

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132321/FO/2021

Date registered valid: 6 December 2021

Proposal: Erection of ground floor front and first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 33 Alness Road, Manchester, M16 8HL

Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Mrs Noha Ibrahim, C/o Agent

Agent (if any): Mr Mohamed Muse, Muse Architects, 14 Gerry Wheale Square, Manchester, M14 4UY

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 10 February 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Dwellings

Date of site visit: 13 January 2022

Standard consultations: Printed: 16 December 2021 Expired: 6 January 2022

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 16 December 2021 Expired: 6 January 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: Adjacent to Whalley Range Conservation Area

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red brick with a hipped roof and bay windows. The property features existing extensions, including a front porch, single storey side and first floor rear approved in 2002 (065582/FH/SOUTH1/02) and a rear conservatory. The plot includes a paved front garden/driveway and long rear garden, both bound by hedging.

Description of area

Alness Road is a residential street adjacent to Whalley Range Conservation Area. It is characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached family dwellinghouses of varying ages as well as several Victorian villas converted into flats. The area benefits from its proximity to Alexandra Park and the shops, services and bus routes along Withington Road.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a single storey front and first floor side extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments received.

Whalley Range Conservation Area Group – No comments received.

Whalley Range Forum – 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, 2019):

- 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 first floor side extension over an existing garage along with a single storey front extension, to provide improved living space 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 side extension, forming a first floor over the existing garage extension, would have a matching width of 2.1m, a depth of 7.68m and a setback from the principal elevation of 1.5m. It would project 1.5m beyond the original main rear elevation, but stopping 2.18m short of the existing rear extension. The eaves would match existing and the ridge would be 0.6m lower than the main ridge. It would be sited along the boundary shared with No.35, which has their own single storey side and outbuilding sited on the boundary. The single storey front extension would infill the gap between the existing porch and ground floor side, creating a bike store with garage door. Originally the plans involved a deeper side extension, which would have come flush with the existing rear extension. This was deemed to form an overbearing feature as viewed from No.35, therefore negotiations took place to reduce the scale of the proposal. The extension is now considered subservient to the original house and appropriately sited and scaled, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed from materials to match the existing house which would include red brickwork and roof tiles, with white uPVC, which have been conditioned as part of this approval. The roof of the side extension would be hipped with a pitch to match existing and a lowered ridge height to ensure subservience. The first floor side element would feature a bathroom window in the front and bedroom window in the rear elevation, with a blank side elevation. The ground floor element would have a garage door to the front of the store. Originally the design was deemed to impact negatively upon the visual amenity of the house and street due to the separate roof with valley. It was designed to match that of No.37, however their extension is completely clad in black cladding with sage green powder-coated aluminium windows and these contemporary materials create a contrasting addition which did not need to tie-in with the original roof. This proposal is of

matching materials therefore the agent was asked to redesign the roof to include a hip to match existing. Following negotiations the resultant design is deemed in-keeping and reads as a subservient addition, therefore the visual amenity of the house and area are not considered to be harmed by these works, pursuant to policies DM1, DC1 and SP1.

Residential amenity – The extension, by way of its siting, orientation and scale, is not considered to significantly affect the levels of residential amenity currently enjoyed by the surrounding occupiers. The revised first floor side projects 1.5m beyond the original rear elevation but is not considered to form an overbearing feature for the occupiers of No.35, which is sited directly south of the extension. This neighbour only has 1 window facing the proposal, belonging to the staircase, and should not experience a loss of light due to the orientation. There are no upstairs windows proposed for the side elevation, hence privacy and overlooking are also not deemed an issue. No objections have been received from the local residents notified of the development and the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impacts on residential amenity.

Flood Risk – The site is located within Flood Zone 2, however, as the only part of the proposal which is to be built/altered at ground floor is the 1.2m x 2.1m bike store, which features the same garage door as existing, a flood risk assessment was considered onerous in this instance.

Conclusion – The storage of refuse and provision of off-street parking situation remain as existing, as the bins can remain stored within the garage and there will remain space for 2 cars on the driveway. The revised proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1 and SP1 and the NPPF, and is not thought to harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or area, therefore the development is deemed acceptable and may commence in accordance with 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 undertook negotiations with the agent 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:

- '005 C2', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 1st February 2022
- '006 C1', '007 C1' and '107 C3', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 7th February 2022

Reason - To ensure 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 existing dwellinghouse, in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form.

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

Whalley Range Conservation Area Group
Whalley Range Forum

38 Alness Road, Manchester, M16 8HQ
28 Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8HJ
28A Demesne Road, Manchester, M16 8HJ
31 Alness Road, Manchester, M16 8HL
36A Alness Road, Manchester, M16 8HQ
35 Alness Road, Manchester, M16 8HL

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH