

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131396/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 23 September 2021

Proposal: Erection of first floor extension above existing flat roof single storey attached garage

Address: 56 Bloomesbury Avenue, Manchester, M20 2BN

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Stephen Munby Bloomesbury Avenue, St. James Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2BN

Agent (if any): Mrs Jenni Higgins Higgins + Higgins Architects Ltd 9 Unity Street, Hebden Bridge, HX7 8HQ

Case officer: Robert Tyrer
Tel: 0161 234 4068
Email: robert.tyrer@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 18 November 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 7 October 2021

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 27 September 2021 Expired: 18 October 2021

Site notice

Posted: 27 September 2021 Expired: 18 October 2021

Press advert

Published: 5 October 2021 Expired: 26 October 2021

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The application site relates to a modern, large, 4 bedroom, detached dwellinghouse built as part of the planning reference: 108541/OO/2015/S2 and amended by application reference: 111891/JO/2016/S2.

The property has had a recent approval for a shed in the rear garden approved under planning application reference: 126437/FH/2020.



Photograph 1 Application site as viewed from Bloomesbury Avenue

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Didsbury St James Conservation Area 1970

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

The surrounding area is known as Didsbury St James Conservation area and it is located to south of Didsbury District Centre in what was the historical core of the village. The area contains the greatest concentration of listed building outside of the of the city centre. The application site forms part of a new modern estate developed on the former Manchester Metropolitan Campus on Wilmslow Road.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission to erect a first floor extension above existing flat roof single storey attached garage.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents/public opinion – No objections, comments or representations in support of the application have been received.

Issues

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan.

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.

The relevant **Core Strategy** policies for this application are as follows:

SP1 Spatial Principles
DM1 Development Management 1
EN 1 Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas'
EN3 'Heritage'

The relevant saved **UDP** policies for this application are:

DC1.1 -1.6 Residential Extensions
DC 18.1 Conservation Areas

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - The NPPF sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors.

In particular NPPF states that in terms of design:

124. The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

And,

127. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

130. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used).

The Principle - Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester 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 first floor side extension in principle is considered to acceptable subject to satisfactory impacts on residential and visual amenity, parking and bin storage in accordance with the above development plan policies.

The site is also located within a designated conservation area, in this case Albert Park and therefore consideration should be given to the proposal impact upon heritage and the conservation area.

Residential Amenity/Design and Appearance/ Impact on the Conservation Area – The applicant is seeking to provide additional living accommodation in the form of a gym at ground floor with a mezzanine level. If approved the changes to the property would result in the addition of a pitched roof together with elevational alterations such as new windows to both front and rear (image 1). The changes to the property are considered to be relatively modest additions, due to the proximity to the shared boundary with No.54 (photograph 2) further consideration should be given to the impact on this property.

In terms of height the proposed extension would have a maximum height of 5.8 metres to the top of the ridge with an eaves height of 3.6 metres. These dimensions are much lower than the ridge height of the main dwellinghouse and therefore would appear to be subservient to the main dwelling.

Following a site visit to the property it would appear that the side windows at No.54 Bloomesbury Road as seen in photograph 2 are obscured with a black material. Despite the obscured windows, the height of the proposed extension would not result in an undue loss of sunlight or daylight from overshadowing. Further despite the proximity to the shared boundary it is not considered that the addition of the roof would cause any overbearing impacts on the neighbouring property.

Although the window at first floor will look towards the rear of the properties (opposite) on Firecrest Drive it is considered that the distance would be similar to existing first floor properties and as such would not increase overlooking towards these properties. No windows are proposed at the side of the proposal at ground or first floor therefore there will be no overlooking towards No.54 Bloomesbury Avenue. At the rear the distance to the properties will ensure that there is no overlooking ranging from 14 metres at obtuse angles to 22 metres.

Therefore, taking into consideration the position, design and scale of the proposed extension and its relationship with neighbouring properties it is not considered that there would be any significant impact in terms of over-dominance, overshadowing or overlooking.



Image 1 Artistic Impressions of the proposed extension (front and rear)

The property is located within Didsbury St James Conservation Area as such consideration must be given to the NPPF, policy EN3 and extant policy DC18.1 seeks to preserve the historic environment and conservation areas.

Both policy EN3 and extant policy DC18 state that new proposals should preserve or enhance the conservation area. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that new development should protect and enhance the historic environment. Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking improvements in the quality of the historic environment, replacing poor design with better design that makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting, proportionate to the assets' importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

The application was accompanied by a heritage statement, in terms of the impact on a heritage asset this is likely to be the conservation area as the property is not within the curtilage of a listed building. However, there are a number of grade II listed buildings adjacent to the application site

collectively known as The Grove which are two storey semi-detached residential properties built in a North Germanic vernacular style.

The heritage statement considered the impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings to be as follows:

“The proposals do not impact on the historic fabric or heritage asset or settings any more than the existing impact of the full St. James’ Park development.” and...

“The impact the proposal will have on the development will be minimal as the intention is to match the existing materials, style and quality of workmanship.”



Photograph 2 Front Elevation as viewed from Bloomesbury Avenue looking towards No.54 Bloomesbury Avenue

Whilst the proposal will result in some changes to the overalls scale and appearance of the property at the side these will not been seen from Wilmslow Road and only visible from a small section within Bloomesbury Avenue. The proposed drawings indicate that the materials will match that of the dwellinghouse to help the extension assimilate with the original dwellinghouse.

The proposal would result in a low level of less than substantial harm as defined by paragraph 202 of the NPPF, to the significance and setting of the designated heritage asset in this case the conservation area. As directed by paragraph 202 of the NPPF, it is now necessary to consider whether the public benefits required exist which outweighs any this harm.

In this case the public benefit will be ensuring the continued use of the residential building and its contribution to the street scene and conservation area.

Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with the NPPF, saved policy DC18.1 and policy EN3 of the Core Strategy.

Car Parking and Refuse Storage – The proposal should not have an impact on refuse storage arrangements and despite the loss of the garage there is still sufficient space at the front of the property to provide room for two vehicles.

Conclusion - The extension is considered to be in accordance with SP1, EN3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 and DC18 of the UDP.

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/agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. In this instance, no negotiations were necessary but appropriate conditions have been attached to the end of this report. The scheme is considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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:

P_AE_00 Revision 00, P_AP_L0 Revision 00, P_AP_L1 Revision 00 and P_AP_RF Revision 00 received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 17.08.2021

Heritage Statement received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 23.09.2021

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 extension hereby permitted shall be similar in appearance to those used during the construction of the original 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

6 Skylark Close, Manchester, M20 2FQ
5 Firecrest Drive, Manchester, M20 2FD
3 Firecrest Drive, Manchester, M20 2FD
1 Firecrest Drive, Manchester, M20 2FD
58 Bloomesbury Avenue, Manchester, M20 2BN
54 Bloomesbury Avenue, Manchester, M20 2BN
5 The Grove, Manchester, M20 2RG
9 The Grove, Manchester, M20 2RG
7 The Grove, Manchester, M20 2RG
11 The Grove, Manchester, M20 2RG

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 - Didsbury St James Conservation Area 1970
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH