

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132248/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 31 January 2022

Proposal: Erection of part single part two storey side and rear extension, following demolition of existing single storey side and rear extensions and rear outbuilding, to form additional living accommodation.

Address: 30 Highbank Drive, Manchester, M20 5QR

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Twana Tariq, 30 Highbank Drive, Manchester, M20 5QR

Agent (if any): Mrs Harriet Greenwood, Create It Studio Architects, Universal Square, Devonshire Street North, Manchester, M12 6JH

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: **11 April 2022**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 23 March 2022

Standard consultations: Printed: 4 February 2022 Expired: 25 February 2022

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 4 February 2022 Expired: 25 February 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 brick with a hipped roof and bay windows. The property features a small original single storey outrigger, existing rear conservatory, carport/canopy to the side and detached outbuilding. The plot includes a driveway and front and rear gardens.

Description of area

Highbank Drive is residential in nature and characterised by similar interwar family dwellinghouses with well-sized gardens. It lies within the Didsbury East ward, close to the Mersey Valley and M56 and M60 motorways.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a part single, part two storey side and rear extension with single storey front porch, to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments received.

MCC Flood Risk Management – Accepted the submitted flood risk statement and asked that floor levels be set no lower than existing. An informative has been attached.

Ward Councillors – Query received from one of the Didsbury East members regarding timeline for decision.

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 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

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 this policy document.

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a part single, part two storey side and rear extension with single storey front porch, to provide additional living accommodation, is acceptable considering the provisions of policy DC1, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The single storey extension to the front would occupy the space in front of the existing entrance and wrap round to the side, projecting 1m forward of the principal elevation, with a width of 5m to occupy the space in front of the two storey side extension, with an eaves height of 2.65m and a maximum height of 3.45m. The two storey side element would project 2.78m from the south elevation, with a depth of 6.3m at first floor to come flush with the original rear wall, leaving a 0.7m gap to the shared boundary. The front elevation at first floor would be setback by 1.3m and the roof would be hipped with a pitch to match existing and a ridge set 0.35m lower than existing. The rear extension would project 4.5m at ground floor and 3.65m at first floor, with a width of 4.55m at first floor and full width at ground floor. The single storey element would have an eaves height of 3m and a maximum height of 4.3m. The first floor would be set 3.1m from the party wall shared with No.28 and 0.7m from the boundary shared with No.32. The internal floor levels are to match existing to ensure the extension(s) are not more susceptible to flooding. Although the rearward depth of the ground floor extension exceeds that which is stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) by 0.85m at ground floor, the GPDO (2015) allows single storey rear extensions up to 6m given no objections are received and in this case the garden can easily accommodate it. Regarding the side, the development potential of the sizeable gap between the properties can be shared equally and due to the 1.3m setback it is not considered that this proposal would lead to a terracing effect. Originally the scheme was much larger, including a two storey side and rear extension which met at the rear corner, with no setback. This was deemed overbearing for the adjacent neighbours and would have negatively impacted upon the street scene therefore negotiations took place to reduce the scale of the proposals. The front, side and rear extensions shown on

the revised drawings are considered subservient to the main house and appropriately sited and scaled, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extensions would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red brickwork, roof tiles and white uPVC windows/doors, and this has been conditioned. The works are considered in-keeping with the property and wider area in terms of materials, design and scale. The side extension features a setback, matching pitch and lowered ridge to ensure a subservient appearance and protect the visual amenity of the house and area. The rear extension would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene. Due to the orientation and arrangement of the property and neighbouring properties, the addition of a two storey side extension should not lead to a terracing effect or form an obtrusive feature within the Highbank Drive street scene. Similar works have been carried out at many nearby properties with large residential extensions a common feature of this part of East Didsbury. The works are considered acceptable in terms of design and appearance.

Residential amenity – The proposal is not considered to significantly impact upon residential amenity. The revised scheme includes a larger gap to the shared boundary at the rear, with the first floor being sited 1.5m from the boundary shared with No.32 and 3.1m from No.28. Both the side and rear elements leave adequate gaps to neighbours and feature lower hipped roofs. Neither element would unduly impact the outlook from neighbouring windows and due to the orientation the only noticeable overshadowing would be of No.28's rear patio doors which is not deemed significant given this is at ground floor and the sizable garden would still receive plenty of afternoon and evening sun. The revised scheme ensures the first floor side and rear elements are not unduly overbearing for surrounding occupiers. The side elevation facing No.32 would contain one landing/staircase window at first floor, which has been conditioned to be obscure glazed, preventing any potential overlooking. In addition to this, no objections have been received from the local residents notified of the development.

Refuse storage and parking – The proposal would leave an adequate gap to the boundary, meaning these bins can remain stored at the rear. Although the detached garage is to be demolished and the driveway made smaller, a space for 1 car off-street would remain, therefore the refuse storage and off-street parking provision would accord with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, it received no objections and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. In addition to this, saved policy DC1 states the City Council must have regard to the requirement for additional living space due to changing household needs. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and construction may continue 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 applicant 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 revised drawing numbered 'AP001 P3', 'AP002 P3' and 'AP003 P3', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority with the planning application on the 4th April 2022 and the Flood Risk Assessment 'QFRA 2115' stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 31st January 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) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form and elevational drawings.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Before first occupation the proposed first floor window in the side elevation facing No.32 Highbank Drive shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Informative(s)

The applicant should design and construct a drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system pursuant to policy EN17 of the Core Strategy.

As the proposed development is within Flood Zone 2, proposed floor levels should be set no lower than existing floor levels of the adjoining property and other flood mitigation/resilient measures (as set out within the FRA ref: QFRA 2115 dated 30/01/2022) should be implemented.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

51 Highbank Drive, Manchester, M20 5QR
70 Broad Oak Lane, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 5GG
49 Highbank Drive, Manchester, M20 5QR
32 Highbank Drive, Manchester, M20 5QR
28 Highbank Drive, Manchester, M20 5QR

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) -
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH