

## **Planning**

## **Growth & Development**

### **Delegated officer report for planning application**

**Application no.** 131513/FH/2021

**Date registered valid:** 28 September 2021

**Proposal:** Erection of single storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation

**Address:** 213 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ

**Ward(s):** Sharston Ward

**Applicant:** Mrs Michelle Webb, 213 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ

**Agent (if any):** James Sudworth, 28 Lincoln Avenue, Stockport, SK8 3LJ

**Case officer:** Constance Phillips  
Tel: 0161 234 5792  
Email: [constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk)

**Recommendation:** Approve

**Date of recommendation:** 8 February 2021

## **Application details**

**Type of application:** Full Householder Application

**Development type:** Householder

**Date of site visit:** 20 December 2021

**Standard consultations:** No consultations have been printed and sent.

**Neighbour notifications:** Printed: 8 December 2021 Expired: 29 December 2021

**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 with a hipped roof, tiled bays to the front and existing single storey side extension, housing a garage and workshop/store, and single storey rear extension, both historic. The plot includes a paved front garden/driveway, large rear garden and single storey outbuilding.

## **Description of area**

Peel Hall Road is residential in nature and is located within the Sharston ward of Wythenshawe, close to Peel Hall Park, a metrolink station and the civic centre.

## **Description of development**

The applicant is seeking permission to demolish the existing extensions in order to build a new single storey side and rear wraparound extension to provide additional living accommodation.

## **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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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

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 these policy documents.

## **Issues**

**Principle** – The principle of building a single storey side and rear extension to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable, 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 extension would span the full width of the rear and side elevations, creating a large amount of additional floorspace for a new kitchen and larger garage. The extension would be flush with the existing porch at the front and would have a sideward projection of 5.1m, a rearward depth of 4.5m and a width across the rear of 13m, with a flat roof height of 3m. At the front there would be a small parapet, 3.2m in height. The rear element would be sited 0.25m from the boundary shared with the adjoining semi No.215, and the side element would be sited 0.15-0.5m from the boundary shared with No.211. The rear projection exceeds that which is stipulated with policy DC1 (of 3.65m) by 0.85m, which is deemed acceptable given 6m can be built under Permitted Development (the larger homes extension scheme) if no objections are received. The side element far exceeds half the width of the original property, however as it would be replacing a historic garage/workshop extension of the same width, the scale is accepted. The extension is considered to be subservient to the original dwelling, with acceptable siting, scale and massing, in line with policies DM1 and SP1.

**Appearance and visual amenity** – The extensions would be constructed of brickwork and uPVC fenestrations to match the existing dwellinghouse, which has been conditioned, along with a flat membrane roof. The side element would feature a 0.2m brick parapet along the front elevation with a garage door below. The rear elevation would feature a double glazed gable, with a set of bi-fold doors beneath each. Both side elevations would form blank walls. The design is standard in appearance and the aspect readily visible from the public highway, the front of the side, are in-keeping with the rest of the property, constructed of matching materials and proportioned appropriately. Many properties nearby have also built to the side and rear, including No.209, and flat roofed attached garages are original to these properties and therefore part of the character of the street, hence the proposal is deemed acceptable in appearance and is not considered to significantly harm the character of the house, wider area or Pell Hall Road street scene.

**Residential amenity** – The proposal is single storey with a maximum height of 3.2m. The neighbour to the north, No.211, should not lose sunlight or experience overbearing impacts given the 4.5m deep store/workshop already exists along this boundary. This neighbour also has their own single storey extensions and a driveway between their property and the boundary.

The other neighbour, No.215, shouldn't experience an undue loss of light given their location south of the proposal. They have a 3.7m conservatory at the rear and a 2m high, 3.7m deep wall sited on the boundary, therefore the extra 0.8m projection created by the proposed extension should not cause disamenity. There are no windows proposed for either side elevation, hence privacy should not be impacted. In addition to this, no objections were received from local residents.

**Parking and refuse** – 3no parking spaces will exist on the retained driveway at the front, with space for 2no vehicles within the new garage, hence plenty of off-street parking, in line with policy DM1. The agent has provided details of refuse storage with the garage to allow bins to be kept out of sight from the public highway, also in line with policy DM1.

**Conclusion** – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor the visual amenity of the street/area, therefore the development is deemed acceptable and may commence in accordance with the submitted drawings and the 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 significant problems 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 following drawings:

- Revised elevations 'CTT/21/08/02', stamped as received by the City Council on the 29th January 2022
- Floor plans 'CTT/21/08/03', stamped as received by the City Council on the 28th September 2021
- Site plan 'CTT/21/08/04', stamped as received by the City Council on the 27th August 2021

Reason - To ensure that 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 extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form and elevations.

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) The refuse bins shall be stored within the proposed garage, as stated on revised drawing 'CTT/21/08/02' (29/01/22), prior to the first use of the extension and this arrangement 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**

180 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HD  
215 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ  
178 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HD  
176 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HD  
211 Peel Hall Road, Manchester, M22 5HJ  
42 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE  
40 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE  
38 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JE

#### **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 - Within Outer Area  
Airport Noise Index Zone - Noise and Nuisance Index - 40-49  
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH