

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131598/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 8 September 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear, part single/part two storey side and single storey front porch extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 17 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE

Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: Mr Mohammad Salim Ahmedi, 17 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE

Agent (if any): Mr Sakib Begg, S Begg Designs, 3 Hazel Grove, Urmston, Manchester, M41 9LU

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 18 November 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10 November 2021

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 20 September 2021 Expired: 11 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 application relates to a two storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red brick with a hipped roof. The property has not previously been extended and sits within a generous triangular plot with a large front/side garden and smaller rear garden.

Description of area

Dennison Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac containing similar semi-detached family dwellinghouses, comprising a mixture of owner-occupied and social housing. The area benefits from its proximity to Withington District Centre and Old Moat Park.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey rear, two storey side and single storey front extension, to provide additional living accommodation, including a 4th bedroom.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – Several letters of objection were received from two objectors:

Objector 1 – The only thing I object to is the two storey side extension, reason being the sun hits our back garden from the side of our house and the side extension they wish to put up will over shadow our back garden and stop the sunlight to the back of our home. Plus it will come right up to the boundary, I explained there has to be access to the back of there home for

emergency services etc but I'm not sure there will be, whilst I don't want to cause any offence to the neighbours I also have to think of my children who like to play in the back garden, the sun is known for hitting our house side on which is why we were offered solar panels, you would have to see the actual homes of both of us to understand that even though they may not have windows facing our home from there extension it will block out our sunlight with the way it will be situated plus we will basically just look out of our back door to bricks. I do object to being overshadowed and for that reason I strongly object to the side extension.

I've lived here 8 years and I know the only source of sun in our back garden comes from the side of our house and that would be totally affected by a 2 storey extension. I've explained to the neighbour I object to it for that reason so I ask please you take my objection and realise it's purely only due to the overshadowing and sunlight issue I object as my children when it's hot enough for in the back garden in a swimming pool and there will be no sun coming in if the extension goes ahead.

These windows are to the side of my home & you can see the neighbour's house through our bathroom window and landing window, both are on the side of our home where no17 wish to put a double storey extension, you can also see where the sun is and how it hits our back garden and in the picture with the sun you can see where it shines through no17's garden into ours and with an extension on it would block the sun from our side windows and from our back garden.

I've copied my housing officer into this email as you must understand although I am a tenant in this house my house is owned by them, I still object to a double storey high extension but looking at these photos I'm not sure if a single extension would also block my light.

Objector 2 – *I don't think the neighbour has thought about our neighbour at number 15, no light, will not be fair to them with a high extension. I think it unfair and they not thinking of them, it will let no light in the garden or home.*

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 but certain 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

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 two storey side, single storey front and single storey rear extension to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, design, appearance and impact upon existing levels of both residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The rear single storey element would have a depth of 4m, a width of 4.8m, an eaves height of 2.25m and a maximum height of 3.25m. It would be sited along the boundary shared with the adjoining semi, No19, and 0.7m from the boundary shared with no.15. The depth exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m) however this is by just 35cm and considering what can be built under Permitted Development this is not deemed significant. The single storey front extension would occupy the space in front of the two storey side extension and existing front door, projecting 2m, with a width of 4.98m, an eaves height of 2.2m and a ridge height of 2.5m. This is considered subservient and appropriately sited and scaled for the size of the house. The two storey side extension would be sited on the south-west elevation of the house, projecting 2.8m to the side, with an depth of 4.65m, stopping 1.5m short of the rear elevation and featuring a setback of 0.33m from the principal elevation. The eaves would match existing and the ridge would be set 0.55m lower than existing. It would be sited 1m from the boundary shared with No.15 at first floor and 0.7m at ground floor. The nominal setback, gap to the boundary and arrangement of the properties ensure the works should not result in a visual terracing effect and the development gap can be shared equally if this neighbour builds a similar extension in future. The extension is significantly stepped down at the ridge, set back from the principle elevation and less than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, thus it is considered subservient to the main house and appropriately sited and scaled, pursuant to policy DM1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed of brickwork, clay roof tiles and white uPVC windows/doors, all to match the existing house, which has been conditioned. The single storey front/side element would have a low mono-pitched roof, the two storey side would feature a hipped roof with a pitch to match existing and the rear would feature a mono-pitched roof containing a large glazed lantern. The side extension features a setback and lowered ridge to ensure a subservient appearance and protect the visual amenity of the house and area. Due to the orientation and arrangement of the property and neighbouring properties, the addition of a two storey side extension should not lead to a terracing effect nor form an obtrusive feature within the street scene. The extensions are to be built of suitable matching materials, are standard in design and considered in-keeping with the character of the house and wider estate, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential amenity – Objections were received from two local residents, both raising concerns relating to overshadowing of neighbouring gardens and properties, mainly in regards to the two storey side extension. There is 1 first floor window proposed for the side elevation facing No.15, which was originally proposed for the rear elevation however this was deemed to provide the opportunity for overlooking of No.15's rear garden to an unacceptable degree. Negotiations took place to move this to the side, where it would overlook the front garden at an oblique angle instead. No other side-facing windows are proposed, hence the privacy of surrounding occupiers should not be unduly impacted. The 4m single storey rear element is sited south-west of No.19, hence this neighbour would lose some evening sunlight to their rear, however this large garden extends 10m to the rear and 10m to the side, therefore plenty of this garden will receive sun throughout the day. The side extension would be sited south-east of No.15 and therefore the rear garden at this property would lose much of the afternoon sun it currently receives before it moves over the existing roofs, however the rear will still receive some early morning sun and this plot includes a large front and side garden which will receive lots of afternoon and evening sun. The original scheme featured a taller side element which came flush with the principal elevation and which was sited along the boundary with No.15, but following negotiations the ridge was dropped, the setback implemented and it was brought 1m away from the boundary. The gap between the first floor and No.15 would now be approx. 4.3m and it would not interrupt their outlook using the 45 degree rule, hence the revised proposal is not considered to cause undue overshadowing or loss of outlook, particularly given the windows

on the side elevation of No.15 are for a landing and bathroom. Therefore, on balance the revised scheme is considered acceptable in terms of its impacts upon residential amenity.

Parking and refuse – The off-street parking arrangement will remain as existing as the driveway is to be retained with space for 2 cars, which is more than adequate for a single family dwelling. A gap of 0.7m is to be retained to the boundary, providing access to the rear for the transport and storage of refuse bins, in line with policy DM1.

Conclusion – Although the proposal received objections, it broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and is not considered to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or character of the area. It is not located within a conservation area, the grounds of a listed building, a district centre nor on an arterial route into the city. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and works may commence in accordance with the following conditions and approved drawings.

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 'SB002', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 8th 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 hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the application form.

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

29 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE
27 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE
19 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE
15 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE
13 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1AE
18 Dennison Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GB

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk)
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH