

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131138/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 21 July 2021

Proposal: Erection of part single part two-storey side and rear extension, conversion of roof from hipped to gable together with installation of rear dormer and erection of front porch to provide additional living accommodation, along with rendering of rear elevation.

Address: 372 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ES

Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Mrs Sadaf Fiaz, 372 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ES

Agent (if any): Dean King

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 November 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 4 November 2020

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 14 October 2021 Expired: 28 October 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 property is a traditional two-storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red brick and tile with a hipped roof and bay windows. The plot includes a large garden to the rear and a large driveway to the front.

Description of area

Princess Road is a main arterial route from the city centre to the M56. This portion of it, within Whalley Range, is predominantly residential in nature and characterised by similar interwar properties.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a part single part two storey side and rear extension, front porch, hip to gable roof alteration and rear dormer, following demolition of garage, to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse. The majority of these works were previously applied for under ref 128294/FH/2020, which was refused based on a lack of subservience, risk of terracing and impacts upon residential amenity.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – Four letters of objection were received, from two residents. Two during the 1st consultation and two during the 2nd consultation following amendments to the scheme. The revised comments were as follows:

Objector 1: *It's gonna block my sunlight, daylight. My main sunlight is from that side. As I have trees on left side and end of garden big giant trees. My main light is from their side of the house.*

Objector 2: *I object to this extension because this will cause me to lose a significant level of sunlight and daylight. I have been looking at the plans of the extension and it is extremely huge and have no consideration how it will affect them daily. As an old retired couple we enjoy our summer days relaxing and gardening but the extension will result in me feeling much more overlooked and causing a loss of privacy and I would feel a greater sense of enclosure and feel being hemmed in my property because of the close proximity and the height of the extension. It will also effect the growth of my plants, vegetables and apple trees due to loss of sunlight. I hope you take all this in consideration and stop the planning going ahead.*

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, however select 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
- Policy EN1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas

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 part single part two storey side and rear extension, front porch, dormer and hip to gable alteration to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse, is acceptable, as policy DC1.1 mentions enabling people to adapt their homes to meet changing household needs. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale and design and its impact upon both visual and residential amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The extensions would be sited to the front (east), side (south) and rear (west) of this semi-detached property. The porch would project 1.1m forward, with a width of 2.65m, a maximum height of 3.48m and a footprint of 2.9m². The ground floor aspect would wrap around the entire house, starting from the porch and finishing along the boundary with No.370. It would have a rearward depth of 5.1m and a sideward projection of 3m, with a maximum height of 3m at the rear and 3.48m at the front, sited along both shared boundaries. The first floor rear element would project 3m, with a width of 5.6m and a height of 5.64m, leaving a gap of 2m to the boundary shared with No.374 and 2.26m to No.370. The first floor side element would be setback from the principal elevation by 1.5m, with a depth of 7m and a ridge height set 0.36m lower than existing. The hip to gable would extend the ridge by 4.25m, to match that of the adjoining semi. The dormer would have a width of 6.4m, depth of 4.2m, height of 2.3m and resulting volume of 30.9m³, along with a 0.4m setback from the eaves. Although

the scale of the works is extensive, the plot can comfortably accommodate the increase and the revised scheme is in line with similar builds in the vicinity (see No.278 - 111795/FH/2016/S1 three doors down). Originally the proposal was larger in scale, received two objections and was not deemed adequately subservient. Negotiations took place with the agent and applicant to come to an acceptable solution, which included reducing the size of the dormer and implementing a 1.5m setback for the first floor side element. These alterations to the proposal are considered to have reduced its potential impacts upon amenity. Although the rear projection exceeds that which is stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) at ground floor, rear extensions can be built up to 6m under permitted development granted the neighbours are not significantly affected and in this case both neighbours have their own extensive rear extensions and outbuildings sited along the boundaries. The dormer and porch are site within the original property and similar could be built under Permitted Development. The side and rear extension is subservient and allows for the neighbour to share the development gap equally, hence the siting, scale and massing of the proposal are considered acceptable.

Design, appearance and visual amenity – Viewed from the front, the extension would have a traditional appearance, in keeping with the house and surrounding area. It would be constructed from red brickwork, concrete interlocking roof tiles and uPVC windows to match existing and this has been conditioned. The extension, as viewed from the public highway, would tie-in with the main house and would not negatively impact the character of the area as it is set back from the principal elevation by 1.5m and set down from the main ridge by 0.36m, thus ensuring the development gap between the properties can be shared without resulting in a terracing effect. The two storey side would feature a gable roof with a pitch to match the main roof, whilst the first floor rear would feature a flat roof, to allow room above for the dormer. Normally flat roofs are not accepted for two storey extensions, however this would not be visible from the public highway and thus is not considered to negatively impact upon the street scene. The dormer and rear elevation of the extensions would feature white render, which, along with the flat roof and large amount of glazing, gives a more contemporary appearance which contrasts with the traditional front and side elevations. This will not feature within the street scene however, hence the character of the area is not considered to be further affected by this proposal, as a precedent has long been set here (see large extensions along nearby Wilbraham Road) and the visible element of the extensions would be in-keeping with the style of the house and the scale of nearby works.

Residential amenity – The rear two storey aspect would be sited at least 2m from both shared boundaries, which minimise the impact the proposal would have on the neighbouring occupiers. There are no windows proposed for the side elevations facing these neighbours, therefore the adjacent neighbours' privacy should not be impacted. Two objections were received in relation to the revised scheme, which raised concerns regarding a perceived loss of light for neighbouring occupiers/plots owing to the extensions. No.374 is sited directly south of the proposal and therefore is unlikely to notice a loss of sunlight. No.370 is sited directly north and features a larger (in height and depth) ground floor rear extension than the proposal, therefore the only loss of sunlight is likely to be mid-afternoon to the first floor rear bedroom, however this is not deemed significant given the large amount of evening sunlight it will still receive due to its orientation. These gardens are very large (25m x 9m) and therefore any overshadowing of part of this is not enough to warrant a refusal. Therefore, on balance, the amended design is not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenity currently enjoyed by the surrounding occupiers and is deemed acceptable.

Parking and refuse storage – The bulk of the driveway would remain, with space for 2 cars off-street, which is adequate for a single family dwelling. Although the side extension is to be built along the boundary, a gap of 1m would be retained within the ground floor, gated at the front, down which to transport bins to the rear garden, pursuant to policy DM1.

Conclusion – Although objections were received from local residents in regards to this application, it is not considered that the revised proposal would significantly affect the existing levels of residential amenity the neighbours currently enjoy, nor cause further harm to the visual amenity of an area which has already seen similar extensions. A condition has been attached removing the permitted development rights from this property (classes A, B and E) so that any additional extensions or outbuildings would require the express permission of the City Council. The proposal broadly accords with the policies contained within the Core Strategy and therefore the development may take place in accordance with the approved plans and the following conditions.

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 'A100', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 11th October 2021 and the revised drawing numbered 'A103 B', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 5th November 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 and additions hereby permitted shall match those specified on the revised elevational drawing 'A103 B', including brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing building and white render.

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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions or additional development shall be erected under Part 1, Classes: A (extensions) and B (alterations to the roof) of the Order without the prior written express consent of the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity and to safeguard the character of the area, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

391 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER

389 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER

387 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ER

370 Princess Road, Manchester, M14 7ES

William Hulmes Grammar School Academy, Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PR

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