

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130199/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 27 April 2021

Proposal: Erection of a first floor rear extension to provide additional living accommodation

Address: Frankton Cottage , 84 Shady Lane, Manchester, M23 9NN

Ward(s): Brooklands Ward

Applicant: Lisa Robson Frankton Cottage , 84 Shady Lane, Manchester, M23 9NN

Agent (if any): Mr Phil Ryan Cube Design Solutions 4 Acresfield Road, Altrincham, WA15 6HU

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 20th October 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 7 May 2021 Expired: 28 May 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 property is located in an area to the South West of Baguley District Centre and is predominantly residential in nature. The property forms a cluster of Victorian dwellings located opposite of Butchers Lane and these are considerable older in comparison with some of the other residential properties.



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

Erection of a first floor rear extension to provide 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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle

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 have been no previous applications relating to this property.

Residential Amenity

Concerns have been raised by the City Council leading to negotiations with the agent. The proposal was amended by the agent by reducing the projection down to 3.2 metres. The new drawings are considered to be acceptable and supersede the original submitted plans.

The proposed extension is located at the rear of the property, where there is an existing single storey rear projection.

The application proposes the erection of a first floor rear extension which would project off the original rear wall by 3.2 metres. The height to ridge would be set down considerably from the existing ridge height of the property. The extension would measure 3.350 metres in width and

would have a Juliet balcony with glazed gable roof overlooking the rear garden. No windows are proposed on the side elevation. It is considered that the introduction of a Juliet balcony in this location would be no more harmful than that of the existing rear first floor window

The adjoining semi-detached property has an existing first floor rear extension on the boundary and therefore it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to undue harm caused by the introduction of an extension to the rear in this location including overlooking or loss of privacy especially given the projection. It is considered that this addition would blend in well with the current design and would not be out of keeping with the host dwelling and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

This element of 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 retained and the houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended. Therefore, 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.

The proposed extension is satisfactory and is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1 DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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 extension is satisfactory and is 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 is in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the materials, these are set to match the existing property 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

Refuse

The storage of refuse bins are not affected by the proposal, as there would be space to the side of the property for storage of refuse bins, which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Not affected by this proposal.

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 to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 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: 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 policies within the Development Plan.

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:

Revised plans received on 11th October 2021 numbered : 1056-03 Proposed Floor Plans

Revised plans received on 11th October 2021 numbered : 1056-04 Proposed Elevations

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 hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form/drawings 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

82 Shady Lane, Manchester, M23 9NN

86 Shady Lane, Manchester, M23 9NN

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