

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132390/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 2 December 2021
Proposal: Erection of part two, part single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 14 Holmside Gardens, Manchester, M19 1WR
Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Jonathan Smith 14 Holmside Gardens, Manchester, M19 1WR
Agent (if any): Mr Ahmed Choudhry Nada Architects 169 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 2ND
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 8th February 2022



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: 15 December 2021 Expired: 5 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 site relates to a two storey semi-detached C3 property located in the Burnage Ward area of Manchester. The property is positioned at the end of a Cul de Sac surrounded by similar type properties. A two storey rear extension is present with raised decking. Gardens lie 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

Holmside gardens is a residential street within the Burnage Ward area of Manchester, characterised by two storey semi-detached family dwellinghouses with gardens, consisting of current and ex-social housing.

Description of development

Erection of part two, part single storey 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

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 accords 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 acceptable and it is believed that there are no factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

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

History

There has been two previous planning applications relating to this site as follows:

Planning reference number: 130563/FH/2021 for Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. This application was Withdrawn on 10th August.2021.

Planning reference number: 131438/FH/2021 for Retrospective application for the retention of a two storey rear extension. This application was refused on 12.10.2021

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking consent for the erection of part two, part single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation

This is a resubmission of a previously refused application (131438/FH/2021) which is currently going through an appeal process. This application differs from the previous in that the

agent/applicant has reduced the width of the proposal at first floor near the shared boundary with the adjoining semi detached property no. 16 Holmside Gardens.

The extension projects off the rear wall by 3.0 metres and is sited across the rear wall up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 16 Holmside Gardens at ground floor retaining a gap to the boundary at first floor of 1.7m. The height of the extension is parallel to the existing eaves with a lower roof ridge height to the existing property.

On the ground floor are Bi folding doors which are positioned on the rear leading into the garden with a window on the side elevation facing the rear garden of properties no. 439/441 Kingsway. At first floor there are two windows which serve a rear bedroom and an en-suite. No windows are present on the side of the extension at first floor. In relation to the ground floor, it is not considered that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by the location of the side window due to the existing boundary treatment and distance to the rear of properties along Kingsway.

Given the fact that the adjoining property has a single storey extension to the rear together with the retained gap at first floor, it is considered that the proposal would not provide an overbearing or oppressive outlook for the existing and any future occupiers of the adjoining semi-detached property. The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and would not feature within the street scene, however, the character of the property would be retained and therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered 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 proposal therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house. The size and footprint of the proposed extension 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 and Appearance

The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the side and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be an acceptable addition to the property and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials as specified in the application form.

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.

Waste management

The location of refuse bins are unaffected by this proposal as there is space along the side of the property for the movement of bins from the rear to the front for collection and therefore accords with EN19 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Parking

Parking is unaffected by this proposal as off road parking would be available on the front drive.

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 drawings received on 27th January 2022 numbered (02)001 Revision PL1 Existing and Proposed Plans

Revised drawings received on 27th January 2022 numbered (03)001 Revision PL1 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 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

12 Holmside Gardens, Manchester, M19 1WR
16 Holmside Gardens, Manchester, M19 1WR
9A Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
14 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
11 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
8 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
6 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
3 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
451 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NR
16 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
15 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
12 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
10 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
9 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
7 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
5 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
4 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
2 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
1 Milton Court, 590 Burnage Lane, Manchester, M19 1RX
18 Holmside Gardens, Manchester, M19 1WR
449 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NR
447 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NR

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