

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131937/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 1 November 2021

Proposal: Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions to form additional living accommodation

Address: 58 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Chris Latchem 58 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ

Agent (if any): Sam Shaw Sam Shaw 15 York Drive, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 2EJ

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 25 November 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit:

Standard consultations:

Printed: 2 November 2021 Expired: 23 November 2021

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 2 November 2021 Expired: 23 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: NO

The application relates to a two-storey dwelling house (C3)of reddish-brown brick with a tiled gable roof. The property sits within a cul de sac location and has previously been extended to include a part single part double extension. The existing extension appears on a location plan that accompanied a previous planning application dated 2000.

Description of area

Lynnwood Road is residential in nature and lies within an estate of mixed house styles and materials in the Didsbury East Ward of Manchester.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a two-storey side and single storey rear extensions to form additional living accommodation.

Previous Site History

059298/FH/SOUTH2/00 Single storey side extension to form study. Refused.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were consulted, and no comments or objections were received.

TFGM Metrolink commented that they had no objection to the proposal.

Issues

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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, 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 not accord with the principles of this policy document.

Principle

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.

Residential amenity

The applicant proposes to erect a two-storey side and single storey rear extensions to form additional living accommodation

The property is located on at the head of a Cul de Sac within a predominantly residential area.

Single Storey Rear Extension

The single storey rear infill extension occupies the space between the existing extension and the common boundary with the adjoining property and has a rearward projection of 2.7metres. The proposed single storey roof at the highest point measures 3m and diminishes in height to 1.9 metres. On balance it is considered that the proposal does not appear to pose a significant impact in terms of visual amenity. Patio doors and a window and 2 no. roof lights will provide additional lighting to the extension. The proposed openings do not pose issues in terms of residential amenity; overlooking or privacy. A condition shall be applied to any approval regarding no further windows in any of the elevations.

Two Storey Side Extension.

The ground and first floor element of the proposal would be setback from the front wall of the property considerably extending along the side and terminating on the same plane as the original rear elevation of the dwelling house. The roof would be set down significantly from the existing ridge height and hipped to reflect the existing roof design of the property. No Windows would be located on the side. The two-storey extension brings built form closer to the non-adjoining property to the side of the application site however, due to the distance between the extension and the neighbouring property there is no overlooking or loss of privacy on the adjacent neighbouring properties.

Given the retained gap to the shared boundary of the adjacent semi-detached property and the distance between the properties and no properties to the rear of the application site together with the orientation of the property, it is not considered that the proposal would provide any undue harm caused by overshadowing or loss of light to the existing residential amenities for the occupiers. Furthermore, given the relationship to the adjacent property no. 60 Lynnwood Road and the setback provided by the extension, it is considered that the proposal would not provide terracing or any loss of amenity within the street scene.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and are considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Refuse Bins

Bins storage is not affected by this proposal as there is adequate space along the side for the movement and storage of bins and therefore the storage of refuse bins accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Off street car parking space would be retained to the site and therefore it is considered that car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

Design and Appearance

The proposed extension would not be highly visible within the street scene and therefore not considered to significantly alter the character of the original property. The applicant intends to match the materials with those of the existing house, therefore it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in design terms. The design of the roof was altered due to its unacceptable appearance and the amended proposal is considered to be a better design solution as it appears to knit into the host building .

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.

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 / agent in a positive and proactive manner to guide the application through all stages of the planning process and resolve any issues that arose in dealing with the planning application. Further information was sought from officers during the application and amendments were made to the proposal.

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:

21-025-004 Rev A, 21-025-007 Rev A, and the Location Plan, stamped as received on the 15 October 2021 and 21-025-006 Rev A, stamped as received 1 November 2021.

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 extension 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 drawing numbers 21-025-004 Rev A, stamped as received on the 15 October 2021 and 21-025-006 Rev A, stamped as received 1 November 2021.

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

Transport For Greater Manchester

60 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ

31 Bolton Avenue, Manchester, M19 1RP

56 Lynnwood Road, Manchester, M19 1RJ

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