

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130954/FO/2021

Date registered valid: 10 January 2022

Proposal: Erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey and first floor rear extensions to provide 8 no. additional hotel rooms together with ancillary space and ground floor garage following demolition of existing garage and outbuilding.

Address: Park Crescent Hotel, 13 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE

Ward(s): Rusholme Ward

Applicant: Mr. Naseer Chaudary, 13 Park Crescent Hotel , Manchester, M14 5RE

Agent (if any): Mr Amjad Tahir, Aeys Associates UK Ltd, 173 Dickenson Road, Manchester, M13 0YN

Case officer: Dave Morris
Tel: 0161 600 7924
Email: dave.morris@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 07.03.2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

Date of site visit: 11 February 2022

Standard consultations:

Printed: 7 February 2022 Expired: 28 February 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 7 February 2022 Expired: 28 February 2022

Site notice

Posted: 11 February 2022 Expired: 4 March 2022

Press advert

Published: 15 February 2022 Expired: 8 March 2022

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

This application relates to a large two storey detached property used as a hotel at the junction of Park Crescent and Denison Road. The property has frontage to both roads and there is a single storey extension to the rear. There is a small grassed area on Denison Road and the remainder of the frontages to Denison Road and Park Crescent are given over to parking with access from Park Crescent. In the supporting documents the agent indicates that the property is used by Manchester City Council to house vulnerable people.







Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Victoria Park Conservation Area 1972

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The site lies with the Victoria Park Conservation Area adjacent to the distinctive landscaped roundabout just off Wilmslow Road. The property is outside of, but close to Rusholme district shopping centre. At this point the area is predominantly residential although there are some hotels nearby as well as educational campuses to the north.

Description of development

Consent is sought to erect a first floor extension above the existing single storey rear extension. The extension would provide five en-suite bedrooms of approximately 13 square metres. Room windows would face the rear elevation of the existing two storey wing fronting Denison Road. The other side elevation would contain windows to the access corridor.

Alongside the existing single storey extension, between that and the site boundary it is proposed to erect a single storey extension accommodating three further en-suite bedrooms of approximately 13 square metres and a laundry room. The windows to the room are either side of a recess in the side elevation beneath the canopy of the roof.

Finally it is proposed to erect a two storey extension at the side of the property on the Park Crescent frontage to replace the existing garage. This would form a garage at ground floor level with a store above. The extension would have a hipped roof. There would be a garage door in the front elevation and a single window above.

The submitted plans show a total of 12 parking spaces at the front of the property, two of which are accessible.



PARK CRESCENT

PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN



PARK CRESCENT

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN

PROPOSED BUILDING PLAN
1:1000 (A1)

AEYS ASSOCIATES (UK)
PROJECT:
13 PARK CRESCENT, RUSHOLM
M14 8SE MANCHESTER, UK
DRAWING TITLE:
PROPOSED BUILDING PLAN
DATE:
09 NOV 2021
DRAWN BY:
AK-S
CHECKED BY:
1:1000 (A1)



**PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION
(PARK CRESCENT)**

AEYS ASSOCIATES (UK)
PROJECT:
13 PARK CRESCENT, RUSHOLM



**PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION - A
(DENISON ROAD)**



To facilitate the developmet the existing garage at the side of the property and a detached building at the rear of the site are tobe demolished.

The supplied Heritage Statement concludes that the works will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that the development will bring a social benefit to the area by increasing the number of hotel bed spaces in the area thus fulfilling the objective of attracting tourists to Rusholme.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents

One letter has been received objecting to the proposed development. The issues raised are summarised below.

- the proposed expansion will be over development, which will impact on the residential & conservation status of the area.
- This will lead to noise, traffic & parking issues for this area by increasing the size of the building & it's occupants.

Highways

-It would be useful if the applicant could provide trip generation data in order to justify that the proposals will not generate any adverse impact on highway safety or network operation. Highways acknowledge that this area is subject to significant demands for on-street car parking with limited capacity to support any further increase.

-The site benefits from good access to local bus services, providing regular connections across the surrounding area from Wilmslow Road. Sustainable travel to and from the site should be fully endorsed for both staff, residents and visitors to the site and it is recommended that a Travel Plan is implemented for the site and conditioned to any approval.

-It is understood that 12 parking spaces are in place in the car park situated on the eastern edge of the site. A garage is also in place on the western edge of the site. It is understood that the 12 parking spaces will remain and two will be converted to disabled parking. The garage will be extended to provide parking for two vehicles. It should be noted that MCC Core Strategy request a maximum of 38 parking spaces (1 space per bedroom) with 6% (2 spaces) allocated as disabled parking. The proposed parking will provide 32% of the total provision. This provision is low, and it is requested that parking is monitored as part of a Travel Plan and a parking management strategy is in place.

- A parking management strategy is required to confirm the total number of car park spaces that will be available and how these spaces will be allocated.

-Electric vehicle charging points should be fitted (minimum 7kw) for 10% of the total number of car parking spaces.

-Vehicular access to the car park is gained via an existing access point from Park Crescent. An existing dropped crossing is already in place to facilitate access in to the site for both vehicles and pedestrians, this is acceptable to Highways.

- secure and sheltered cycle parking provision should be made, within the curtilage of the site, for the accommodation of staff / guest's cycles.

It appears from the documents submitted that no boundary treatments are proposed. For the avoidance of doubt, all gating which is accessed from the highway must be ensured to be inwardly opening, in order to prevent obstruction to passing footway users.

-Highways require all servicing to take place within the site's curtilage and do not support the requirement for servicing to be carried out on Park Crescent or Denison Road. Further clarification is sought regarding: Refuse storage arrangements; It is recommended that a full Servicing Management Plan is provided by the applicant in order to ensure no adverse highway impact is created.

-A Travel Plan should be produced to highlight the accessibility of the site via public transport, and collect existing modal shares of staff travel.

-A Construction Management Plan should be provided by the applicant prior to any construction works beginning.

Environmental Protection - No objections to the proposed development subject to conditions in respect of the acoustic insulation of external plant, air quality and a watching brief for contaminated land.

Policy

NPPF 2021

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) underpins the planning system and provides guidance on all aspects. The central theme to the NPPF is to achieve sustainable development. The Government states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.

The Framework re-iterates that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory status of the development plan remains as the starting point for decision making.

However, paragraphs 10 and 11 state that 'at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development' and, in 'decision-taking', this means approving development

proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The National Policy Framework has been related to the proposed development, with particular emphasis given to the following:

Decision Making - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

The following specific paragraphs being particularly relevant to the proposed development:

190. Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.

194. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

195. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

197. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

199. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

202. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Core Strategy

The relevant Core Strategy policies are SP1, DM1 and EN3

Policy SP1 sets down the spatial principles that guide development in the City, including the creation of neighbourhoods of choice.

Policy DM1 seeks to protect the amenity of an area from the adverse impact of development.

Policy EN3 seeks to protect the City's heritage assets from the adverse impact of development.

The relevant saved UDP policies are DM1 and DC18

Policy DM1 sets down the principles to be considered in determining applications for residential properties including the need for extensions to be subservient to the host property and not to adversely impact on the amenity of residents. The policy makes clear that it also applies to hotels (DC1.6).

Policy DC18 seeks to protect the City's Conservation Areas from the adverse impact of development.

Issues

Principle

Whilst the principle of enlarging the hotel to improve facilities for visitors to the Curry Mile is considered acceptable consideration also needs to be given as to the impact of the development on the character of the conservation area and the amenity of adjoining residential properties.

Scale

The main part of the existing building comprises a two storey L shaped building with frontages to Park Crescent and Denison Road. The existing single storey wing at the rear nestles behind these structures and due to the raised ground level within the site is largely unseen from the public domain, although it is visible from the adjacent sites. The proposed first floor extension would significantly increase the scale of this part of the building and as can be seen from the elevations the enlarged wing would be visible beyond the end of the part of the building that forms the Denison Road frontage. Coupled with the proposed single storey extension at the side of the wing it is considered that the scale of the proposed extensions is considered to be excessive. The two storey replacement for the existing garage is also considered to be over large for its position.

On balance it is considered that the scale of the proposed extensions are excessive.

Design

The proposed two storey garage extension would due to its, including design with a hipped roof, appear as an incongruous structure in the street scene. Whilst the design of the other

extensions picks up on the hipped roofs of the original building, this proposed extension it is of a different pitch appears incongruous.

Parking

The existing parking arrangements remain unchanged despite an increase in the number of bedrooms by 8. However, this is a sustainable location close to the services on offer within the District Centre and with easy access to public transport.

On that basis it is considered that the lack of additional parking could not form the basis of a reason for refusing consent.

Residential Amenity

Concern is expressed that the proposed ground and first floor extensions would impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the residential accommodation to the north. Whilst the extension would be sufficiently far from the adjacent properties not to loom over them the scale of the proposed extension is such that it would still have an overbearing impact.

Whilst there are no habitable room windows overlooking the residential accommodation, there are windows which serve the access corridor to the rooms and it is considered that these could give rise to a loss of privacy.

Finally, the additional rooms would generate further activity within and around the site and in what is a residential area, albeit close to a district centre and educational establishments this additional activity and any noise generated would impact on the amenity of residents.

Standard of accommodation.

The proposed rooms at 13 square metres are quite small and concerns is expressed that should the premises be being used as emergency accommodation they would be on the small site. Concern is also expressed that the rooms in the proposed ground floor extension have limited supplies of natural light. The rooms are provided with small windows facing the windows to the adjacent room across a small recess which is covered by the extensions roof. Thus the windows would receive little light and potentially give rise to privacy issues.

The proposed first floor extension would have an overbearing impact on the existing rooms on the rear of the ground floor of the wing that fronts Denison Road, there is also the potential for a loss of privacy.

On balance it is considered that the rooms would offer a poor standard of accommodation.

Impact on the character of the Conservation Area

The Victoria Park Conservation Area contains a wide range of building styles and ages, however, one of the unifying features is the space between and around the building. Concern is expressed that the proposed extensions will infill a significant open area at the side and rear of the property to a significantly greater degree than is the case at the moment and that this will impact on views within the Conservation Area.

Consent was granted for side extensions to number 11, reference 111391/FH/2016/S1 and this has now lapsed. There is a current, as yet underdetermined application for a similar proposal, reference, 132503/FH/2021.

Whilst the earlier consent at number 11 would suggest that side extensions are acceptable in the conservation area, each case needs to be considered on its merits. In this case number 13 is set substantially further into the site than number 11 and consequently the erection of a side extension would create a greater sense of enclosure and erode the openness that is a characteristic of the Conservation Area.

The applicant has suggested that the extension of the hotel would increase the availability of bed space and therefore accord with the Council's policies on improving Rusholme as a tourist destination. However, it is considered that any benefits attributable to the 8 additional rooms would not outweigh the harm that the proposed extensions would cause to the character of the Conservation Area.

On balance it is considered that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion.

The proposed extensions represent an over development of the site that would harm both the amenity of residents, the future users of the hotel and also the character of the Conservation Area.

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: Refuse

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.

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

1) The proposed single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension by reason of their scale and design would be out of character with the pattern of development found in the area to

the detriment of the character of the Victoria Park Conservation Area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN3 and saved Unitary Development Plan policies DC1 and DC18.

2) The proposed two storey side extension would partially infill the space between 11 and 13 Park Crescent to the detriment of the character of the Victoria Park Conservation Area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policy DM1 and EN3 and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC18.

3) The provision of additional bedrooms on the site would result in the over intensive use of the site to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent residential accommodation by reason of the additional comings and goings and general activity associated with the additional accommodation. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policy DM1.

4) The proposed first floor rear extension would have an overbearing impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring property and upon the existing bedrooms within the hotel to the detriment of the occupiers of those rooms. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policy DM1.

5) The inter relationship of the proposed bedroom windows in the single storey rear extension coupled with their small size and orientation would result in a poor levels of privacy and natural light to the detriment of the standard of accommodation for the occupiers of the rooms. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policy DM1.

6) The windows in the Northwest elevation of the proposed first floor extension would overlook the rear gardens of the adjacent properties resulting in a loss of privacy. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policy DM1.

7) The proposed new bedrooms by reason of their small size would result in a poor standard of accommodation to the detriment of the future occupiers of the rooms. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Strategy policy DM1

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
Urban Design & Conservation
Rusholme, Fallowfield & Moss Side Civic Society

9 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
10 Lower Park Road, Manchester, M14 5QZ
20 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
18 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
14 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
10 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
89 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
87 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
16 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
Flat 14, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 13, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 12, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 11, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 10, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 9, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 8, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 6, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 5, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 4, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 3, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 2, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
Flat 1, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
12 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
Flat 7, 48 - 50 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
85 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
83 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5RN
16 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
11 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE

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
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Conservation Area - Victoria Park Conservation Area 1972
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH