

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132141/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 5 November 2021

Proposal: Erection of two storey side and rear extension together with installation of rear dormer to form additional living accommodation.

Address: 4 St Brannocks Road, Manchester, M21 0UP

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr. Nadeem Khadim, 4 St Brannocks Road, Manchester, M21 0UP

Agent (if any): Mr. Niamat Ali, NA Design, 47 Egerton Road South, Manchester, M21 0YW

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 3 March 2022

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: 12 November 2021 Expired: 3 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 of red brick and white render, with a gable roof, brown fenestrations and bay windows. The property features an existing two storey rear extension and porch. The plot includes a paved driveway to the front and garden to the rear.

Description of area

St Brannocks Road is a residential street within the Chorlton Park ward which runs perpendicular to Wilbraham Road. It is characterised by two storey semi-detached family dwellinghouses of red brick and white render and benefits from its proximity to two tram stops, several bus stops and Chorlton District Centre.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a two storey side and rear extension along with rear box dormer to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse, including three additional bedrooms.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – One objection received:

My wife and I think that the drawings are misleading in that there are no units of measurement shown and they suggest that all the proposed work is to be carried out in red brick to match the existing fabric. The extension to the rear of the property was finished in a textured brindle brick

when it was completed some years ago (photos attached). We would like some assurance that we will be looking at a uniform finish and not a jumble of colours. The proposal looks like the over-development of a site which cannot support it. The result will be an unbalanced, overbearing structure which has been shoe-horned into an inappropriate space. The proposed dormer will have an adverse impact on our sense of privacy in and enjoyment of our garden. We are, predictably, unhappy at the prospect of further loss of light through our French window at the rear of the house but accept that this will not have a bearing upon the final decision. However the original extension darkened the room noticeably and this proposal will make the situation worse.

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 some 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 DM 1 - 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 two storey side and rear extension with rear dormer, to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse, is acceptable, as policy DC1.1 mentions enabling people to adapt their homes to meet changing household needs. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale and design and its impact upon both visual and residential amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The two storey side extension would occupy the full side elevation, projecting 5.1m beyond the rear and coming flush with the principle elevation at ground floor. It would have a 0.5m setback at first floor, with a width of 2.67m and a ridge set 0.4m lower than existing. The two storey rear element would project 5.1m to the rear, with a width of 6m and a ridge height set 1m down from existing, leaving a gap of 3.95m to the party wall shared with No.6. The side element would leave a gap of 0.15m to the boundary shared with No.2. The eaves for both elements would match existing. Within the ground floor of the side extension there would be a cut-through leading to the rear garden with a width of 0.77m. The dormer would have a width of 4m, depth of 4.28m and height of 2.35m, resulting in 20.11 cubic metres of additional roof space above the existing two storey rear extension. Though the rear projection exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m), it would be sited 3.95m from No.6 and 5.4m from No.2 and the latter property has its own large rear extension (approx. 5.5m at first floor and 9.5m at ground floor). The large garden can easily accommodate the works and the 45 degree rule can be satisfied from the nearest first floor window at No.6. The width (less than half the width of the original property), set down ridges and setback from the frontage

ensure a subservient appearance. Given the large gap to the boundary at No.2 and staggered positioning of these properties, the proposal is not considered to risk a future terracing effect and it is believed the development gap can be shared equally should No.2 wish to extend in a similar way. The original submission was considered to harm neighbours' residential amenity and the character of the property. Therefore, negotiations took place to reduce the width of the excessive dormer and to remove the single storey rear element proposed along the boundary with No.6. The revised scheme is considered acceptable in terms of siting, scale and massing.

Design, appearance and visual amenity – The extension would have a traditional appearance, in keeping with the dwellinghouse and surrounding area. It would be constructed from red facing brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC windows to match existing and this has been conditioned. The dormer would sit directly over the existing rear extension, with a flat roof and one rearward bedroom window. The main roof would contain 4no rooflights in the front slope and 1no in the rear. The side extension would feature a gable end with a pitch to match existing, whilst the rear would feature a hipped roof. The front elevation would feature a window at both floors, along with the cut-through at ground floor. The side elevation would feature an obscure bathroom window at first floor and one at second floor (conditioned). The rear elevation would contain a first floor bedroom window and a ground floor kitchen window. Many properties in this residential area of Chorlton Park already feature two storey extensions, for growing families, hence the character of the area is not considered to be further affected by this proposal, as a precedent has long been set here and the extensions would be in-keeping with the style of the house and the scale of similar nearby works.

Residential amenity – Although the side and rear extension is considered large, it is not considered to form an unduly overbearing feature as viewed from either neighbouring plot given the gap between the first floors of the proposal and neighbouring properties, both of which satisfy the 45 degree rule from the adjoining properties' rear windows. These properties have 30m+ deep, east-facing rear gardens therefore the only noticeable loss of sunlight would be to No.6's rear windows, which is not deemed significant given these windows are slightly overshadowed by the existing rear extension sited along the boundary approved in 2001 (063290/FH/SOUTH1/01) and given the distance from the proposal to these windows (over 4m). The neighbour to the south, No.2, is a large detached property with a very large rear extension of its own and a significant gap to the shared boundary, hence this proposal is not considered to unduly impact these neighbours. The only side-facing windows are for bathrooms and have been conditioned to be obscurely glazed. Due to the distance to neighbouring properties, the 45 degree rule can be satisfied, hence outlook is not deemed unduly impacted. Other issues raised by the objector include previously inappropriate brickwork to the 2001 extension, which is not being assessed. The previous brickwork does look acceptable regardless, and the proposed works have been conditioned to utilise matching materials as per the application form. The objector also raised concerns with the dormer providing views of their garden and impeding their privacy, however the revised dormer would have 1no window, facing east down the applicant's garden, which would afford no greater views over the neighbouring gardens than the existing 1st floor bedroom windows already afford. Therefore, on balance, the revised proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impacts upon residential amenity.

Parking and refuse storage – Regarding off-street parking provision, the area of hardstanding to the side will be reduced in size to make way for the extension, however it will retain a space 2.9m in width and 5.1m in depth which is adequate for a family dwellinghouse. There would be a 0.77m gap through the ground floor of the side extension, therefore refuse bins can remain stored at the rear, pursuant to policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly accords with the policies contained within the Core Strategy and NPPF, and although the initial design received an objection, the revised scheme is not considered to cause undue harm to the character of the property or visual amenity of the

street scene nor cause undue harm to the residential amenity currently enjoyed by the surrounding occupiers, therefore the development may take place in accordance with the approved plans 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. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the agent in order to reach a satisfactory solution.

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 drawings numbered 'NA-P02' and 'NA-P03', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 14th February 2022.

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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the main dwellinghouse in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the dwellinghouse is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the outbuilding, 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 windows on the side elevation, facing No.2 St Brannocks Road, 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

5 St Brannocks Road, Manchester, M21 0UP
7 St Brannocks Road, Manchester, M21 0UP
2 St Brannocks Road, Manchester, M21 0UP
6 St Brannocks Road, Manchester, M21 0UP
5 Morville Road, Manchester, M21 0UG
3 Morville Road, Manchester, M21 0UG
1 Morville Road, Manchester, M21 0UG

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