

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132608/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 29 December 2021
Proposal: Hip to gable conversion and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 17 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Tom Harrington 17 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF
Agent (if any): Mr Chris Wilkinson CD Wilkinson Plans 5 Highmeadow, Outwood, M26 1YN
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 22nd March 2022



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	8 February 2022
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 6 January 2022 Expired: 27 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

The application site relates to an extended traditional two-storey semi-detached dwelling house located in the Didsbury East ward area of Manchester. Access remains along the side of the property with a garden and off road car parking to the front and garden to the rear.



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

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature

Description of development

The applicant is proposing a hip to gable conversion and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – one letter of objection has been received in relation to this proposal. Summary of comments as follows:

- Garden is level with the rear of the house such that the side elevation is almost parallel to the rear of
- Overlook garden.
- New development will include back facing windows, and in this plan 3 full length bifold doors/windows
- Create a balcony, which will exacerbate the feeling of being overlooked.

- Currently there are bifold doors in the ground floor development. During the summer when the doors are open there is a reverberation effect causing normal day to day sounds to be amplified around the neighbourhood.
- Concern from the new plans, with bifold doors in the 2nd floor development, is that this will be repeated but with greater coverage
- Current noise levels are not unreasonable given that we
- We have no objection to the applicant extending up into the roof space;
- Concerned about the impact it will have on privacy

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 not accord 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. Saved 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 applicant proposes a hip to gable and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation. The City Council requires that consideration is given to the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs. In this case the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

History

There has been one previous planning application relating to this site as follow:

Planning reference number 107185/FH/2014/S2 for the erection of a 2 storey side and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing garage. This application was approved on 17.12.2014

Plans considered

Received 29th December 2021 numbered 2267-DID-01 Revision A

Residential amenity

Concerns were raised by the City Council with the applicant regarding the change in the hip to gable roof and as a result requested changes to the proposal. The applicant provided further document in response to the concerns raised with proposal. The documentation raised another property at no. 26 Anerley Road which has previously undergone a similar change. However, each application is based on its own individual merits with circumstances between each site which can and do vary, therefore what may be acceptable at one property may not be acceptable at another. Thurleigh Road is primarily characterised by two storey semi-detached dwelling houses of the same original design with hipped roofs. The majority of the extensions are hipped roofs to reflect the original design within the area, this includes the 2014 permission at this address

It was regarded that given that the existing addition to the property is hipped, the change from hip to gable of the original roof would provide conflicting roof forms resulting in an unbalanced feature on the existing property leading to a detrimental impact within the street scene. The City Council therefore considers that these changes would result in a roof structure which would be out of character with the existing property and other properties in the area.

The City Council consider that the hipped roofs of the host dwelling as currently extended, provides a harmonious view within the street and to introduce a gable roof to the original dwelling would disrupt the rhythm of the established roof design causing harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.

Further concerns were raised by a local resident in relation to the rear dormer window and the potential to provide overlooking and loss of privacy. The dormer would be positioned on the rear elevation with the addition of Juliet balcony overlooking the rear garden. It is not considered that the introduction of a dormer to this location would in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy provide any further additional harm than an existing rear bedroom window at first floor.

Siting, Scale and Massing

The size and footprint of the proposal is believed to provide a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of the adjoining property and is therefore considered that the proposal would be out of character with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. The proposal not satisfactory and is considered not to accord with the principles policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposal is considered unacceptable with the existing and surrounding properties in the area.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development does not accord with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered unacceptable.

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would provide a detrimental impact to the occupiers of the surrounding area and if approved would lead to a loss of residential amenity currently enjoyed

by neighbours impacting on the character of the area and therefore does not comply with Council saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the NPPF.

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: Refuse

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 cumulative impact of the proposed a hip to gable roof extension together with the new dormer to the rear with previous extensions to the property would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area. In particular it would create a visually intrusive feature in the street scene by reason of its location, design and massing. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the NPPF.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

10 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
20 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF
8 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
6 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
4 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
2 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
1 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
19 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF
18 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF

16 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF
15 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF

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