MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Delegated Officer Report

Summary of application details

Application reference:	PLA-2026-001291
Application type:	Householder planning permission
Proposal:	Installation of rear dormer, single-storey side and rear extension and roof alterations to existing property.
Site address:	19 Biddall Drive Manchester M23 1PE
Ward(s):	Baguley
Date application valid:	10 August 2026
Applicant name:	Craig & Annette McLoughlin
Agent (if any):	Mr Kieran Hibbs
Case officer:	Holly Wright
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	2 October 2026

Description of site, building and/or area

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of brown brick and white render with a grey/brown tile dual-pitch roof. The property features white uPVC-framed windows, a tarmacadam driveway and modest front garden bordered by a mid-level brick wall, a single storey side and rear extension, a glazed conservatory, and a spacious rear garden.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in terms of its character, consisting of terraced and semi-detached dwellinghouses, and benefits from its proximity to public outdoor amenity and green spaces.

The property is not listed, nor is it sited within a conservation area.


Biddall Dr
Biddall Dr
Biddall Dr
25
23
21
17
15
13
27
9


HJ24 KNH





Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the installation of a rear dormer, together with a single-storey side and rear extension and roof alterations to existing property.

Relevant planning history

Planning Application - 106641/FH/2014/S2 - Erection of a single-storey side and rear extension – Approved (2014).

Consultation, notification and publicity responses

Local residents – no responses received.

Relevant policies

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance:
- Policy DC1 – Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy – Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012:
- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles

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.
- Policy JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026)
- Chapter 14 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places



Submitted proposed elevations

Assessment

Principle – the principle of the proposal, to erect a single storey side and rear extension together with a rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation for a dwellinghouse, is acceptable. Notwithstanding this, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale, and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity, waste storage, and parking, amongst other matters.

Siting, scale, and massing – the proposed single storey extension would be sited to the rear of the dwellinghouse, replacing the existing conservatory, and adjoining the existing additions present. It would project approximately 4.49m rearwards, with a width of 5.9m, a pitched roof height of 3.6m, and an eaves height of 2.3m. It would be sited adjacent to the boundary shared with No.21 Biddall Drive. The roof of the existing single storey side extension is also proposed to be amended to match the pitch of the rear extension.

The proposed dormer would be sited on the rear-facing roof slope of the dwellinghouse. It would measure to approximately 3m in length, 6.1m in width, and 2.1m in height. It would be set just below the existing ridge and 1.3m above the eaves with a gap of 0.15m maintained to the gable end.

Overall, the siting, scale, and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable. The rear extension would remain visually subservient to the host dwellinghouse on account of its single storey form and appropriate length, width, and height, which should ensure that it does not appear as an excessively large or bulky addition to the property. Adequate private amenity space would also be retained to the rear of the dwellinghouse. Additionally, the dormer is understood as being subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of its dimensions on account of it being set just below the existing ridge with adequate gaps maintained to the existing eaves and roof edges. The proposal would therefore avoid resulting in an 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the property and is not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of introducing an overbearing feature into the area.

Appearance and visual amenity – the submitted application form states that the proposal would be constructed using brick and render walls, with a tiled roof and dark grey composite cladding. However, the submitted elevations appear to show hanging tiles to the dormer and brickwork to the rear extension. The agent was asked to clarify the proposed materials of the extensions; however, no such clarification was received. As such, a condition has been imposed requiring the use of materials that are similar in appearance to the existing dwellinghouse.

In terms of its appearance, the proposed single storey rear extension would incorporate a set of sliding doors within the rear elevation, with three rooflights above and blank side elevations. The dormer extension would include two rear-facing windows and similarly feature blank side elevations.

The proposal is relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Sited at the rear of the property, the proposal would not be highly visible within the street scene or public realm and, as such, should avoid forming a prominent visual feature in the area. Subject to the aforementioned materials condition, the proposal is considered to integrate satisfactorily with the host dwellinghouse and would preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on visual amenity.

Residential amenity – given that the rear extension would be single storey in form, would be sited adjacent to an existing single storey addition at the adjoining property, with a high-level

fence and mature foliage evident along the shared boundary, this element of the proposal is not considered to give rise to significant issues of overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook. Moreover, as the extension would not feature any side-facing windows or windows in close proximity to shared boundaries, it should also avoid causing significant issues associated with overlooking and loss of privacy.

The rear dormer's siting on the roof of the property, set just below the existing ridge, above the existing eaves and away from the roof edges, should ensure that it does not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area, given that its mass and bulk would not impact the path of light to neighbouring properties beyond that of the host dwellinghouse itself. Further to this, the dormer's rear-facing windows would be set back from the eaves and, as such, should provide no further degree of overlooking than any existing windows at first-floor level.

Waste storage – the current waste storage arrangements would be unaffected by the proposal.

Parking – the current parking arrangements would be unaffected by the proposal.

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. The proposal 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 the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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. Minor issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the agent to reach a satisfactory resolution.

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

1) 3-year time limit:

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

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

2) Specified plans:

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

- ‘Proposed Elevations’, numbered ‘KH1300-102’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 10 August 2026.
- ‘Proposed Plans’, numbered ‘KH1300-101’, received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 10 August 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) Materials:

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 Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) Restriction on additional openings:

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 into the elevations of the development hereby approved, without planning permission being granted by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.