the works not reaching completion when the enforcement issue was brought to light, the extension has been completed in accordance with the approved plans from the previous application. This extension was judged and the discussion of that verdict can be read in the officer report 142400/FH/2025.

Sitting, Scale and Mass

The proposed rear extension has been built in accordance with the previous approval and has already been judged to be acceptable in terms of its scale and mass.

As per the plans, the dormer measures 5530mm in width, 2575mm in height and 3180mm in depth. However, the photographs from site indicate the dormer to be slightly wider and taller than this. Although the dormer does not have a section of roof tiles between the bottom of the structure and the eaves, a 300mm set back has still been achieved and the overall volume of the dormer in terms of scale alone it would fall within the maximum size allowed under permitted development rights (40sqm) With that as a fall-back position, the dormer is acceptable in terms of sitting, scale and mass alone.

Visual Amenity

The proposed rear extension has been built in accordance with the previous plans, with use of matching materials, an acceptable size and scale, and its similarity to other extensions in the vicinity this element of the application is acceptable in terms of its impact on visual amenity.

The infilled window on the rear elevation of the main house also has minimal impact on the visual amenity of the terraces, furthermore the infilling of a small window on the rear elevation could be done under permitted development rights.

The dormer is finished in Sikarlan SGK-15 single ply in slate grey colour, the bathroom window and julliet balcony doors are finished in anthracite framed windows, which matches the windows on the rest of the rear elevation.

The finish of the material above the windows and at the base of the structure appears warped, with likely air pockets between the wall and liner, resulting in a visibly uneven and inconsistent surface finish. The material used on the dormer walls is usually used on flat roofs where it is not prominently visible from ground level. Its use in this location results in a poor-quality external appearance that lacks the texture and definition of traditional slate tiles and fails to blend with the host roof. Furthermore, the evident defects in the installation and finishing give rise to a poor quality of finish, which significantly detracts from the overall quality and appearance of the development.

Whilst the dormer is not visible from the public highway, it is clearly visible from the publicly accessible alley to the rear, which represents a legitimate and frequently experienced public vantage point as it is the main access to both sets of terrace year gardens. Due to its position and as the only dormer within this row of terraces, it appears visually prominent and draws undue attention within the roofscape. The dormer therefore fails to integrate with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and adjoining properties, appearing incongruous and discordant within the established and otherwise uniform roofscape of the terrace.

As such, the proposal is considered 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 Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity
In terms of overlooking, concerns have been raised that the installed Juliet balcony would result in increased overlooking compared to the previously approved standard window. However, since completion of the development, an obscurely glazed screen has been installed. Provided that this screen is fitted with obscured glazing to Pilkington level 5 (or equivalent), it would effectively prevent direct views from the lower portion of the doors towards neighbouring properties, restricting outlook to the section above the screen. As such, the level of overlooking would be broadly comparable to that experienced from a conventional window.

Furthermore, given that the dormer is set back approximately 300mm from the rear roof slope, it is not considered to result in undue or excessive overlooking of neighbouring private amenity space.

In terms of overshadowing, set in from the eaves and the adjoining properties, dormers do not provide an unacceptable level of overshadowing as they are set within the roof slope, any overshadowing that occurs as a result of the dormer would be at dawn and dusk when the sun is lowest, and is there within the tolerable limits in terms of impact on light to neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

While certain elements of the proposal, such as impacts on residential amenity, are considered acceptable, the overall development results in a poor-quality addition that fails to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider row of terraces. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies SP1, DM1, and EN1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan, and the design principles set out in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Planning permission is therefore refused

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: 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. The proposed dormer, by reason of its design and use of poor-quality materials, fails to integrate with the host property and appears as an incongruous and visually intrusive addition to the terraces that does not blend with the existing roof form or overall design of the host 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

7 Brooklands Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JE
12 Brooklands Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JE
10 Brooklands Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JE
12 Rutland Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JD
8 Rutland Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JD
10 Rutland Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JD
8 Brooklands Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JE
11 Brooklands Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JE
7 Brooklands Avenue, Withington, Manchester, M20 1JE
12 Rutland Avenue, Withington, Manchester, M20 1JD

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