

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133228/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 16 March 2022

Proposal: Installation of a ramped access to the front of the property

Address: 6 Marbury Avenue, Manchester, M14 7AJ

Ward(s): Fallowfield Ward

Applicant: Mrs Paula Mackinnon, Mack 4 Limited on Behalf Of One Manchester Ltd, 52 Cornwall Street, Openshaw, Manchester, M11 2PS

Agent (if any): Mrs Paula Mackinnon, Mack 4 Ltd, 52 Cornwall Street, Openshaw, Manchester, M11 2PS

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: **11 May 2022**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 27 April 2022

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 24 March 2022 Expired: 14 April 2022

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: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two storey, semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red painted brick with a hipped roof. The plot includes a large garden and driveway to the front and a garden to the rear, both bound by picket fencing.

Description of area

Marbury Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac, off Thornleigh Road in Fallowfield, which is characterised by similar post-war semi and quasi-semi-detached family dwellinghouses with sizeable lawns.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to install a ramp to facilitate easier and safer access to the front door from the driveway, for a disabled resident.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments 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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 – In particular:

DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes. Many people prefer to extend their existing homes rather than move, and the planning system needs to accommodate this demand for more living space, whilst 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; the Policy therefore allows each case to be looked at on its individual merits, having regard to a range of criteria.

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

Design for Access

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021):

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places

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

Issues

Principal – The principal of the proposal, to install an access ramp to facilitate access from the garden/footpath up to the entrance of the property, is acceptable given the provisions of policy DC1.5. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's impact upon the character of the area and the neighbouring properties' amenity.

Siting, scale and Massing – The ramp would be situated on the left-hand side of the front garden leading to the existing front door, connecting the driveway to the entrance to the property to enable a disabled resident to enter their home more easily and comfortably. It would occupy the existing front path at 1.2m in width, with a max height of the platform 0.21m, a max height of handrails 1.1m and overall depth of ramp (two landings and one slope) 4.6m. The gradient from the top rest area to the bottom would be 1:10 which is acceptable. The siting of the ramp is considered appropriate and it is not deemed bulky or excessive and therefore accords with policy DM1.

Design, appearance and visual amenity – It would be a simple construction, consisting of black painted pre-fabricated metal handrails secured to concrete paving flags. It would be sited adjacent to a timber fence separating the property from its neighbour, therefore it will only be visible from one direction. Although the ramp would be visible from the public highway due to its siting facing the street, the design is to be expected of this type of development, it is not considered unsightly or bulky and should not significantly impact upon the visual amenity of the area, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1.

Residential Amenity – The ramp occupies a small footprint and is not thought to impact the residential amenity of surrounding residents as it won't overshadow the neighbours plot or provide overlooking of the neighbouring properties to any higher a degree than currently exists within the front garden. A ramp can be relatively easily demolished and removed once the

house is in new ownership, meaning these works are potentially reversible in future. In addition to this, no objections or comments have been received from the surrounding occupiers.

Conclusion – The proposal accords with the principals set out in policies DM1, DC1 and SP1, specifically DM1's point on 'Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people' and allowing 'design for health' and DC1.5; 'The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.' Therefore the development detailed above is considered acceptable and works may commence in accordance with the approved drawings and following conditions.

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 applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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 drawing numbered '111-002', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 16th 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

7 Marbury Avenue, Manchester, M14 7AJ
4 Marbury Avenue, Manchester, M14 7AJ
8 Marbury Avenue, Manchester, M14 7AJ
5 Marbury Avenue, Manchester, M14 7AJ
3 Marbury Avenue, Manchester, M14 7AJ

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk)
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH