

Planning

Delegated Officer Report

Summary of application details

Application reference:	144403/FH/2025
Application type:	Householder planning permission
Proposal:	Erection of first-floor rear extension, roof alternations to include a parapet wall to existing single storey rear extension and associated elevational alterations to rear
Site address:	34 Cherry Tree Road Manchester M23 9BX
Ward(s):	Brooklands
Date application valid:	17 February 2026
Applicant name:	Mr Sean Addison
Agent (if any):	Mr Mohamed Muse
Case officer:	Tracie Simpson
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date of recommendation:	09 June 2026

Description of site, building and/or area

The site comprises a two storey brick built detached property in the Brooklands area of Manchester. The property has a fronted bay window at ground floor with porch and attached garage with two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension with conservatory. The property benefits from a large front garden with driveway and smaller rear garden.

Description of development

The applicant is proposing the erection of first-floor rear extension, roof alternations to include a parapet wall to existing single storey rear extension and associated elevational alterations to rear

Relevant planning history

Consultation, notification and publicity responses

Consultations

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 - No comments, objections or representations in respect of this application were received.

RSPB Swift Champion - Should the application be approved attach informative

Notifications and publicity

Negotiations

Negotiations have taken place with the applicant/agent, however, a solution has not been reached.

Relevant policies

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

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.

- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.

JP-S1: Sustainable Development

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Governments' planning policies for England and how these should be applied. A draft revised NPPF was published for consultation on 16 December 2025. The consultation period runs for 12 weeks and will close on 10 March 2026.

The draft NPPF proposes significant changes to the structure and content of national policy. These include a move to Local Plan-style policy sections, a clearer distinction between planning making and decision-making policies, and the reintroduction of strategic planning through Spatial Development Strategies. Other notable changes include an expanded presumption in favour of sustainable development, policies promoting higher densities around transport hubs, and support for small and medium-scale housing schemes through a new "medium development" category. The draft also integrates Nation Development Management Policies, strengthens climate change and biodiversity policies, and introduces measures to encourage clean energy and critical minerals development.

Once adopted, the revised NPPF will replace the current framework and form a key part of national planning policy. At this stage, as the document is subject to consultation and has not yet been finalised, while still a material consideration, it can only be afforded limited weight in the determination of planning applications. In this instance, the relevant sections is outlined below:

Policy L4(Residential Extensions) - This policy states that development proposals to extend existing dwelling houses should blend effectively with the existing building and its immediate surroundings in terms of its scale and form; and maintain acceptable living standards for current and new occupiers in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.

Assessment

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of first-floor rear extension, roof alternations to include a parapet wall to existing single storey rear extension and associated elevational alterations to rear. Following assessment, negotiations took place to consider moving the proposal away from the boundary due to the staggered position of the host dwelling to the neighbouring property. A solution has not been reached.

Principle of the Proposal

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered unacceptable and it is believed that there are factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed not to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy

Site History relating to 34 Cherry Tree Road

140923/NMC/2024 - Recv: 23.09.2024 - Application Approved - 09.10.2024 - Non Material Change to planning permission reference 132358/FH/2021 to add a window to the first-floor extension.

140052/NMC/2024 - Recv: 20.05.2024 - Application Refused - 17.06.2024 Non-material amendment to planning permission reference 132358/FH/2021 to allow the addition of a window to the first-floor extension.

132358/FH/2021 - Recv: 13.06.2022 - Application Approved - 08.08.2022 Erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey front extension, roof alterations including increase in height and dormer extension to rear to provide additional living accommodation

117339/FH/2017 - Recv: Application Returned - Erection of a two-storey side extension and roof alterations including increase in height and dormer extension

119031/FH/2018 - Recv: 07.06.2018 - Application Approved - 21.08.2018 Erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey front extension, roof alterations including increase in height and dormer extension to rear to provide additional living accommodation

090540/FH/2009/S2 - Recv: 13.08.2009 - Application Approved - 23.09.2009 Erection of 2 storey side extension, single storey front extension and loft conversion with rear dormer to form additional living accommodation

087498/FH/2008/S2 Recv: 17.10.2008 - Application Approved - 11.11.2008 Erection of single storey extension to the front and two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.

Residential Amenity

The applicant seeks planning permission for the erection of a first-floor rear extension, alterations to the roof form including the introduction of a parapet wall to the existing single-storey rear extension, and associated elevational changes to the rear of the property.

During the course of the application, concerns were raised in respect of the impact of the proposed extension on neighbouring residential amenity, particularly given the staggered relationship between the host dwelling and the adjacent property. As a result, discussions and negotiations were undertaken with the applicant/agent to explore potential amendments to the scheme, specifically in relation to repositioning the proposed extension further away from the shared boundary in order to reduce its overbearing impact and mitigate issues of dominance, outlook, and enclosure.

Despite these efforts, a satisfactory amended scheme has not been achieved. Consequently, the proposal remains unacceptable in its current form, as it fails to adequately address the adverse impacts arising from its siting, scale, and relationship with the neighbouring property.

The proposed development would be situated above the existing single storey rear element of the ground floor extension on the southern side of the dwelling. The first floor projection would extend approximately 3.439m from the rear elevation, aligning with the existing first floor rear projection on the opposite side of the property. A separation gap of approximately 3.550m would remain between the two projections, maintaining a degree of spacing within the overall rear elevation. The extension would be set flush with the existing side wall of the dwelling and would not project beyond it, thereby retaining the established side building line.

In terms of elevational changes, the proposal includes alterations to the existing first floor rear bedroom window, which would be extended into the side elevation of the new rear projection. Whilst this amended window would continue to overlook the host dwelling's rear garden and would primarily face the internal side wall of the opposing rear projection, it is not considered to introduce any significant additional overlooking beyond the existing situation. Similarly, the proposed window within the rear elevation of the new first floor extension serves a bathroom, therefore the potential to overlook being reduced by obscure glazing.

The proposal includes the introduction of a parapet roof design to the rear slope of the existing single-storey rear element. While this represents a design alteration, it does not sufficiently mitigate the overall visual bulk and massing introduced by the additional first-floor structure.

It is also important to consider the spatial relationship, or juxtaposition, between the host dwelling and the adjacent property at No. 36 Cherry Tree Road. Given the positioning, height, and depth of the proposed first-floor rear projection, the development would appear unduly dominant and oppressive when viewed from neighbouring habitable rooms and private amenity spaces. The increased scale and proximity of the extension would result in an overbearing form of development, leading to a harmful sense of enclosure and a significant reduction in outlook for the occupiers of No. 36.

Taken as a whole, the proposal would give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of providing an overbearing impact on neighbouring residential amenity. These adverse effects are considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of relevant local planning policies, which seek to ensure that development proposals protect and maintain the amenity of existing residents.

The proposal therefore does not comply with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

When considered within the context of the application site and the surrounding area, the proposed extension is deemed unacceptable. The scale, siting, and massing of the development would result in a form of built development that is excessive and incongruous with the established pattern of the surrounding residential environment.

The proposal would therefore fail to integrate appropriately with the existing dwelling and would disrupt the prevailing character of the area. Furthermore, the cumulative impact of the extension's scale and massing, particularly in relation to its proximity to neighbouring boundaries, would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact. This would materially harm the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of surrounding properties through increased sense of enclosure, reduced outlook, and an oppressive visual presence.

As such, the proposal fails to comply with the principles of good design and protection of residential amenity as set out in saved UDP Policy DC1, as well as Policies DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy. These policies require development to be of an appropriate scale, massing, and design that respects its context and safeguards the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Design

The proposed design is not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. While the extension has been shaped to follow the form of the existing property and respond to the constraints of the plot, this has resulted in an awkward and contrived form of development that appears visually incongruous within its context.

Furthermore, the design approach does not adequately respect the established pattern of development or the architectural character of neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposal would detract from the overall visual amenity of the area.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1, which require development to achieve a high standard of design, respond positively to its context, and contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

Refuse Bins

Refuse bins are unaffected by this proposal.

Parking

Existing car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, massing, and design, fails to represent a subservient or sympathetic addition to the original dwelling. The proposal would result in a form of development that is excessive and visually intrusive, causing harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Furthermore, the development would give rise to unacceptable impacts on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, including an overbearing effect and loss of outlook, which would significantly diminish the current levels of residential amenity.

While it is acknowledged that the occupiers seek to adapt their home to meet their needs, this must be balanced against the requirement to ensure that development does not result in undue harm to neighbouring properties or the wider area. In this case, the adverse impacts identified are of sufficient weight to outweigh any benefits of the proposal.

As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the relevant policies of the development plan, and there are no material considerations that would justify a departure from these policies.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal would not improve the social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There are no conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which would have made the development acceptable and it is therefore not possible to approve the application.

Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for refusal

- 1) The proposed first floor rear extension by reason of its size, mass and location, would form an unduly visually and incongruous feature which would have an overbearing visual appearance on the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore 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 paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).