

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132340/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 26 November 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 42 Pasture Field Road, Manchester, M22 5UJ

Ward(s): Sharston Ward

Applicant: Fiona Phillips, 42 Pasture Field Road, Manchester, M22 5UJ

Agent (if any): Ian Grainger, Blu Room Architecture, 5 Uplands Road, Darlington, DL3 7SZ

Case officer: Janine Renshaw-Livesey
Tel: 0161 234 4555
Email: janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 6 January 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 1 December 2021 Expired: 22 December 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: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

The application relates to a two storey red brick detached 1960's property, located in a residential area of the Sharston Ward. The property has a garden and driveway to the front and a larger rear garden.

The area is residential in nature and benefits from being in close proximity to a number of local schools and within a short distance to Wythenshawe Town Centre and a number of green spaces.

Description of development

Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation

There are no previous planning applications at the property.

Consultations & Notification Responses

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted and no representations were received.

Issues

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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.
- 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 EN 19 - Waste Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle - The proposal is the erection of a single-storey front, side and rear extension, including a dormer, to provide additional living accommodation, which is considered acceptable,

Notwithstanding this, consideration must be given to the proposed developments siting, design, appearance, scale and massing, and to the proposal's impact upon existing levels of residential amenity.

Siting - The proposed side extension, wraps around the host building leaving an 800mm gap between the boundary, the rear extension projects 3 metres from the rear elevation with a similar projection to the adjoining single storey rear extension. The non adjoining property also has a large single storey rear extension that over projects the proposed extension. The extension would be well placed in relation to the neighbouring property. It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any significant impacts on visual amenity on neighbouring residents.

Design and Appearance - The proposal seeks to bring the front elevation in line with the front of the existing porch, similar to the extension on the adjoining property. The materials to be used in the construction of the extension are to match the existing property, and the design appears to be in keeping with the character of the dwelling house and surrounding properties in the area and within the street scene.

It is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Scale and Massing - The scale and massing of the proposed extension, is considered to be proportionate to the existing dwelling house and should not give rise to unacceptable visual relationships within the street scene.

The extension would have a width of 1.8 metre and a rearward projection of 3 metres, fitted with a hipped roof to the front which terminates and becomes flat on the side and rear.

The extension would be fitted with one to the front elevation overlooking the driveway, with a window and patio doors on the rear elevation and a side door to provide access to the storage area.

It is considered that the fenestration should not provide any additional overlooking or loss of privacy than that the neighbouring occupants currently enjoy. The side extension should have minimal impact and should not appear incongruous in relation to the neighbouring properties.

As such the proposal accords with saved UDP policy DC1 and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Parking - The current off street car parking would be retained at the front of the property, it is considered that there is sufficient off street car parking for two cars, which accords with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1.

Refuse bin storage - The storage of refuse bins is not affected by the proposed extension, as there would be continued access to the rear of the property. However, it is proposed to place an informative on any approval for the bins to be stored at the rear of the property.

The proposal accords with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity - The extension, by reason of the orientation at the side of the property, should not give rise to overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy to the detriment of the amenity that the neighbouring occupants could reasonably expect to enjoy. The design is what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity.

In this respect, the proposed extension accords with saved UDP policies DC1 and to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Dormer

The applicant proposes the installation of a rear dormer window which would extend across the roof in line with the ridge line of the original roof height and in from the side walls of the house. Two windows are proposed which overlooks the rear garden and one window is proposed on the side elevation of the dormer. Given the distance to rear boundaries it is not anticipated that there would be any further overlooking afforded by these windows than already exist from the rear windows at first floor. Similarly, given the distance to the property on the opposite side, it is not anticipated that there would be any further overlooking than already exists from the first floor windows.

The City Council considers the change to the roof design as acceptable especially given that the ridge height is no higher than the existing and the gable does not project further than the existing gable wall of the property. This is considered to be an acceptable addition to the roof of the property and is therefore considered would not provide a detrimental outlook on the adjoining properties or the surrounding area and is therefore considered acceptable in this location and is not believed to impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

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, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

The proposal would allow 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.

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

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner by requesting further information relating to the scheme and appropriate conditions to the approval have also been attached.

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:

The Location Plan, 03,04 and 05, stamped as received on the 26 November 2022.

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 external facing materials to be used on the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing buildings in terms of type, colour, texture and scale.

Reason - To ensure that 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 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

44 Pasture Field Road, Manchester, M22 5UJ
40 Pasture Field Road, Manchester, M22 5UJ
53 Pasture Field Road, Manchester, M22 5JX
62 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JP

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 - Within Outer Area
Airport Noise Index Zone - Noise and Nuisance Index - 50-59
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH