

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132100/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 1 November 2021

Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension and ramped access to front elevation to create additional living accommodation

Address: 1 Pembury Close, Manchester, M22 9PU

Ward(s): Sharston Ward

Applicant: Mr P Burke, Wythenshawe Community Housing Group, Wythenshawe House, 8 Poundswick Lane, Wythenshawe, Manchester, M22 9TA

Agent (if any): Mr Ian Perry, Heaton Design Ltd, 153 Woodsmoor Lane, Woodsmoor, Stockport, SK3 8TH

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 20th December 2021

Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 5 November 2021 Expired: 26 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

The site relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Sharston ward area of Manchester. Gardens lie to the front, side and rear of the property with off road car parking to the front.



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

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature

Description of development

Erection of single storey side extension and ramped access to front elevation to create additional living accommodation

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. There have been no comments 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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 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 are no previous planning applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking to extend the property by erecting a single storey side extension and access ramp to the front of the property to allow additional living accommodation. The proposed single storey extension would be in line with the front and rear wall of the property to a width of 4.2m at the front and 2.2m at the rear sited parallel to the site boundary along the side and retaining a gap to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property no. 162 Broadoak Road. The height of the extension would be 3.0m approximately and would have a flat roof.

There is a window to the front, bathroom window to the side and door to the rear. However given the distance to the shared boundary with the adjacent property, together with the current boundary

treatment, it is not considered that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by the window on the side.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene, however, the character of the area has been retained although over time some of the houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended; therefore, the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

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.

Access Ramp

The applicant is proposing the installation of an access ramp to the front of the property set back from the highway retaining adequate amenity space to the front of the property.

No comments or objections have been received from the local residents notified of this application. The ramp occupies a relatively small footprint and is not thought to impact the residential amenity of surrounding residents as it won't overshadow or overlook the neighbours gardens or houses due to the distances between the properties.

Although the proposal would be visible in the street scene, the development benefits the needs of a disabled user residing at the property and requires access to and from the property, therefore in this instance the proposal is considered acceptable and therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 and DC1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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 materials 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 side is retained. Therefore the bins would accord with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Current parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal complies with the above policies; it received no objections and the City Council recognises the importance of adapting homes to suit changing household needs and accommodate disabled residents. The single storey rear extension would improve the safety and comfort of the dwelling for the resident, allowing them to remain independent in their own home, therefore development may commence in accordance with the following conditions.

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

Received on 1st November 2021 numbered 2 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 of the 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

162 Broadoak Road, Manchester, M22 9LU
3 Pembury Close, Manchester, M22 9PU
2 Pembury Close, Manchester, M22 9PU

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 15M
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 45M
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH