MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning
Delegated Officer Report

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Application reference:	PLA-2026-000195
Application type:	Householder planning permission
Proposal:	Erection of single-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension, front porch and installation of rear dormer.
Site address:	35 ROSSLARE ROAD MANCHESTER M22 5GQ
Ward(s):	Sharston
Date application valid:	19 May 2026
Applicant name:	Mrs Raegan Spencer
Agent (if any):	Mr David Price
Case officer:	Joshua Lee
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	15 July 2026

DESCRIPTION OF SITE, BUILDING AND/OR AREA

The proposal is related to a two-storey semidetached dwellinghouse on Rosslare Road. The property features hardstanding to the front and side for off street vehicle parking and garden to the rear. The property features an existing side car port canopy.

The property is in a mostly residential part of Sharston ward. The property is in a medium risk surface water risk area.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The applicant is proposing the erection of a single-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension, front porch and installation of rear dormer.

Single storey rear extension

The proposed single storey rear extension projects 1300mm from the existing rear elevation and spans the full 7230mm across the rear of the original property and proposed side extension. The rear extension features a sloping roof and glazing to the rear and the extension is finished in matching materials.

Two Storey Side Extension
The proposed two storey side extension projects 2210mm from the existing side elevation of the property and runs the full 8038mm length of the property. The side extension continues the main roof line to finish with a gable end. New glazing is featured to front and rear, and the extension is finished in matching materials.

Rear Dormer extension
The proposed rear dormer spans 6900mm across the rear of the main roof and continues across the roof of the proposed two storey side extension. The dormer sits within the main roof slope is finished in matching hanging tile and features glazing to the rear.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY
No planning history at address.

CONSULTATION, NOTIFICATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

Consultations

Manchester City Council Flood Risk Management
The proposal can be approved with no condition required.

Notifications and publicity
1no local resident objected to the proposed development with concerns regarding

- Overbearing impact and character: The proposed two-storey side extension is considered excessive in height, scale and mass, resulting in a dominant and intrusive form of development. It would reduce the gap between properties, erode the sense of openness and create a terracing effect that is out of keeping with the established semi-detached character of the street.
- Loss of light and overshadowing: The extension's proximity and scale are said to result in a material loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring windows, particularly affecting the kitchen. Concern is raised that insufficient information has been submitted to assess these impacts.
- Parking and highway concerns: The enlargement of the dwelling (including an additional bedroom) is likely to increase parking demand in an area already experiencing pressure, potentially worsening congestion and on-street parking issues.
- Loss of side access and visual impact: The development would remove existing side access, requiring bin storage in the front garden. This is considered visually intrusive, harmful to the street scene, and indicative of overdevelopment of the plot.

NEGOTIATIONS
Issues have arisen in the consultation phase which required negotiations in positive and proactive manner.

- Two storey side - As the two-storey side meets the boundary a setback of 2m (from the principal elevation) to the first-floor elevation (and lower roofline) is required. This is to ensure we mitigate any risk of terracing and ensure subservience of the proposed development.
- Rear dormer - The roof dormer would need to be contained within the original roof slope only and not on the proposed extension. This is to minimise the effect of it reading as a full third storey, ensure subservience and minimise the massing/overlooking effects to neighbours.

Updated proposal
The updated proposal amends the proposed plans to:

1. Introduce a 2m setback at first floor to the principal elevation.
2. Reduce the rear dormer to sit entirely within the original rear roof slope.



Figure 1. Updated proposed plans and elevations

Renotification

Given we received a local resident comment and the substantial changes a 14 day renotification was deemed necessary.

No further responses were received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions on planning applications must be made in line with the statutory development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

For Manchester, the development plan comprises:

- The Core Strategy (2012–2027)
- Saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
- The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2022–2039)

These documents are considered up to date and carry substantial weight in decision-making. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and other local guidance may also be relevant.

National planning policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is a material consideration and provides overarching guidance.

The Government has published a consultation draft of the NPPF, intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making. While this draft is not yet adopted, it is a material consideration.

Where applicable, the Council must give special regard to preserving the character of conservation areas and the setting of listed buildings, in line with statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The policies referenced in this report are those considered most relevant to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development as follows:

- The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027
  - Development Management and Planning Obligations
    - DM 1 - Development Management
  - Objective 1 - Spatial Principles
    - SP 1 - Spatial Principles (Partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 1)
  - Objective 6 Environment
    - EN 1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
    - EN 14 – Flood Risk (partially replaced by PfE Policy JP-S 4)
    - EN 19 – Waste
- Guide to development in Manchester - supplementary planning document and planning guidance, April 2007
- Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP) –
  - Citywide Development Control Policies
    - DC1 - Residential extensions
    - DC26 - Development and Noise
- Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039-
  - Strategy
    - JP-Strat9: Southern Areas
  - Sustainable and Resilient Places
    - JP-S1: Sustainable Development
    - JP-S4: Flood Risk and the Water Environment
  - Places for People
    - JP-P1 Sustainable Places
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024–
  - Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
  - Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
  - Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- National Planning Policy Framework Draft for Consultation December 2025 - National decision-making policies
  - Chapter 3 – Decision-making policies
    - DM1: Preparing development proposals
    - DM2: Information requirements
    - DM3: Determining development proposals
    - DM6: Use of planning conditions and obligations
    - DM7: Relationship with other regulatory regimes
  - Chapter 4 - Achieving sustainable development
    - S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
    - S4: Principle of development within settlements
    - S6: Neighbourhood plans and the presumption
  - Chapter 5 - Meeting the challenge of climate change
    - CC2: Mitigation of climate change
    - CC3: Adaptation to climate change
  - Chapter 12 - Making effective use of land
    - L4: Residential extensions
  - Chapter 14 - Achieving well-designed places
    - DP3: Key principles for well-designed places
    - DP4: The Design process
  - Chapter 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change

- F4: Assessing flood risk for decision-making
- F7: Ensuring development is safe from flooding
- F8: Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses

ASSESSMENT

Principle of development

Many people prefer to extend their existing homes rather than move, and the planning system needs to accommodate this demand for more living space, while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed. The Council is not generally in favour of dealing with this issue by laying down firm rules about home extensions with each case looked at on its individual merits, having regard to a range of criteria.

In this case the principle of the development is acceptable.

As stated in Policy DM 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, all development should have regard to the following specific issues:

Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials, and detail

The proposed extensions have been designed to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling through the use of matching brickwork, roof tiles and window detailing.

The development would remain clearly subordinate to the host dwelling, with the two-storey side extension incorporating a lower ridge height and being set back from the principal elevation. The side extension is positioned approximately 2 metres behind the front elevation of the dwelling, which is considered sufficient to avoid creating a terracing effect and to maintain the visual separation that contributes to the character of the semi-detached pair.

Impact on No. 33

The principal impact upon No. 33 would arise from the rear projection at ground-floor level. However, this element is single-storey in scale and projects only approximately 1.3 metres beyond the existing rear elevation. Consequently, it would not result in undue overshadowing, loss of outlook or an overbearing relationship to neighbouring occupiers.

It is also noted that the extension projects significantly less than a rear extension that could potentially be erected under permitted development rights, which provides a realistic fallback position and is a material consideration in assessing the likely impact.

The proposed dormer is contained within the main roof slope and would not materially increase bulk or massing. As such, it would not result in any significant additional harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of No. 33.

Impact on No. 37

The proposal would have a greater relationship with No. 37 due to its position adjacent to the shared boundary. Whilst the proposal introduces additional built form alongside the boundary, the first-floor element has been set back by 2 metres from the principal elevation and incorporates a reduced ridge height to ensure a subordinate appearance. The extension would not project beyond the established rear building line of the dwelling and, as such, the additional massing would be limited and would not materially increase the impact currently experienced by the neighbouring occupiers.

The dormer is positioned well within the roof plane and away from the shared boundary with No. 37. As a result, it would appear as a subordinate roof addition rather than an additional storey and would not result in undue visual intrusion.

Overall, by virtue of its siting, scale, design and relationship with neighbouring properties, the proposal would not appear unduly dominant, overbearing or oppressive and would not result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with relevant residential amenity and design policies.

Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

Following negotiations, amendments have been secured to ensure the first-floor side extension remains subordinate to the host dwelling, including a 2-metre setback from the principal elevation and a corresponding lower roofline. These design measures ensure that the extension reads as a secondary addition and maintains the visual hierarchy of the original dwelling.

The separation created by the setback, together with the reduced roof height, would avoid the creation of a significant terracing effect and preserve the semi-detached character of the property. As such, the proposal would maintain the established pattern of development along Rosslare Road and would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area

Effects on amenity

Privacy
The proposal includes new glazing within the front and rear elevations. These windows would serve habitable rooms and would face directions typical of a suburban residential environment. The rear dormer windows would overlook the applicant's own rear garden and neighbouring gardens in a manner comparable to other first-floor rear-facing windows commonly found in the area. No side-facing windows are proposed that would result in unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The proposal would not therefore result in any significant loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

Light
As set out above, the rear extension is modest in scale, projecting only approximately 1.3 metres beyond the existing rear elevation. The first-floor side extension remains within the established building lines of the host dwelling and would not introduce a materially greater impact than the existing built form.

Given the scale and siting of the proposed development, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring occupiers.

Noise
The proposed extensions are for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of a single dwellinghouse. The development would not introduce any commercial activity or other noise-generating use beyond what would normally be associated with residential occupation.

Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes.

The proposal does not materially alter access arrangements to the dwelling. The proposed porch would not prejudice accessibility and the property would continue to be capable of accommodating occupants with differing mobility needs.

Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.

The proposal would increase the amount of internal accommodation available to the occupants and would provide appropriately sized living spaces.

Although a small area of the rear garden would be lost as a result of the extension, a substantial and usable private rear garden would remain. Accordingly, adequate external amenity space would continue to be available to serve the dwelling.

Refuse storage and collection.

The proposal would remove the existing side access to the rear garden. However, the submitted plans indicate that refuse and recycling bins would be stored within a purpose-built wooden bin store within the curtilage of the property. Given its modest scale and domestic appearance, the bin store would provide a satisfactory solution for refuse storage and would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and

appearance of the street scene. The arrangements are also considered adequate to enable the continued operation of existing refuse collection services

Vehicular access and car parking

The proposal would result in the enclosure of the existing side carport. However, the property would continue to benefit from a generous front driveway capable of accommodating off-street parking.

Whilst concern has been raised regarding increased parking demand arising from the enlarged dwelling, the proposal would remain a single dwellinghouse and sufficient off-street parking provision would be retained. The development would not therefore result in unacceptable highway or parking impacts.

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private

The dwelling would retain a sizeable private rear garden following completion of the development. The proposal would not affect any public open space, green infrastructure assets or strategic green corridors.

Flood risk and drainage.

The site lies within an area identified as having medium surface water flood risk. Manchester City Council's Flood Risk Management team were consulted and raised no objection to the proposal.

Given the modest scale of the development and the absence of any objection from the Lead Local Flood Authority, the proposal is considered acceptable in flood risk and drainage terms. Surface water would continue to be managed through existing drainage arrangements.

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.

CONCLUSION

The proposed single-storey rear extension, two-storey side extension, porch and rear dormer have been designed in a manner that is sympathetic to the host dwelling and the wider street scene. Following amendments secured through the application process, the proposal would remain subordinate to the original dwelling and would not result in a harmful terracing effect.

The development would not result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers through loss of outlook, overshadowing, dominance, overlooking or other amenity impacts. Satisfactory arrangements would remain for parking, refuse storage and private amenity space, and no objections have been raised by consultees.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policies DM1, EN1 and EN19 of the Manchester Core Strategy, Policy DC1 of the UDP, relevant Places for Everyone policies and the design objectives of the NPPF. Accordingly, the application is recommended for Approval.

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. There were minor changes required to meet the requirements for approval and the officer and applicant worked together to find an amicable solution.

CONDITIONS TO BE ATTACHED TO DECISION FOR APPROVAL

1. 3-year time limit

The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Specified plans

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

a. Site and Location Plan received 5 May 2026
b. Drawing No. 2070/26 A – Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations, received 30 June 2026
c. Drawing No. 2071/26 – Sections and Specification, received 5 May 2026
d. Drawing No. 2072/26 – Parking Layout and Bin Storage Plan, received 19 May 2026.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 & of Places for Everyone.

3. Materials to match

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. Bin store

The secure and ventilated bin store for the storage of waste containers, including segregated and recyclable waste, as listed with the drawings above, shall be implemented prior to the first use of the extension hereby approved and thereafter retained and maintained, in perpetuity.

Reason - In the interests of residential and visual amenity pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for Manchester.