

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131042/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 12 July 2021
Proposal: Raising of roof ridge height and loft extension with rear dormer window
Address: 449 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UZ
Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Noreen Aslam, 449 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UZ
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: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 21st September 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: 19 July 2021 Expired: 9 August 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 large 2 storey detached property on Wilbraham Road, in the Chorlton Park ward area of Manchester. The house has previously undergone enlargements to the property. Hardstanding lies to the front with brick and railings along the boundary with garden to the rear and timber fencing along the boundary.



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

Description of area

This is predominantly a residential area in character.

Description of development

Raising of roof ridge height and loft extension with rear dormer window

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 – No letters of objection has been received in respect of this application.

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o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 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.

History

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

100754/FH/2012/S1 - Erection of two-storey rear and side extension, re-roofing of property with dormer window to rear, with associated porch and canopy to front. This application was approved on 28th November 2012.

128809/FH/2020 - Raise of ridge height and loft extension with full width rear dormer window. This application was refused on 3rd February 2021.

Plans considered

The plans considered as part of this proposal are as follows:

Received 21st September 2021 01-001 PL2 Existing and Proposed Site Plan

Received 21st September 2021 04-001 PL1 Existing and Proposed Floor Plans

Received 21st September 2021 06-001 PL1 Proposed Elevations

Received 12th July 2021

05-001 PL0 Proposed Floor Plans

Received 12th July 2021

02-001 PL0 Existing Elevations

Received 12th July 2021

03-001 PL0 Existing Floor Plans

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking to raise the ridge height and loft extension with rear dormer window. It is considered that the general character of the properties along this street frontage are of a hipped roof design which is retained along the street frontage although enlargements have been carried out to many of the properties.

Previous planning permission was granted on the property which although large retained the hipped roof of the existing building and therefore the original design was retained and was able to follow through without seeing the loss of the character of the property.

The applicant proposes to increase the height of the ridge by 1.0 metre with the inclusion of changing the existing hipped roof to a partial hip with a flat roof. The dormer would sit across the new roof set in slightly from the sides, ridge and eaves.

The City Council believes that altering the height of the ridge by 1.0 metre would alter the appearance of the pattern of development along this road significantly leading to a detrimental impact within the street scene. It is considered that the introduction of a roof extension particularly this design in this location would be considered overbearing and oppressive providing a detrimental outlook for the existing and any further occupiers of the adjoining and surrounding properties which is out of character with the area.

The roof would extend upwards considerably, with a large expanse of flat roof surface impacting on its visual appearance. The increase in volume involves a notable increase in height and, subsequently, scale and massing of the dwelling house and this is considered to be out of character with the original house and with other properties in the street scene.

Therefore, the City Council considers that the proposal would provide an overbearing and unsatisfactory visible appearance to the occupiers of surrounding properties and lead to a detrimental impact within the street scene and on the character of the area.

In terms of residential amenity it is considered that the proposed development does not accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and Manchester Core Strategy Policies DM1 and SP1 and NPPF.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed roof extension is believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of the adjoining and surrounding properties and is not considered to be subservient to the original house and therefore, it is considered that the proposal would provide an overbearing structure within the street scene which would be out of character with the surrounding properties in the area.

It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is not satisfactory and is considered not 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 considered unacceptable with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. The design is not detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development does not accord with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered unacceptable.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal would provide visual harm to the occupiers of the adjacent and surrounding properties by way of appearance, bulk and mass and if approved would provide an overbearing and oppressive outlook within the street scene and on the character of the area and therefore does not comply with Council saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan and policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 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

Officers have outlined to the applicant's agent that the height, scale and massing of the proposal is a concern, but no agreement could be reached on satisfactory changes to the scheme. The application has been determined to be in conflict with the Development Plan.

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

1) The proposed roof extension by reason of its design, mass and size relative to the roof of the application property, would appear as a bulky and excessively large feature, and would result in an unduly overbearing visual appearance to the detriment of the general character of the property and the visual amenity of the area within which it is situated. The proposal would constitute an over-dominant, un-subservient, unbalanced, and incongruous feature that is therefore contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework for the City of Manchester and saved policies DC1.1 and DC1.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

22 White Moss Avenue, Manchester, M21 0XT
451 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UZ
447 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UZ
366 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0XA
364 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UX
362 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UX
24 White Moss Avenue, Manchester, M21 0XT
20 White Moss Avenue, Manchester, M21 0XT

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
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH