

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131498/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 26 August 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing outrigger

Address: 9 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs B Ramsden, 9 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ

Agent (if any): Mr Simon Miles, S R Miles Ltd, 28 Parrs Wood Avenue, Manchester, M20 5ND

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 3rd November 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 6 September 2021 Expired: 27 Sept 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 two storey semi-detached property in the Didsbury ward area of Manchester. A small outrigger is present on the rear elevation. Gardens are located to the front and rear with access along the side and off street car parking to the front.



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

Description of area

The area is largely residential in nature, with a number of circa mid twentieth century semi detached dwelling houses fronting Craigweil Avenue (cul-de-sac), off Parrs Wood Road, in Didsbury East ward area of Manchester.

Description of development

Erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing outrigger

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. There has been no response in relation to this proposal

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal does 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 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 has been one previous planning application relating to this site as follows:

Planning reference 109598/LP/2015/S2 for Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development for detached outbuilding. This application was approved on 16th September 2016.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking to extend the property by erecting a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation following the demolition of the existing single storey rear outrigger.

The applicant proposes to erect a single storey extension with a projection of 3.0 metres off the rear wall from the side wall up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property

no. 11 Craigweil Avenue. The roof would be flat to a height of 3.15m approximately with a small overhang on the adjoining property and the inclusion of a large roof lantern.

Bi folding doors are proposed on the rear elevation with the installation of a high level window on the side facing no.7 Craigweil Ave. However, given the height of the window measuring 1.7m above ground level, there would be no overlooking or loss of privacy given by the installation of a window in this location.

Given the orientation of the application site and its relationship to the neighbouring properties especially given the projection, it is considered that the proposal would not provide a domineering and harmful outlook on the occupiers of the adjoining properties. In addition, properties either side of the application site both have single storey rear projections.

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 has been retained and 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.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not provide a significant impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers and surrounding properties in the area and therefore is considered accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and SP1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house, is not excessively large or bulky and are therefore considered to accord with the principles set out in saved UDP policies DC1 and accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The proposal is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching brick 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 storage of bins are not affected by this proposal as adequate space to the rear is retained, therefore the bins would be screened from within the street scene which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Current parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered 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, or the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

For the above reasons, the proposal is unlikely to have any detrimental impact and therefore accords with saved UDP policy DC1 and 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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application.

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:

Received on 6th October 2021 numbered PL200 REV B Proposed Plans and 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

128 Atwood Road, Manchester, M20 6GP
126 Atwood Road, Manchester, M20 6GP
124 Atwood Road, Manchester, M20 6GP
7 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ
11 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ
10 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ
8 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ
12 Craigweil Avenue, Manchester, M20 6JQ

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