

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132392/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 2 December 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 26 Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1QB

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Kathryn & Andrew Tighe, 26 Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1QB

Agent (if any): Tomislav Vuletic, Flocc Studio Limited, 157 Harcourt Street, Stockport, SK5 6UP

Case officer: Robert Griffin
Tel: 0161 234 4527
Email: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 19.01.2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 22.12.2021 and 12.01.2022

Standard consultations:

Printed: 13 December 2021 Expired: 3 January 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 13 December 2021 Expired: 3 January 2022

Site notice

Posted: 22.12.2021 Expired: 12 January 2022

Press advert

Published: 21 December 2021 Expired: 11 January 2022

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The application relates to a mid-terraced red brick Victorian terraced house fronting Cavendish Road within the Albert Park conservation area. The property has a small front amenity area sited behind a low brick wall together with an original single storey front outrigger and set back front door. To the rear the property has a small yard with a part single and part two storey outrigger with the single storey element appearing to be a later addition. The rear alley is accessed via security gates and timber gate. Cavendish Primary school is sited opposite the property and it is located a short walk to the west of the Burton Road local centre.

The application proposals are for the erection of a single storey rear infill extension which would fill the gap between the existing outrigger and the boundary with the neighbouring property which has had a single storey addition adjacent the boundary.

The extension would extend rearwards from the rear wall by 4.2m and would have an overall height of 3.8 and height to eaves of approx 2.5m. The mono -pitch roof would house a roof light and the rear elevation would comprise glazed doors and large glazed windows. The materials to be used on the external brickwork are indicated as being to match the existing dwelling house and the rear yard to be retained would have a depth of 4.2m

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbouring properties were notified of the proposal a site notice was posted and an advertisement was placed in the Manchester Evening News as a result of the property being located within the Albert Park Conservation Area. No responses were received.

West Didsbury Residents Association - Raise no objection if the dwelling remains as a family dwelling house, request that suitable steps are taken to ensure that hedgehogs are not able to gain access to the proposed rear lightwell.

Policy

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

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (July 2021)

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)

- Policy EN3 (Heritage)

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

Unitary Development Plan

Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks to accommodate the demand for more living space, while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed. It relates specifically to residential extensions and the relevant criteria from this policy include:

DC1.1 The Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property
- b. The effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- c. The overall appearance of the proposal in the street scene;
- d. The effect of the loss of any on-site car-parking

Policy DC1.2 states extensions will be allowed subject to:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of the original buildings)
- b. They do not create a loss of sunlight/daylight or privacy
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area
- d. They would not result in the loss of off-street parking

Policy DC1.3 states that notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

Issues

The principle of householders extending their properties to provide additional living accommodation is generally acceptable subject to further consideration of the impacts of proposals on residential amenity and the character of the area.

Residential Amenity - The proposals are located to the rear of the existing property. The rear infill extension would project approximately 4.2 metres from the rear wall and would project no further rearwards than the existing outrigger. It is noted that there has been a previous single storey extension to number 28 Cavendish Road and as such the proposals are not considered to give rise to a tunnelling effect or given the orientation to unacceptable impacts in terms of daylight or overshadowing.

Visual amenity - The proposals are considered to be subservient to the existing property and have been designed to reflect the finishes of the existing property. The addition to the rear would not give rise to unacceptable visual impacts on the street scene given its size and positioning. The proposals are to be constructed utilising matching materials which will further assist in ensuring the proposals assimilate successfully.

Impact on the Conservation Area - The property is an attractive Victorian terraced property located a short distance from the Burton Road local centre within a road of similar designed and detailed properties. The rear of the property is accessed via secured alley gates and a timber gated access which restricts any views towards the rear of the property. As such the location and siting of the rear extension would mean that there would be limited views of the extension. It is considered that the proposals would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and would not give rise to harm on the designated heritage asset.

Car parking - Is not affected by the proposals.

Bins - Access to the rear will be maintained and it was noted that bins in this area are generally stored within the secured rear alleyway although there is also adequate space for them to be located within the rear yard.

Other matters- Comments have been made with regards to avoiding hedgehogs becoming trapped in a rear lightwell. The application proposals do not include for a light well. But given the sites location and boundary wall/fences arrangements such measures are not considered necessary in this instance.

Conclusion - The proposals are considered to be acceptable and not give rise to significant impacts on residential or visual amenity. As such it is considered that they are in accordance with the adopted planning policies and can be supported.

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

The application has been determined in a positive and proactive manner. A decision has been issued within statutory timescales.

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:

WD2.2'Site plan proposed'; WD3.2 'Plans Proposed'; WD5.3 'Elevations Proposed'; WD5.4 'Elevations Proposed' as received by the City Council on the 2nd December 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 development hereby permitted shall be arranged and match those of the existing dwellinghouse 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 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

West Didsbury Estates Residents Association

2 Perrygate Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JR

28 Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1QB

1 Leopold Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JL

24 Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1QB

Cavendish Community Primary School, Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1JG

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

Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH