

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132865/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 18 February 2022
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and associated raised terrace to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Roy, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Agent (if any): Mr Simon Casey, BlueChip Architecture Ltd, 18 Botany Road, Manchester, M30 8JS
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 27th April 2022



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	7 March 2022
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 24 February 2022 Expired: 17 March 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

The site relates to a large semi detached property in the Whalley Range ward area of Manchester. The front has brick bays at ground and first floor. Gardens lie to the front and rear with access along the side. The roof is slate and gable in appearance with roof lights on the rear. The front entrance is recessed with decorative brick arch and steps with steel railings. The site benefits from an existing single storey rear outrigger adjoining a similar outrigger on the attached semi.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in character.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and associated raised terrace to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. There has been one letter of objection in respect of this planning application. Summary of comments as follows:

- It is our view that this proposal, by reason of its scale and bulk would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties and with its overbearing effect and design it would jar with the scale and character of the existing architecture.

- The footprint of the line of Victorian semi-detached properties on this street still maintains a continuous rear and front main building facade 'line', whilst the quirky nature of the rear, slate and brick outriggers affords each occupant an immediate outdoor area with a higher level of privacy, more akin to a courtyard. This arrangement at the rear serves as a dampener to the travel of any associated bustle (noise, etc) from the 'busier' living spaces and containment from neighbouring view with only the 'quieter' bedroom windows overlooking further into the gardens from first floor. These single storey outriggers and add-ons also relate well and are in keeping with the construction and massing of the properties as they drop down in level to the gardens.
- By projecting the ground floor living spaces, at such scale, with the height of floor level and the use of building materials, we believe that this proposed extension not only eliminates this 'courtyard-like' space but also brings forward the impacts of overlooking from living spaces and the associated noise, along with, a visual impact, into the neighbours domain. Its facade line transposes into a large 'block' facade that meets the shared boundary almost to the centreline of the neighbouring gardens, with a floor level elevated above the garden ground level, protracted by the proposed fenestration of large sliding patio doors with an outdoor cooking and eating terrace area in white render and reflecting glass. As such, it would be intrusive and the quality of the neighbouring properties and gardens as an amenity would be diminished.
- Along with the architectural attributes of the existing properties, as described above, it appears that the proposal has also overlooked its visible impact at its party wall junction where the proposal has to demolish the outrigger on their side so the proposed block extension can be built in its place. The resulting discord between the remaining outrigger and the new build at this join is evident with the omissions and anomalies on the planning drawings, as listed below. Some of these ambiguities also seem to avoid conveying the true scale of the proposal vis-a-vis the existing.
- 001 - Existing Plans + Elevations - no north elevation + outrigger levels and roof pitch not shown
- 210 - Proposed Elevations - no outrigger of no.8 shown on north elevation
- 211A - Proposed Plans + Elevations - incorrect depiction no. 8 outrigger on side elevation (west)
- 200 - Site Layout - no.8 incorrect(no porch projection on rear west corner) + no proposed site layout shown
- 211A - Proposed Plans + Elevations - omission of projecting outdoor cooking zone wall of balcony on side elevation (west) (gives extension a smaller size).
- 202 - Proposed Plans + Elevations - although correct in theory, by not showing even a dotted line of balcony/terrace of extension below the development roof line it does not convey finished 'line' of extension
- We would like to add that the proposed scale plus the incongruity of a flat roof and white render walls against a Victorian vernacular would in our view remain an issue regardless of a rethink of materiality to better suit a north facing brick facade, and the flat roof would remain out of keeping and introduce a security issue by providing much easier access to the upper floor windows of the semi-detached properties.
- Also to mention is that the existing party wall along these outriggers is a single brick thick above ground level. The foundation issue this presents is something we are grappling with at present as we try to rebuild the last part of our outrigger and a small section of garden wall which had collapsed due to the previous owners lack of maintenance and inappropriate fitting of heavier concrete roof tiles. A final point that also may, or may not

have any bearing on this proposal, is the mature trees located along the eastern boundary of the site, which come quite close to the proposed extension.

Policy and Issues

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy 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.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History

There are no previous planning applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and associated raised terrace to provide additional living accommodation. There have

been raised concerns from a local resident in relation to the scale, appearance, bulk, character and use of materials. Amended plans replaced original submission to rectify any discrepancies raised during the process of the assessment.

The extension would be set back from the front wall of the property by approximately 9.0m extending along the side by a total of 7.6m with a projection off the rear wall of 6.0m wrapping around the property and up to an existing outrigger retaining a gap to the adjoining semi detached property no. 8 Manley Road. The applicant proposes to extend the wall beyond the existing outrigger providing an outdoor kitchen area. The front elevation facing the street would have steps leading down to ground level with the installation of a glazed balustrade.

No windows are proposed on the side, with bi folding doors along the rear elevation and large glazing to the remainder of the rear elevations.

As part of the proposal, the applicant is proposing a raised terrace extending the width of the rear with a small projection of the terrace beyond the existing rear outrigger of the adjoining semi detached property. Given the current boundary treatment on both sides, it is not anticipated that the terrace would provide any overlooking or loss of privacy.

The extension would provide a modern addition to the property and given that the proposal is single storey it is not considered that the introduction of a side and rear extension would provide visual harm to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area and the footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property.

Although the extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene, the character of the area has been retained and is in keeping with the existing and other houses in the area. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

While the extension exceeds City Council's saved Policy DC1 of 3.65 metres, the proposal can be comfortably accommodated at the site especially given the space retained at the rear and the existence of an outrigger along the shared boundary with the adjoining semi detached property together with the distance of the adjacent property no 4 Manley Road.

On balance and although objections have been raised with regards to the proposed extension, the City Council believe that the extension is considered can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and in addition the proposal is single storey and is considered would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area.

The proposal therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house. The size and footprint of the proposed extension is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the side and rear and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be an acceptable addition to the property and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to introduce white render and use Grey Composite Door Grey Aluminum Bi-Folding Doors Grey Aluminum Sliding Doors as specified in the application form.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Refuse

The storage of bin storage would not be affected by this proposal as adequate space along the side would be retained for the movement of bins. This is considered to be acceptable, therefore the proposal accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

There would be continued off street car parking retained to the front of the property and therefore the existing arrangements would be unaffected.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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

Positive and proactive working 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. The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the policies within the Development Plan.

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

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:

Received on 3rd February 2022 numbered 201 Existing and Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 3rd February 2022 numbered 202 Proposed Floor Plans

Received 13th April 2022 numbered 210 Rev A Proposed Elevations

Received 13th April 2022 numbered 211 Rev B Proposed Elevations

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 hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form/drawings in type, size, colour and texture.

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 structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

62A Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
8 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
3 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
62 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
16 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
Flat 6, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 5, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 4, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 3, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 2, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 1, 6 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 7, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
32 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
31 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
30 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
29 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF

28 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
27 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
26 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
25 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
24 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
23 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
22 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
21 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
20 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
19 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
18 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
17 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
15 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
14 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
13 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
12 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
11 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
10 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
9 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
8 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
7 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
6 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
5 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
4 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
3 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
2 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
1 Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
Flat 6, 8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
Flat 5, 8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
Flat 4, 8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
Flat 3, 8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
Flat 2, 8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
12 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PW
1 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Greysham Court, 52 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PF
Flat 1, 8 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL
Flat 5, 4 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 4, 4 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 3, 4 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 2, 4 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 1, 4 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8PN
Flat 6, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
Flat 5, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
Flat 4, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
Flat 3, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
Flat 2, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
Flat 1, 64 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8PJ
10 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PL

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
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH