

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130759/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 25 June 2021
Proposal: Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation
Address: 301 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 6JZ
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Arif Khan, 301 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 6JZ
Agent (if any): Mr Mark Walsh, 6 Harrycroft Road, Stockport, SK6 1NT
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 21st September 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	11 August 2021
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 2 July 2021 Expired: 23 July 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

The site relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Didsbury East ward area of Manchester. The property has a two storey gable fronted projection with single storey side projection. hardstanding and off road car parking space lies to the front with garden to the rear. Boundary treatment is made up of front brick boundary wall and timber fencing to the side and 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

Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. No comments, objections or representations in respect of this application were received

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle of the Proposal

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. 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 principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History

There are no previous applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

This proposal is for the erection of a part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Following raised concerns, the City Council requested the removal of the first floor rear element of the proposal close to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 303 due to the impact posed in terms of overshadowing and mass. The proposal has been amended showing first floor retaining a large gap to the shared boundary of 2.0m.

Ground Floor

The proposal would project 3.0 metres off the rear wall of the house extending across the rear wall up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. Two windows and bi folding doors would be present on the rear. No windows are proposed on the side. There is a small hipped roof on the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property.

First Floor

Following receipt of amended plans, the first floor would project 3.0 metres off the rear wall extending partway across the rear wall retaining a gap of 2.0m to the adjoining semi-detached property. The proposed roof will be hipped to match the existing design of the roof to the property set down significantly from the existing roof height. Windows are proposed on the rear only.

Given the retained gap to the shared boundaries, it is not anticipated that the proposed development will impact upon the existing levels of residential amenity currently being enjoyed by occupants of adjoining properties including loss of privacy, light or overshadowing.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene, however, the character of the area is still retained and various houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area. It is not anticipated that the introduction of a part single part two storey extension to this location would provide a harmful outlook on the occupiers of the surrounding properties.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting Scale and Massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and have been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house. The proposal is not excessively large or bulky and are therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials by way of render as specified in the application form.

The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Disabled access

Not applicable

Bins

Bins storage is not affected by the proposal as there is space to the side of the property which is retained for the movement of bins from the rear to the front for collection which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Off road car parking is not affected by this proposal. Space to the front driveway is still available

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered

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

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 guidance contained within saved policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester

Unitary Development Plan and to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 drawing:-

Revised drawings received 14th September 2021 numbered A102 Rev 02 Proposed Floor Plans

Revised drawings received 14th September 2021 numbered A114 Rev 02 Proposed Elevations

Revised drawings received 14th September 2021 numbered A103 Rev 02 Proposed 3D visuals

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 hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form 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 structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

30A Elmsmere Road, Manchester, M20 6FL
32 Elmsmere Road, Manchester, M20 6FL
32A Elmsmere Road, Manchester, M20 6FL
292 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 6JY
30 Elmsmere Road, Manchester, M20 6FL
303 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 6JZ
299 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 6JZ
34 Elmsmere Road, Manchester, M20 6FL

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH