

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131816/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 4 October 2021

Proposal: Erection of front porch and part single part two part storey side and single storey rear extension, to form additional living accommodation.

Address: 6 Massey Walk, Manchester, M22 5JY

Ward(s): Sharston Ward

Applicant: Mr Ansar Choudhary, 6 Massey Walk, Manchester, M22 5JY

Agent (if any): Mr Rashid Mehmood, I. Planning Services, 6B Cook Street, Bury, BL9 0RP

Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 26 November 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10 November 2021

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 11 October 2021 Expired: 1 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of reddish brown brickwork with a pantile gable roof and single storey side/rear outhouse. The property has not been previously extended and sits within a generous plot which includes a front garden bound by hedging, a driveway and detached garage to the side and a large garden to the side and rear.

Description of area

Massey Walk in Sharston is a small residential cul-de-sac, comprising of three pairs of semis and two detached properties, all with generous gardens. The wider area is characterised by similar properties and benefits from its proximity to Peel Hall metrolink stop and Heald Green train station.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a porch, part single, part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse. The rear box dormer shown on proposed plans is currently under construction using permitted development rights.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – One letter of objection was received:

I like to ask the following pls: Are you aware of a Dorma roof extension that has already been added to the property? I take it this is allowed? This extension has already made us feel over-looked in our home & garden. I would like to know if the proposed extension plans for the property will effect any daylight we currently have. Our property is south facing and we receive a full day of sunlight and is one of the reasons we purchased our house. Our other concern is loss of privacy in our home & garden, as I have already mentioned re the Dorma roof extension, will the extension to the property mean we will feel over-looked? We are only objecting at this stage due to wanting some answers and reassurances to our concerns please. We do not want any ill feeling with the new occupants

Policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 - Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) in particular:

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well designed places

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

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a two-storey side, single storey front and single storey rear extension to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity. It is noted that the rear box dormer is being constructed under permitted development and is therefore not being assessed under this application.

Siting, scale and massing – The rear single storey element would have a depth of 5m, a width of 9.45m, an eaves height of 2.8m and a maximum height of 3.34m, leaving a gap of 0.3m to the party wall shared with No.4 and leaving 10m of garden left to the rear. This depth exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) however it accords with the dimensions set out under the larger homes extension scheme and has not received an objection in relation to this element specifically. The single storey front extension would project 1.5m, with a width of 2.74m, an eaves height of 2.57m and a ridge height of 3.42m. This is considered subservient and appropriately sited and scaled for the size of the house. The ground floor of the side extension would come flush with the principal elevation and extend the full depth of the property. The two storey side extension would be sited on the west elevation of the house, projecting 3.22m to the side with an depth of 3.2m to come flush with the original rear. The eaves would match existing and the ridge would be set 1.78m lower than existing. The first floor side element would be setback from the principle elevation by 5.2m and would be sited 3m from the boundary shared with No.8. The large side/rear garden can comfortably accommodate such

an extension and adequate gaps have been left to shared boundaries. The significant setback, gap to the boundary and low ridge ensures the two storey element will not result in a visual terracing effect and the development gap can be shared equally if this neighbour builds a similar extension in future. The extensions are considered subservient to the host dwellinghouse and appropriately sited and scaled.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed of brickwork, roof tiles and white uPVC windows, all to match the existing house (which has been conditioned). The rear extension features a set of glazed doors opening onto the garden, with a window either side and 2no large glazed lanterns within the flat roof. The gable roof over the first floor side element would be pitched to match the existing roof. The extension features a significant setback and lowered ridge to ensure a subservient appearance and protect the visual amenity of the house and area. Due to this 5.2m setback and the orientation and arrangement of the property and neighbouring properties, the two storey side extension would not form a prominent feature within the Massey Walk street scene. The extensions are to be built of appropriate matching materials, are standard in design and considered in-keeping with the character of the house and area, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential amenity – There are 2no side-facing first and second floor windows proposed, facing No.8. These windows accompany 2no existing side facing windows within this elevation, which have all been shown on the plans as obscurely glazed and this has been conditioned. This condition along with the large gap to the next property ensures the privacy of surrounding occupiers is protected. The gap to the next house tapers towards the rear due to the perpendicular angle, with two garages in between, therefore it is not considered the works would form an overbearing feature as viewed from No.8. The 5m single storey rear element is sited west of No.4, therefore this neighbour may experience a loss of evening sunlight, however due to No's large garden and existing 2.5m rear extension it is not considered significant. The other neighbour, No.8, is sited south-west of the site and therefore should also not experience a loss of sunlight. Although an objection was received which cited concerns relating to potential overlooking and loss of sunlight, following the assessment none of the surrounding properties are considered to be unduly impacted by these works given the orientation of the dwellings and scale of the gardens. Hence, the proposal is deemed accepted in terms of its impacts upon residential amenity. Note, the objector objected to the dormer (loss of privacy from the rear 2nd floor windows), however this is not being assessed under this application.

Parking and refuse – The off-street parking arrangement will remain as existing as both the driveway and garage are to be retained with space for at least 1 car, which is adequate for a single family dwelling. A gap of 1.3m is to be retained to the boundary at ground floor, providing access to the rear for the transport and storage of refuse bins, in line with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, did not receive any objections and it is not considered to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or character of the area. It is not located within a conservation area, the grounds of a listed building, a district centre nor on an arterial route into the city. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and works may commence in accordance with the following conditions and approved drawings.

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 in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the applicant/agent to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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 revised drawing numbered 'SHT 2 of 2 Rev:C', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 25th November 2021 and the revised drawing numbered 'SHT 2 of 3', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 4th October 2021.

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 of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form and drawings.

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.

4) The proposed first and second floor windows, on the side elevation facing No.8 Massey Walk, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

9 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JQ
8 Massey Walk, Manchester, M22 5JY
5 Massey Walk, Manchester, M22 5JY
4 Massey Walk, Manchester, M22 5JY
3 Massey Walk, Manchester, M22 5JY
7 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JQ
5 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JQ
13 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JQ

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 - Within Outer Area
Airport Noise Index Zone - Noise and Nuisance Index - 40-49
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH