

## **Planning**

## **Growth & Development**

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

**Application no.** 132663/FH/2022

**Date registered valid:** 11 January 2022

**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation

**Address:** 33 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BW

**Ward(s):** Northenden Ward

**Applicant:** Mr Raymand Millar, 33 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BW

**Agent (if any):** Mr Barry Swainson, 13 Moorfield Avenue, Manchester, M34 7TF

**Case officer:** Janine Renshaw-Livesey  
Tel: 0161 234 4555  
Email: [janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk)

**Recommendation:** Approve

**Date of recommendation:** 3 February 2022

## **Application details**

**Type of application:** Full Householder Application

**Development type:** Householder

**Standard consultations:**

No consultations have been printed and sent.

**Neighbour notifications**

Printed: 12 January 2022 Expired: 2 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:** No

**Tree Preservation Order:** No

The application site is a large detached house sat within landscaped gardens. There is a hipped roof arrangement with a front porch area.

The area is residential in nature. Netherwood Road in particular is characterised by large detached house of differing architectural styles.

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation.

## **Planning History**

086707/FH/2008/S2 was approved in 2008 for the erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, installation of rear dormer and first floor balcony and erection of front porch to form additional living accommodation.

## **Consultations & Notification Responses**

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted and no representations were received.

## **Issues**

## 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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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.

## Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking consent for the erection of a single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.

The extension would be level with the front wall of the house leaving a recessed nib to allow for services. The extension would have a 3m projection, retaining a 900mm gap to the shared boundary with the non-adjjoining property. The proposal would extend approximately 3m

beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling house. However, would be level with the rear elevation of the extended rear elevation of the dwelling house.

Height of the roof measures 3.7 m. The roof would be a rooflight. Two patio type doors would be inserted on the rear and the internal return elevation of the extension.

The positioning of the patio doors would not give rise to overlooking.

It is not considered that the introduction of a side extension would provide visual harm to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area. 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.

On balance, the extension is considered can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal 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

Although the extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene, the character of the area is still retained. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible. 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 is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such structure. The design of the proposal would be an acceptable addition to the property and in terms of the proposed materials vertical timber shiplap boards and black tiles to match the tiles that appear as a vertical detail on the existing dwelling house are to be used. It is considered that proposed materials are a contemporary addition that compliments the white rendered dwelling house.

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

Space for the storage of bins would be retained at the rear of the property with access along the side retained, therefore the storage of refuse bins are not affected by the proposal which 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:**

### **Article 35 Declaration**

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner by requesting further information relating to the scheme and appropriate conditions to the approval have also been attached.

## **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:

RM22-04 Rev A and RM22-03 Rev A, stamped as received on the 21 January 2022 and the Location Plan and the Site Plan, stamped as received on the 10 January 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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the materials as set out in drawings:

RM22-04 Rev A and RM22-03 Rev A, stamped as received on the 21 January 2022

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

## **Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified**

35 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BW  
31 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BW  
28 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BN  
32 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BN  
30 Netherwood Road, Manchester, M22 4BN

## **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 45M  
Site of Biological Interest - Name: Round Wood  
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH