

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130009/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 12 April 2021

Proposal: Erection of part single part two storey rear extension to create additional living accommodation

Address: 18 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH

Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Mr Jamal Ahmed 18 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH

Agent (if any): Mr Rashid Mehmood I. Planning Services 2A Cook Street, Bury, BL9 0RP

Case officer: Robert Tyrer
Tel: 0161 234 4068
Email: robert.tyrer@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 9 July 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 4 June 2021

Standard consultations:

Printed: 19 April 2021 Expired: 10 May 2021

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 19 April 2021 Expired: 10 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 application site is a two storey end of terrace inter-war dwelling of brick construction on a large 407.29m² plot.

The property has a slated hipped roof; long, linear front and rear gardens and space for off-road parking.



Photograph 1 Rear of 18 Cranford Avenue

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: None

Description of area

The property is within a residential area of similar housing design and type. The area is served well with public transport and highway links.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission to erect a part single part two storey rear extension to create additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents/public opinion – No objections, comments or representations in support of the application have been received.

Network Rail – No comments on the proposal.

Issues

Local Policy

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant **Core Strategy** policies for this application are as follows:

SP1 – Spatial Principles

DM1 – Development Management 1

The relevant **UDP** policies for this application are:

DC 1.1 – 1.6 – Residential Extensions

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - The NPPF sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors.

In particular NPPF states that in terms of design:

124. The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

And,

127. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

130. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used).

The 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 applicant is seeking to extend the property to provide additional living accommodation in the form of an open kitchen and living room together with two additional bedrooms at first floor.

Matters that will require consideration, in order to assess the acceptability of any proposal are siting, scale and massing, design and appearance.

Further consideration will be given as to whether the proposal has any impact on surrounding residential amenity in particular the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Siting, Scale and Massing – The proposal seeks to extend the property at the rear a part single, part two storey rear extension. As noted, the application site has a large linear rear garden and therefore can accommodate a larger extension, saved UDP policy states that the Council will not normally approve a rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length. However, the inclusion of the word “normally” does allow scope for large extensions, in addition under permitted development rights householders can now extend up to 6 metres with a single storey rear extension. In this case the first-floor element is set back to 3.6 metres and would be set away from the shared boundary with no. 20 Cranford Avenue by 1.5 metres.

This reward projection of 5 metres and proximity to the shared boundary at the side will lead to some overshadowing of the rear garden at No.20 especially in the late afternoon as the rear garden of this property is orientated north. It is noted that as with the application site, No.20 has a significantly larger linear garden to the rear, and which appears to be used for recreational purposes. The length of the garden means that the vast majority will still benefit from the sun all day including in the evening, so the partial overshadowing of the rear garden by the proposal can be justified in this case.

Therefore the proposal in terms of siting, scale and massing accords with policies with SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Design and Appearance – The extension has been designed to complement the existing dwellinghouse with materials shown to be a brick finish and a slate roof finish. There are no concerns with the design or appearance, it is recommended that materials are dealt with by means of a planning condition.

Residential Amenity - If the proposed development is approved there would still be sufficient space for outdoor amenity. The siting, scale and massing of the proposal have been discussed previously in this report and are found not to cause any detrimental impact on residential amenity. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policies DM1 of the Core Strategy and DC1 of the UDP

Car Parking and Refuse Storage – There are no changes to the proposed car parking and refuse storage arrangements.

Conclusion - The extension is considered to be in accordance with SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

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. Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application and these concerns have been addressed in amended drawings. Appropriate conditions have been attached to the end of this report. The scheme is considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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:

IPS/R/18/M20 6EH REV A stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 05.07.2021

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 of the extension hereby permitted shall be similar in appearance to those used during the construction of the original dwellinghouse 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 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Network Rail

15 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
12 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
20 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
19 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
17 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
16 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
14 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH
13 Cranford Avenue, Manchester, M20 6EH

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