

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131281/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 12 August 2021

Proposal: Erection of a first floor front and part single/part two storey side and rear extensions to form additional living accommodation together with widening of existing drive and dropped kerb

Address: 15 Queensway, Manchester, M19 1QP

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mahmud Akram 15 Queensway, Manchester, M19 1QP

Agent (if any): Mr Mark Gordon MGD 12 Westbury Close, Bury, BL8 2LW

Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 30th November 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Standard consultations:	Printed: 16 August 2021 Expired: 6 September 2021
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 2 November 2021 Expired: 23 November 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. To the front are projecting square bays with a setback and front recessed porch. Gardens are to the front and rear with access along the side.



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

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in character.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning consent for the erection of a first floor front and part single/part two storey side and rear extensions to form additional living accommodation together with widening of existing drive and dropped kerb.

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.

Highway Services - Highways have no objections to the proposed development.

Should the application be approved, recommend the applicant is made aware of the following Informative:

The proposed development extends only within the red-line boundary of the site and as such, does not impinge upon the adopted highway. Given that the proposed development will not result in any increase in residential units, it is accepted that no highway concerns in terms of safety or capacity are considered likely to arise.

The current on-site parking offering is to be retained and an additional parking space installed and as such, Highways have no concerns regarding vehicular build up on- street. The applicant should ensure that the length of the driveway is sufficient so that the vehicles does not overhang on the footway, each driveway space should provide a minimum of 3.0m x 6.0m in line with MCCs standard minimum dimensions.

The existing dropped kerb is to be extended by 3.2m to the east. Highways would not support any greater than a double dropped kerb and therefore the driveway should be positioned at an appropriate point away from the neighbouring (no. 17) driveway. Therefore, the dropped kerb would need to be raised between the set of driveways to stop this happening. The applicant would be required to enter into a section 184 agreement at their own cost for a vehicular or dropped crossing.

All boundary treatments with frontage to the adopted highway will require visual permeability from a height of 600mm upwards in order to maintain appropriate sight lines. Gated accesses, both vehicle and pedestrian, will need to provide inward opening gates to ensure they do not impact on the adopted footway.

It is expected that refuse servicing will continue as present, bins will be stored within the sites curtilage and presented to the highway on waste collection days. Given the minimal scale of construction works involved, the level of construction vehicles are unlikely to generate any significant on-street parking demands.

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 EN 19 - Waste Management
- 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. 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 unacceptable and it is believed that there are factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposal is deemed not to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Plans considered as part of this scheme

Received on 2nd November 2021 numbered 15Q-300-BR-C2 Proposed Site Location Plan and Proposed Site Plan

Received on 2nd November 2021 numbered 15Q-302-BR-C1 Proposed Plans Layout

Received on 2nd November 2021 numbered 15Q-303-BR-C1 Proposed Elevations

Received on 6th August 2021 numbered 15Q-300-BR Existing Location Plan

Received on 6th August 2021 numbered 15Q-301-BR Existing Plans and Elevations

History

There are no previous planning applications relating to this site.

Residential amenity

The City Council raised concerns with the applicant as the initial submission did not comply with City Council policy. Negotiations took place to provide a scheme which was compliant and although it is acknowledged that the applicant has addressed some of the issues raised, the first floor side element beyond the rear wall has not been addressed. The applicant was given the opportunity to address the concerns raised, however, has chosen not to amend the plans.

Front

The applicant proposes to infill the first floor front by erecting an extension over the front porch. This would provide a flush elevation to the property as replicated by other properties within the area. The roof would be flat to follow through with the existing design of the roof at the front of the property.

Ground floor

The extension would be in line with the original front wall of the house extending along the side of the property and wrapping around the property up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi detached property no. 17 Queensway. Projection from the rear would be 2.880 metres with

a gap to the shared boundary with no. 11a of approximately 1.0 metre. The roof would be hipped to the front with a mono pitch at the rear with the inclusion of a roof light. Windows are proposed on the front and side with bi folding doors on the rear.

First floor

The first floor would be set back from the original front wall of the property by approximately 3.0 metres extending along the side by 7.570 metres retaining a gap to the shared boundary with no. 11a of approximately 1.0 metres. A projection off the rear wall measures 2.880 metres wrapping around the property extending partway across the rear retaining a gap to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 17.

The height would measure approximately 4.9 metres to eaves and 6.0 metres to ridge height. The roof would be hipped to reflect the current style of roof of the property. Windows are proposed on the front, side and rear.

The City Council maintains that the proposal would by reason of its height, rearward projection and close proximity to the site boundary with no. 11a would create an undue loss of light and have an overbearing impact to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of the property. It is believed due to the location of the side extension together with the orientation of the application site, that this would provide an overly dominant structure, which would be oppressive and visually obtrusive to neighbouring occupiers and result in visual harm.

The City Council therefore considers that the proposal does not accord with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC1 and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan and policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Scale and Massing

It is considered that the proposal would read as excessively large and bulky to the adjacent neighbouring property, and would have an overbearing impact upon the amenity levels of neighbouring occupiers at no. 11a Queensway, and would not appear as subservient additions to the property, contrary to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, DC1.4 of the UDP.

Design

Given the proposals prominent location it is considered that the proposal has not been sited and designed appropriate to the character of the area and therefore does not accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1 and Core Strategy Policies DM1, SP1 and EN1.

Waste management

Bin storage is not affected by this proposal as there is adequate space along the side for the movement of refuse bins. Therefore, bin storage complies with policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Parking

Off street car parking would be retained to the site and therefore it is considered that car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

Dropped kerb

In addition the applicant proposes a dropped kerb. The current on-site parking offering is to be retained and an additional parking space installed and as such, Highways have no concerns regarding vehicular build up on- street. The length of the driveway should be sufficient so that the vehicles do not overhang on the footway, each driveway space should provide a minimum of 3.0m x 6.0m in line with MCCs standard minimum dimensions. The City Council do not object to the works to be carried out.

Conclusion

For these reasons, it is considered that the extension would have an unacceptable appearance as the resultant house would have a bulky appearance with an overbearing massing and scale to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers. In light of this, the proposed extensions are considered to be unacceptable in terms of their appearance and would be detrimental to visual and residential amenity within the area contrary to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.4 and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

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

The proposal would not improve the social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There are no conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which would have made the development acceptable and it is therefore not possible to approve the application.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposed extensions by reason of their height, rearward projection and close proximity to the site boundary would create an undue loss of light and have an overbearing impact to no. Queensway, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of the property. The proposed

development is therefore contrary to the provisions of DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan and policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services

17 Queensway, Manchester, M19 1QP
14 Queensway, Manchester, M19 1QP
11A Queensway, Manchester, M19 1QP
12 Queensway, Manchester, M19 1QP
8 Hurstfold Avenue, Manchester, M19 1RE
10 Hurstfold Avenue, Manchester, M19 1RE

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