

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131897/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 1 December 2021

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension with balcony, to provide additional living accommodation.

Address: 11 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2NL

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Khurram Hussain, 11 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2NL

Agent (if any): Mr Jahangir Malik, AD-P, 293 Staines Road, Feltham, Hounslow, TW14 9HF

Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 April 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 January 2022

Standard consultations: Printed: 24 March 2022 Expired: 7 April 2022

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 24 March 2022 Expired: 7 April 2022

Site notice: Posted: 14 December 2021 Expired: 4 January 2022

Press advert: Published: 14 December 2021 Expired: 4 January 2022

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: None

The application relates to a three storey semi-detached Victorian villa of red and mixed brick with painted stone sills, timber sash windows, a slate gable roof, large bays, a habitable basement and an original two storey rear outrigger. It has previously been extended via a single storey side/garage extension (approved in 1993, reference: 043563/FH/SOUTH2/93). The plot includes a gravel driveway to the front and lawed garden to the rear, featuring trees and established hedging.

Description of area

Northern Grove is a residential road in West Didsbury comprising of large Victorian houses, mostly arranged in semis, some since converted into flats or house shares, which differ slightly in detail and shape at each section of the street. The street also features modern infill properties and to the side and rear of the site lies 2no three storey apartment blocks. It is sited within the Albert Park Conservation Area (1988) and benefits from its close proximity to Burton Road local centre and good transport links.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a two storey side and part single part two storey rear extension, along with extra basement chamber underneath, 1st floor balcony and associated landscaping, to provide additional living accommodation following demolition of the existing single storey side/garage extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – 4 objections were received, from 3 individual objectors, in relation to two neighbour notifications.

A summary of comments relating to original scheme (3 objection):

- First floor side too close to No.42 Clyde Road flats – *“The proposed extension will block all light and warmth from the side elevation of the flats and would cause considerable dis-amenity, loss of light, feel claustrophobic and may even cause a damp problem.”*
- Loss of habitat for hedgehogs – *“If the planner is minded to approve we need restoration of habitat in the front garden for a species listed as vulnerable to extinction and on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.”*
- Tree protection measures required for retained trees
- Objection to roof terraces due to overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbours – *“This is an 1850s Victorian property. It is in a conservation area. Roof terraces have never been in keeping with this age or style of property. The Victorians were extremely private people.” “There are no details of what materials the proposed roof terraces are to be constructed from? I have no objections to the other proposals just the roof terraces, which I think is reasonable.”*
- Disruption to home-working caused by building works during the day

A summary of comments relating to revised scheme (1 revised objection):

- Overlooking of neighbouring gardens from the flat roof and rear balcony
- Flat roof design unnecessary, a sloping roof would negate the need for access for maintenance – applicant is needlessly creating an issue which is easily avoided
- Flat roof, balcony, stone sills and 3-pane windows are not in-keeping with the Victorian properties and conservation area

West Didsbury Residents Association – Objected to the original scheme but no further comments were received from WDRA following the revisions. Their objection is summarised below:

- The proposed extension would be insufficiently subordinate to the host building
- No.23's side extension is significantly lower and somewhat set back behind the line of the host building, with no side facing window
- We feel it important to keep in mind that a mature apple tree, hedging, front wall with sandstone top stones and shrubs were all removed recently without the benefit of planning approval
- The proposed extension is harsh, overbearing and unwieldy, forming overdevelopment of the plot
- Detrimental to amenity of close neighbours by virtue of loss of daylight to windows and amenity area of neighbouring properties
- Loss of trees, hedges and front boundary wall to the visual detriment of the Conservation Area.

Ward Councillors – Several queries were received from a ward member for Didsbury West, regarding off-street parking, driveway materials, a dropped kerb, removal of a streetlight, obscure glazing, bin store, tree protection, location of previous replacement tree and landscaping. All queries have been answered and no formal objection was received.

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
- Policy DC18 - Conservation Areas

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

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- Policy EN3 – Heritage

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021)

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.



Issues

Principle – The principle of building two storey side and rear extensions to provide additional living space is acceptable given the provisions of policy DC1 of the UDP, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance, impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity as well as the degree of harm upon the character of the conservation area.

Siting, scale and massing – The side extension would project from the north-east elevation, by 3.4m at the front and 3.8m at the rear, to come flush with the original rear outrigger. It would have a setback of 1m from the principal elevation at first floor and a ridge set 0.45m lower than existing. The 1m deep single storey side would have a flat roof height of 4.8m and the single storey element at the rear would have a height of 3.6m with a 1.7m high wall to the side to screen the rear balcony. The two storey rear extension would sit adjacent to the original

outrigger with a depth of 2.2m and a flat roof height set 1.2m lower than the original eaves. The height of the existing outrigger would be raised by less than 1.5m to create a flat roof, 5.45m in width. Beneath the rear extension would sit a new chamber to the existing basement. To the front a new first floor bay would be installed above the existing ground floor bay window within the original elevation, with proportions and fenestration to match, and a ground floor bay would be included within the side extension, also to match existing. The two storey side extension would be sited along the boundary shared with No.42A Clyde Road (modern three storey apartment block) however due to the siting on a corner, with the neighbour sited on the road behind and No.9 Northen Grove located nearly 10m away, the 1m setback and difference in materials, it is not considered that the works would form a terracing effect, particularly as No.42A cannot build to the side and is sited 8m from the Northen Grove highway. The side extension would replace an existing one and a half storey garage extension with internal mezzanine with a very similar footprint. Although it is sited close to the shared boundary, the first floor above this is set back from the front, set down from the ridge, does not project beyond the original rear and does not exceed half the width of the original house (9m as existing), hence the siting, scale and massing of the side element is acceptable. The rear extension does not project beyond the original outrigger and does not exceed the depth stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m) nor does it exceed the eaves of the existing property, hence the siting scale and massing of the rear is also considered acceptable.

Landscaping and boundary treatment – As part of the works hard and soft landscaping is proposed for the front and rear gardens. Objections received referenced previous removal of hedging (carried out many years ago), removal of the original boundary wall to the front (permitted development given the height was below 1m), removal of a tree (subject of an enforcement case and replaced in 2020) and the conversion of the majority of the front garden into driveway (permitted development due to porous gravel covering). None of these issues relate to the current application. The applicant proposes to remove the mature hedging along the front section of the boundary shared with No.42A Clyde Road in order to build the extension. To replace this boundary a 1.8m high close-boarded timber fence would be erected, similar height to existing, with 4no 4-5ft pear trees planted along its length. To the other side of the driveway the replacement tree (ENF/14983/20) would feature root protection fencing, as would the trees within the rear garden. At the rear the new fencing would extend behind the retained hedge to secure the garden and the wall along the boundary shared with No.13 Northen Grove would be built up to 1.8m to provide privacy. The proposed planting, tree-protection measures and boundary treatments are considered acceptable in terms of their design, scale and siting.

Design and impact upon visual amenity and conservation area – The extension(s) would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including matching brickwork, roof slates, lead flashings, stone sills and lintels, coping stones and white painted timber sash windows. Due to the highly visible location within a conservation area though, a condition requiring specifications of the materials prior to above ground works has been attached. The rear elements would not be visible from public land and therefore would not feature within the street scene of Northen Grove. The side extension features a setback and lowered roof height with gable pitch to match existing, with matching bay windows and fenestration detailing, to ensure a subservient and appropriate addition, protecting the visual amenity of the house and area, and to avoid any future terracing effect. Along with the extensions and landscaping, 2no new windows would be inserted in the rear at 2nd floor above the flat roof, 2no large rooflights would be installed within the original rear slope and 4 smaller rooflights would be installed within the front slopes. Rooflights are a common feature of the area and considered acceptable. Due to matching high-quality materials and a sympathetic design, the extension as viewed from the street would be in-keeping with the period property and appropriate for the conservation setting. The rear elevation would be slightly contemporary through the inclusion of flat roofs, a railed balcony and bi-folding doors, which is acceptable given the matching materials and siting at the rear. The proposal is similar in scale and style to that of No.23 Northen Grove 5 doors down

(108420/FH/2015/S2) and extensions are a relatively common feature in the area due to high levels of owner-occupied dwellings and wealth.

West Didsbury Residents Association objected to the original submission, though did not object to the revised scheme. Within their initial objection they raised concerns relating to:

- Subservience – the original submission showed a side extension which was flush with the principal elevation, however the revised scheme includes a 1m setback and a ridge set 0.45m lower than existing which ensured subservience.
- Overdevelopment – The footprint of the property would only increase by 3.8m to the side and 2.2m to the rear, without projecting beyond the side of the existing garage or rear of the outrigger, with lower roof heights, hence the proposal is not considered an overdevelopment of the property.
- Side-facing windows – These were removed.
- Loss of habitat – Although a section of the hedge would be lost, 4no new trees are to be planted along the side boundary in front of the extension and the lawn and trees to the rear are to be retained.
- Loss of front garden and boundary wall – These works were carried out previously under PD and do not form part of this proposal.

Both policy EN3 and saved policy DC18 state that applications within conservation areas should preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area and that it is desirable for retention of existing features, such as boundary walls, gardens, trees and, where possible, preserving, enhancing the character, setting within the conservation area. The proposal retains the important features of the property, such as bay windows, part of the original boundary wall and the stone pillars. The existing frontage would remain unchanged aside from installing a new bay window over the existing bay window, as No's 21 and 23 have previously done. The garage to be demolished was built in the late 1990s and bares no historic merit and therefore its loss would have a neutral impact on the conservation area. The front boundary wall was less than 1m in height and therefore its removal did not require permission. The proposed planting of 4no pear trees will soften the appearance of the side extension from the street and the existing trees at the front and rear will be retained and protected. Due to design, appropriate scale and high-quality materials, it is not considered that the proposal will have an unduly detrimental impact upon the character of the Albert Park Conservation Area and as a result it is considered that the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.

Residential amenity – Local residents were notified of the development via letters and a site notice. 4no objections were received, with 3no in relation to the original submission and 1no in relation to the revised scheme. They raised the following concerns:

- Blocking light and outlook for No.42A Clyde Road flats – The windows (3 across 3 floors) adjacent to the site are to bathrooms, as shown on the original plans for the flats (048160/FO/SOUTH2/95) and by the soil and vent pipes below each window (see site photos). The overshadowing of these windows is not considered to be so significant as to refuse permission.
- Loss of privacy due to roof terraces – The 2nd floor roof terrace was removed from the scheme and the rear balcony has privacy screening to ensure views over neighbouring gardens are oblique, in line with what would be expected from rear bedroom windows.
- Roof terraces, balconies and flat roofs are not in-keeping with character – The balcony and flat roof are sited at the rear and do not feature within the street scene nor unduly impact the character of the conservation area.
- Trees at the rear could be impacted – Tree protection measures have been submitted and will be conditioned.
- Loss of habitat, particularly for hedgehogs – Some hedging, lawn and trees will remain.

- Disruption to home-working from future construction noise – Impacts from building activity would be temporary and short term it is not considered that such a proposal would give rise to excessive impacts on residential amenity to withhold consent.
- Maintenance of flat roofs (collection of leaf and bird litter) is unnecessary and avoidable if pitched instead – The applicant's maintenance issues will be their own and are not considered to be a material planning concern.

Given the side windows and 2nd floor roof terrace were removed, the side extension would give rise to some overshadowing of existing side windows which are indicated as bathrooms on the approved drawing for that building and observations on site, the rear extension would not cause any overshadowing and the balcony would include privacy screening, the revised scheme is, on balance, not considered to cause undue loss of amenity for surrounding occupiers, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Refuse storage and parking – Currently the bins can be stored within the garage, however when this is replaced by a two storey side extension along the shared boundary, there will be no access to the rear or internal storage area, therefore a bin store has been requested and although this is shown on the site plan, further details are required, including its height, design and materials, therefore a condition has been attached requiring these prior to occupation. The garage is to be demolished, however the driveway would be retained, with space for 2 cars as shown on the revised site plan, therefore off-street parking provision and the storage of refuse accords with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF. Although it received objections, following detailed assessment and negotiations, the revised scheme is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor cause substantial harm to visual amenity and the character of Albert Park Conservation Area. The proposed development is therefore deemed acceptable and may commence in accordance with the following conditions and approved drawings.

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

Officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. 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

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:

- '301-00P' - stamped as received by the City Council on the 12th October 2021,
- '300-03C', '300-04', '301-01C', '301-02B' and '302-03A' - stamped as received by the City Council on the 16th March 2022,
- '300-04A' and '300-05A' - stamped as received by the City Council on the 23rd March 2022,
- '302-02D' - stamped as received by the City Council on the 24th March 2022.

Reason - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) Prior to above ground works commencing, samples and specifications of all materials to be used on all external elevations of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

4) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5387 (Trees in relation to construction)

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and

the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with policies EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

5) All tree work should be carried out by a competent contractor in accordance with British Standard BS 3998 "Recommendations for Tree Work".

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with policies EN9 and EN15 of the Core Strategy.

6) The flat roof adjacent to the recessed window within the roofspace shall not be used for any other purpose other than as a means of escape in an emergency or for maintenance of the building.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises against overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

7) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, details of a secure and ventilated bin store shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council. The approved store shall be implemented and be in place prior to the first use of the extension and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

West Didsbury Residents Association

Flat 1, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 2, 42A Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 5, 42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 7, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 4, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 3, 42A Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 1, 42A Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 6, 42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 4, 42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 3, 42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 2, 42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 1, 42 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 6, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 5, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 3, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 2, 44 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
9 Northern Grove, Manchester, M20 2NL
8A Northern Grove, Manchester, M20 2WL

8 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2WL
10 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2WL
15 Northen Grove, Manchester, M20 2NL

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH