

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 145252/FH/2026

Date registered valid: 23 February 2026

Proposal: Erection of basement and ground floor rear extension; and associated elevational alteration.

Address: 1255 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M9 7EG

Ward(s): Higher Blackley Ward

Applicant: Mr Hassan Riaz UI

Agent (if any): Mr Rashid Mehmood, I. Planning Services

Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: **29 April 2026**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 4 March 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 26 February 2026 Expired: 19 March 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 24 March 2026 Expired: 9 April 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 1255 Rochdale Road within the north Manchester ward of Higher Blackley. The application site relates to a two/ three storey dwellinghouse characterised by a change of levels, with the property sitting at a lower topography than Rochdale Road with a steep driveway and pedestrian walkway offering access to the property. As such, whilst the front of the property reads a two storey dwelling, the rear of the property reads as a three storey dwelling. The property benefits from a large porch/ entrance and a garage is sited to the rear of the property. As existing the basement is used for storage only. The rear garden is levelled.

Description of area

The applicant site sits within a residential area. The site sits to the west of Rochdale Road which acts as a key route in and out of the city.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of basement and ground floor rear extension; and associated elevational alteration.

The proposal would appear as a two storey extension from the rear garden. The extension would create a veranda at the basement level and living room on the ground floor. The extension would be set off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour (no.1253 Rochdale Road) by 2 metres. At the largest point, the extension would have approximate dimensions of Height: 5.6 x Length: 3 x Width: 5.5 metres. Both storeys would have the same dimensions.

The proposal would involve the insertion of 1no. rooflight and 1no. window within the rear elevation of the extension. Steps to the side and rear would allow access into the veranda which would be open in nature.

Associated elevational alterations would take the form of a new window inserted at ground floor level. This window would come closer to the shared boundary with the adjoining property than the existing circumstance. The window would be smaller in size than the existing window in the existing location.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed as:

- brick walls to match existing
- roof tiles to match existing
- uPVC windows to match existing.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

Concern was raised with the initial proposal as the scheme had a projection of 5.5 metres. Inaccuracies with the site boundaries were identified.

A revised scheme was received with the projection of both levels reduced to 3 metres and site boundary discrepancies overcome. A neighbour re-notification was undertaken on the revised plans.

Following further conversations, the scheme was further amended to have a set in of 1.65 metres off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour. The description of development was amended to include the elevational alteration to the host property. A neighbour re-notification was undertaken on the revised plans.

The scheme was amended to have an increased set in of 2 metres following the LPA's request.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

2no. objections were received from the initial consultation. The following concerns were raised:

- The proposal would result in direct overlooking due to it being two storey and due to the different levels of the applicant site to that of surrounding properties.
- The proposal would result in loss of daylight and sunlight to gardens and windows.
- The submitted site boundaries of the property are inaccurate and should be reviewed.
- The works would give rise to unacceptable impact and disturbance.
- Approving the extension would give rise to an unacceptable precedence for surrounding properties.
- One neighbour would be comfortable with a single storey extension, just not the second floor.

3no. responses were received from the 1st re-notification (undertaken 24 March 2026).

2no. objections were received. The following concerns were raised:

-Whilst appreciating some amendments have been made to the scale of the proposal, the revised scheme does not sufficiently address the key concerns previously raised.
-Although the projection has been reduced it would still result in overlooking, overbearing and loss of light implications.

1no. letter of support was received from a neighbour who confirmed they were happy with the proposal in close proximity to the applicant site.

3no. responses were received from the 2nd re-notification (undertaken 16 April 2026):
1no. objection state that whilst they note the proposal has been amended, previous objections and concerns still remain, due to the development being two storey in height. Concerns still remain in respect of issues arising with noise and disturbance during the construction process.

2no. letter of supports were received from neighbours who confirmed they were happy with the proposal in close proximity to the applicant site.

MCC Flood Risk Management

MCC Flood Risk Management Team provided the following comments:
Since the proposed development involves extending the basement and erection of a two storey extension, and is located within Flood Zone 2, the applicant is expected to complete a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Proforma, supported by Product 4 data.

The Team suggested wording of a condition, and an informative to 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 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) (partially superseded by PfE);
- Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas);
- Policy EN14 (Flood Risk) (partially superseded by PfE).

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 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.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

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 erection of basement and ground floor rear extension; and associated elevational alteration. The scheme has been subject to amendments which were considered necessary to overcome concerns raised in respect of the potential harm to surrounding neighbours in respect of loss of light and tunnelling implications, due to the projection and form of the development. It is noted that the revised scheme still received letters of concern during the 2nd neighbour re-notification period. However, consideration has been given to such objections and it would be considered unreasonable to not grant consent on the amended scheme and such matters will be discussed in further detail later on in the report. With the amendments to the scheme and given the proposal would provide the homeowners with additional living accommodation to support the changing needs of families without moving, such development can be considered acceptable in principle. The proposal is considered to support the general thrust of provisions within policy DC1 of the UDP

and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1. 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 including objections received. 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.1253 Rochdale Road:

No.1253 Rochdale Road is the adjoining property and as existing, the boundary separating the two properties consists of a low timber fence, with easy overlooking opportunities at present. As a result of the proposal, the neighbour would experience a two storey extension sited 2 metres off the common boundary. Although the extension would act as a basement and ground floor extension, for the neighbour the extension would feel the same as a two storey extension. During the course of the application, the extension was amended so that there was a 2 metre set in off the boundary and the projection was reduced to 3 metres. Given the set in, it is not considered the proposal would give rise to an overbearing feature when the neighbour looked out of their first floor window. When the neighbour were to utilise their rear private amenity space, it is noted the openness currently experienced would be replaced by a 5.6 metre blank wall. However, given the limited 3 metre projection and given the set in off the boundary, it is not considered to create an overbearing and tunnelling impact when the neighbour utilises the garden. Given the neighbour sits due south of the applicant site, it is not considered the proposal would give rise to adverse privacy implications.

1no. window is to be inserted in the rear elevation of the host property. The window would sit marginally closer to the common boundary than the window in a similar position as existing. Even though the window would come slightly closer, given the existing circumstance it is not considered the window would give rise to harm beyond that currently experienced by the neighbouring property. The proposed living room window could give rise to overlooking into the neighbour's property, however, would not be significant given the existing relationship. Further, a condition would be attached to any approval granted to ensure no additional windows are inserted to any elevation, especially to the side elevation facing in the direction of no.1253 Rochdale Road.

No.1257 Rochdale Road:

No.1257 Rochdale Road is the non-adjoining neighbour and sits to the north of the applicant site. The proposed extension would be sited against the existing garage at the applicant site, although during the course of the application, the agent confirmed the two would not become connected internally. Given the existing gap between the side of the applicant site and the boundary of the neighbour due to the detached garage, it is considered that much of the bulk of the extension would be hidden from the development at basement level. Whilst the ground floor level would be visible from when the neighbour utilises their garden, the extension would be sited approximately 4.5 metres from the side wall of the neighbour's property and so the 5.7 metre height of the proposal is not considered to create an overbearing feature, nor any loss of light. Given the extension would not extend beyond the applicant's existing side wall, any overlooking opportunities from the proposed window at ground floor level would not be considered to give rise to significant harm to this neighbour.

Neighbours to the rear:

Neighbours to the rear along Coulsden Drive benefit from similar arrangements to the applicant site whereby the properties sit at a higher topographic position than the bottom of the gardens. Such properties closest to the applicant site relate to bungalows. Consideration has been given to any overlooking implications as a result of the proposal given the change in heights and the

introduction of effectively a first floor extension. The double extension with a projection of 3 metres would result in a gap of 11 metres to the rear boundary of the site. As such, the extension would be sited 27 metres from the rear elevation of the closest neighbour to the west. 1 no. living room window would be inserted 27 metres from the closest rear habitable window of the neighbour to the west. Even with the change of levels across the site, it is not considered to give rise in respect of harm given the large distance retained. In addition, shorter privacy distances have been approved further south of the applicant site and the retaining gap would still be larger than other privacy gaps seen in close proximity to the applicant site.

Due to the separation between the applicant site and properties to the south, the proposal would not give rise to an overbearing feature nor loss of light.

Noise and disturbance:

Objections raised concern with noise and disturbance during the construction phase of any extension approved. Due to the limited scale and localised nature of the works, it would be unreasonable to impose a construction management condition on any approval granted. The applicant will need to comply with hours of construction stipulated within Environmental Health legislation. Given such legislation in place, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis.

In short, the revised proposal 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 proposed rear extension would not be visible from the streetscene.

The proposed rear extension would not encompass the entirety of the rear elevation and given the hipped roof formation with the 3 metre projection, it is not considered to create a visually intrusive feature to the detriment of 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 match the host property. A materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

The proposal would have a projection of 3 metres and so the proposal would be considered compliant with Policy DC1.3 of the UDP where rearward extensions should not exceed 3.65 metres. Given the scheme has been amended to have a 2 metre set in from the boundary with the adjoining neighbour, it is considered such 3 metre projection can be successfully accommodated in the site without giving rise to undue harm.

Further, there is a precedence of similar projections being approved with a two storey 3 metre rear extension, whereby the site appears as 2 storeys from the streetscene but acts as 3 storeys within the rear elevation due to the basement level (see planning ref: 139005/FH/2024 -

492 Victoria Avenue- approved 8 March 2026). However, in the instance of the current application, the 2 metre set in was required given the existing open nature of the properties which meant the adjoining neighbour would feel the full extent of the proposal. As such, the extent of the proposal is not considered to be excessively large or bulky.

In short, the proposed design and scale of the proposal is considered pursuant 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.

Off Street Parking

As the works are located to the rear of the site, there would be no impact to off street parking provision as a result of the proposal.

Bin Storage

As the works are located to the rear of the site, there would be no impact to bin store provision as a result of the proposal.

Flood Risk

The site lies within an area more likely to be susceptible to surface water flooding and involves a basement conversion. Colleagues in LLFA identify the site is in Flood Zone 2, however planning records indicate that the site does not lie within Flood Zone 2.

Colleagues in the LLFA requested the applicant to complete a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Proforma, supported by Product 4 data. However, 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. The LPA consider 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.

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: 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

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 23 February 2026.

Drawings:

-Location Plan, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 February 2026.

-Proposed- Plans and Elevations- Sheet 2 of 2 REV E, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 29 April 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) 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.

4) 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 inserted in the basement or ground floor of any elevations 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) Property 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.

2) Existing Surface Water Drainage System

If the applicant proposes to utilise the existing surface water drainage system, it is recommended that a full survey of the existing drainage infrastructure is undertaken. Any identified remedial works should be completed, and an ongoing maintenance scheme should be established to ensure that the existing drainage system is fit for purpose for the lifetime of the development.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

1257 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M9 7EG
1090 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M9 7EQ
26 Coulsden Drive, Manchester, M9 6AP
24 Coulsden Drive, Manchester, M9 6AP
28 Coulsden Drive, Manchester, M9 6AP
1253 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M9 7EG
1088 Rochdale Road, Manchester, M9 7EQ

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) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (More) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA