MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	145545/FH/2026
Date registered valid:	26 March 2026
Proposal:	Installation of rear roof dormer loft conversion together with roof light.
Address:	50 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WU
Ward(s):	Didsbury West Ward
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Alex and Lauren Thatcher
Agent (if any):	Mrs Stephanie Procter, MAST Architecture Ltd
Case officer:	Ciara Gettinby Tel: 0161 234 3048 Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**14 May 2026**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 17 April 2026

Standard consultations:
Printed: 7 April 2026 Expired: 28 April 2026

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 7 April 2026 Expired: 28 April 2026

Site notice
Posted: 17 April 2026 Expired: 8 May 2026

Press advert
No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of Site/ Area

The property that is subject of this householder planning application is a two-storey, C3, semi-detached family dwellinghouse. The property features red brickwork, white uPVC window frames and grey slate roof tiles. The property is considered to be of heritage significance. To the front of the property is a hardstanding driveway with the parking provision for one vehicle and an area of soft landscaping. To the rear of the property is an existing single storey extension and a moderately sized rear garden.

Old Landsdowne Road is a residential street in the Didsbury West ward of Manchester. The street is situated east of Burton Road and nearby West Didsbury Metrolink stop. The area also benefits from sustainable transport links such as bus routes. The area benefits from small pockets of green infrastructure such as Cavendish Park and Marie Louise Gardens. This street is located in the Albert Park Conservation Area and features many protected trees within the street.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: There is a tree preservation order to the rear of the garden sufficiently located away from this development proposal.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking planning permission for the installation of a rear dormer and roof light. This application has been submitted with a joint application- (145544/FH/2026) which proposes the erection of a single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing together with works associated with the conversion of the basement to additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per appendix 1- no comments or objections.

Site Photos:





Proposed Plans:





POLICY
The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application:

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)- The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered relevance:

-Policy DC1- Residential Extensions
-Policy DC18. 1 – Conservation Areas

The Manchester Core Strategy- Development Plan Document 2012- 2027 (The Core Strategy) was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012, it is a key document for the local plan which provides a framework that planning applications are assessed against.

Policy DM1- Development Management
Policy SP1- Spatial Principles
Policy EN19- Waste
Policy EN3- Heritage

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)- The Government's own planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied.

-Chapter 8- Promoting healthy and safe communities
-Chapter 12- Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
-Chapter 16- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Para 131 – Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Para 135 – Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Para 202 – Heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Para 207 – Local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Para 208 – LPAs should ensure that any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal is avoided or minimised.

Para 210 – In determining applications, LPA's should take account of, the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para 212 – When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

The DRAFT National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)- The Government's new national planning policies and how they are to be implemented through local authorities. Whilst this is a draft NPPF for consultation it is considered that the development proposals are in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it.

Achieving sustainable development

Policy S3- Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy S4- Principle of development within settlements

Achieving well-designed places

Policy DP3- Key principles for well-designed places
Policy DP4- The design process

Places for Everyone- Along 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 (Bolton, Bury, Rochdale, Oldham, Tameside, Stockport, Manchester, Trafford, Salford, Wigan) and took into effect and become part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

-Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places
-Policy JP-P2: Heritage

Issues
Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy seeks to ensure that any new built development enhance or creates character, meets local needs and enhances the built environment and its design, scale and appearance of the proposed development that is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 of the UDP for the City of Manchester relate specifically to residential extensions and set out several criteria against which proposals for extension will be assessed. Although the latter policies are of age, they are of long-established practice with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks a high standard of design in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future residents

Principle
The principle of erecting a rear dormer for additional living accommodation is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes to meet changing household needs rather than move. Residents' homes should enable growth by providing sufficient space to accommodate changing needs and circumstances. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting scale and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity and impact on the conservation area.

Siting Scale and Massing
Given the location of the property in a conservation area, special attention will be paid to the proposed materials and appearance of the extension. The dormer would be sited on the rear roof of the property and would measure a length of 4.5m. It would project forwards from the ridge of the roof by 4.9m and would be set back from the eaves of the roof by 0.3m. The dormer would be set back from the shared boundary with no. 48 Old Landsdowne Road by 3m. The dormer would be slightly set back from the south-western eaves by 0.1m and situated just under the ridge of the original roof. The proposal would introduce 3 new windows to the property; one would be a roof light and two would be on the face of the dormer looking into the applicant's rear garden. Both side elevations would be blank.

The overall siting scale and massing of the proposal is acceptable as the dormer is understood as being subservient to the host dwellinghouse and is considered to be acceptable in this instance. The proposal is not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of introducing an overbearing feature into the area.

Visual Amenity and Appearance
The submitted application form indicates that the extension would be built of materials to match the existing dwellinghouse. The roof materials used on the dormer would match the existing roof through the use of hanging tiles. The window frames would also match the existing property. The dormer would only partially be visible from the street scene and would not be considered a large addition to the street scene. As the level of harm is considered to be minimal and certainly less than substantial harm then the public benefits of the scheme, including improvements to the internal space available/ improving housing stock outweighs harm.

A material condition has been attached to ensure that materials are adhered to pursuant with the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policies SP1 and DM1 and saved Policies DC1 of the UDP. The overall character of this property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works. The design and appearance of the extension therefore accord with saved Policy DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity
The adjoining property is no. 48 Old Landsdowne who is situated north of the applicant property. The dormer would be set back from this neighbour by 3m and is not considered to affect the existing levels of privacy between the neighbouring properties as no windows face towards this neighbour. The new fenestration would also not give rise to any privacy concerns as it would not give rise to any further onlooking than that of the first-floor windows. The dormer is also not considered to create any significant overshadowing or loss of light to the neighbouring property. Overall, no objections have been received, and the dormer is not considered to introduce an overbearing presence for no. 48 Old Landsdowne Road.

The neighbouring property who sits southwest of the applicant property is no. 52 Old Landsdowne Road. As existing, the property is separated by approx. 7m. Given no windows are facing towards the neighbouring property, the existing levels of privacy are expected to be retained. He insertion of the windows on the rear elevation would not give rise to any further onlooking than that is existing from the first-floor windows. Additionally, the dormer is not expected to cause any significant overshadowing to the neighbouring property. The dormer is also not considered to create an overbearing presence for the neighbouring property and would not give rise to any significant residential amenity implications.

Given the above reasons, and that there have been no objections, the proposed extension should not give rise to issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. The proposal therefore accords with saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policies SM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Impact on Albert Park Conservation Area
Development control in the Albert Park Conservation Area is aimed at encouraging development which enhances the prosperity of the are whilst paying attention to its special architectural and visual qualities. Property owners in the area are encouraged to retain the original character and details of their houses. This should include the details, colour and materials of window frames, doors and other elements of the buildings.

The proposal would be sited at the rear of the property and would not be wholly visible from the wider street scene. Additionally, the dormer would utilise matching materials to those already featured on the dwellinghouse, which would provide a blended appearance with the existing property, minimising the degree of harm caused to the visual amenity of the area and character of the conservation area. The extension would provide benefits in the form of improved and enlarged living accommodation for the residents, which in this instance is considered to outweigh any potential less than substantial harm caused to the Albert Park Conservation Area.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which stipulates ‘where development proposals will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’ as well as Policy DC18 of the UDP, Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy and Policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone.

Conclusion
Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting scale and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity, waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and chapter 8 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone joint development plan document.

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
Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application, and the applicant has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies in the development plan.

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

1) The development must have begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of permission. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:

Drawing existing and proposed, ref- 0238-MASTA-DR-A-1003
Proposed elevations, ref- 0238-MASTA-DR-A-0502

Location plan, ref- 0238-MASTA-DR-A-0202
Proposed floor plan, ref- 0238-MASTA-DR-A-0303

Received on 26 March 2026

Reason- to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to the existing building in terms of type, size, colour and texture.

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

West Didsbury Residents Association

47 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2JJ
Flat 5, 43 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
Flat 3, 43 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
Flat 2, 43 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
45 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
Flat At, 52 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WU
Flat 3, 48 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WU
Flat 2, 48 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WU
Flat 1, 48 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WU
Flat 6, 43 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
Flat 4, 43 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
Flat 1, 43 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2PA
52 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WU

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA