

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131625/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 22 September 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, together with installation of rear roof dormer to form additional living accommodation

Address: 45 Corkland Road, Manchester, M21 8XG

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr Edward Hogarth, 45 Corkland Road, Manchester, M21 8XG

Agent (if any): Mr Chris Baker, 45 Corkland Avenue, Manchester, M21 8XG

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: 29 September 2021 Expired: 20 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 tall two storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red brick with a gable slate roof, two storey original outrigger to the rear and bay windows to the front. The plot includes a driveway and front and rear gardens.

Description of area

Corkland Road in Chorlton is residential in nature and characterised by similar Victorian semis. The area benefits from its close proximity to a metrolink stop and the district centre.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey side and rear extension and rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – One letter of objection was received:

I would like to object to the use of Juliet style balcony doors to the rear of the loft extension. This would directly overlook my garden and patio area and substantially intrude on my privacy. I would ask for a window instead. This incidentally is what the neighbouring property has so the statement that the loft extension would mirror that of the neighbours is inaccurate. I would add also that the proposed loft rear extension with Juliet style doors would likely afford my neighbours a view through my kitchen windows, possibly even from their bed. This can easily be remedied and loss of privacy minimised with a window.

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, 2018)

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

Siting, scale and massing – The flat roofed single storey extension would project c.2.3m beyond the main side elevation with a depth of 9.2m, though it would stop short of the rear elevation of the original outrigger, with a maximum height of 3.2m. The extension would be sited 1m from the boundary shared with No.47 and would feature a 1.6m setback from the principal elevation. Beyond the rear elevation, infilling the space adjacent to the outrigger, would be an external bbq area. The box dormer would be sited within the main rear slope, projecting 3.3m with a width of 4.4m, a height of 2.2m and a resulting volume less than 16 cubic metres. The dormer would be set in 0.36m from the gable, set down 0.18m from the ridge and set 0.86m in from the eaves. The dimensions of the side and rear extension would almost accord with the GPDO (2015) if the two elements were considered separately, due to the rearward projection not exceeding 3m and the side projection not exceeding half the width of the dwellinghouse, as could the small dormer. The rearward depth also accords with that which is stipulated within policy DC1, of 3.65m. These additions are considered subservient to the host dwelling, similar to nearby works and sited appropriately, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension and dormer would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red brickwork to the extension and concrete hanging tiles to the dormer face and cheeks, along with white uPVC windows and doors. The materials have been conditioned. The extension would have a flat roof with a small parapet and the dormer would have a sloping single ply roof. The front elevation of the extension would feature a small window, the side would contain a door and the rear elevation would feature a set of bi-folding doors opening onto the patio via a wide step. The dormer would contain two windows, one being a juliet balcony, both rear-facing. Many properties along Corkland Road have single storey infill extensions and dormers, therefore a precedent has long been set in this area of Chorlton. The front elevation of the side extension would be the only element readily visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene, however as the proportions and materials are in-keeping with the original property, and appear similar to

other properties in the vicinity, the appearance of the development is considered acceptable and is not thought to significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor wider area, the latter of which is not a conservation area.

Residential amenity – The extension only has the potential to affect the neighbour to the side, No.47, however due to the orientation, 1m gap to the boundary and the existence of a single storey side extension next door, the proposal is not considered to cause harm to this neighbour's residential amenity. There would be no-side facing windows, hence privacy is not deemed an issue. However, an objection was received from a local resident in relation to the Juliet balcony, which they voiced concerns regarding its view into neighbouring windows. This window would be set 6m further back than the existing rear bedroom window, therefore it is not considered to impede on surrounding residents' privacy. Due to the scale and siting of the proposal and the size of the gardens, it is not considered that the proposal would cause undue harm to residential amenity.

Refuse – A gap of 1m is to be left to the side boundary, therefore refuse bins can remain stored at the rear. The driveway will be reduced in length, however space for 1 car off-street will remain, in accordance with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal accords with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and although it received an objection, on balance the development is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. The proposal is deemed acceptable and development may commence 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. No significant

problems have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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 drawings numbered '(20)001 B', '(20)002', '(20)003' and '(20)100 B', all stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority with the application form on the 10th September 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 extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted 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

38 Corkland Road, Manchester, M21 8XA
40 Corkland Road, Manchester, M21 8XA
47 Corkland Road, Manchester, M21 8XG
43 Corkland Road, Manchester, M21 8XG
1 Devonshire Road, Manchester, M21 8XB

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
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH