

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130857/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 20 July 2021

Proposal: Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension and front porch following demolition of existing garage structure and proposed annexe.

Address: 91 Buckingham Road, Manchester, M21 0QT

Ward(s): Chorlton Ward

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Campbell, 91 Buckingham Road, Manchester, M21 0QT

Agent (if any): Mrs Jade Taylor-Daly, AJ Architectural, 70 Oak Street, Southport, PR8 6AL

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 5 November 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 September 2021

Standard consultations: Printed: 13 August 2021 Expired: 3 September 2021

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 13 August 2021 Expired: 3 September 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 reddish-brown brickwork, red tiles and white render, with a hipped roof and rounded bay windows. The property has not been previously extended and the plot includes a large paved front garden/driveway and a large lawned rear garden.

Description of area

Buckingham Road is residential in nature and characterised by well-sized semi-detached family dwellinghouses with gardens. It benefits from its proximity to Chorlton District Centre which features a tram stop, supermarket and many bars, shops and eateries.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a two storey side, single storey front and rear extension along with re-built outbuilding forming ancillary annexe in the rear garden, to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments received.

Transport For Greater Manchester – TfGM had no objection to the proposal in principal but provided 7 conditions to attach to an approval in order to protect the metrolink line which runs behind the property.

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 and rear outbuilding to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse 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 rear single storey element would have a depth of 3m, a width of 8.1m, an eaves height of 2.5m and a maximum height of 3.5m. This accords with policy DC1 which stipulates rear extensions should not exceed 3.65m in depth. The single storey front extension would occupy the space in front of the two storey side extension and existing front door, projecting 1.4m, with a width of 2.2m, an eaves height of 2.46m and a ridge height of 3m. This is considered subservient and appropriately sited and scaled for the size of the house, particularly as its footprint is 3m² and therefore can be built under Permitted Development. The two storey side extension would be sited on the south-west elevation of the house, projecting 1.97m to the side, with an depth of 10m to come flush with the original rear. The eaves would match existing and the ridge would be set 0.3m lower than existing. The first floor side element would be setback from the principle elevation by 0.36m and would be sited 0.9m from the boundary shared with No.89. The nominal setback, gap to the boundary and orientation 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 stepped down at the ridge, set back from the principle elevation and accords with the dimensions set out in DC1, thus it is considered subservient to the main house and appropriately sited. The annexe would occupy the same 36m² footprint as the existing outbuilding, along the boundary shared with No.89, with a width of 6, depth of 6m, eaves height of 2.65m and ridge height of 4m. It would feature a deck with a depth of 1.5m and a height of 0.15m. The outbuilding would be taller than existing but is not considered too large given the size of the garden and its siting.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed of brickwork, roof tiles and white uPVC windows/doors, all to match the existing house, which has been conditioned. The extension features windows at first and ground floor in the front, side and rear elevations, to match existing, as well as a wide set of bi-folding doors opening onto the garden, with 3no rooflights within the mono-pitched roof of the single storey element. The hipped roof over the

side element would be pitched to match the existing roof. The 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, particularly given the other side of the semi, No.93, already features its own (wider) historic two storey side extension (under ref 036488), hence the proposal would re-balance the semi. The garden annexe would also be constructed of brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC which is considered appropriate and would be an improvement on the current structure which features pebbledash concrete and corrugated roofing. The extension and outbuilding are to be built of matching materials, are standard in design and considered in-keeping with the character of the house and area, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential amenity – There is 1 window proposed for the side elevation facing No.89, however this is at ground floor and is high-level, sited 2.1m above ground level, hence the privacy of surrounding occupiers should not be impacted. The 3m single storey rear element is sited 2.3m from the party wall, to match that of No.93, which should not overshadow the neighbouring plots. The side extension and annexe would be sited north of No.89 and therefore should not cause an undue loss of light for the neighbouring property or garden. Due to the 0.9m gap to the boundary and the fact the two storey side extension does not extend past the original rear elevation, the proposal should also not appear overbearing for No.89. In addition to this, no objections were received from local residents, thus the proposal 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 0.9m 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 – The proposal complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, did not receive any objections and it 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. Minor 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 drawings numbered '02' and '03', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 24th June 2021 and revised drawings numbered '04 Rev A' (Annexe Elevations and Site Plan) stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 1st October 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.

4) The annexe hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 91 Buckingham Road, M21 0QT.

Reason: To ensure the proposed use remains ancillary to the principle use on the site. In the interest of residential amenity, in accordance with the policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

5) Excavation is not to be carried out greater than 1m deep within 1m of the Metrolink operational boundary or any piling works within the zone of influence without notifying Metrolink in advance and obtaining their approval. Any such works may require track monitoring to be carried out as agreed with Metrolink and at the cost to the developer.

Reason - To ensure that the development does not adversely affect the track alignment and therefore the operation of Metrolink, pursuant to policies T1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

6) Works to the outbuilding shall not take place, including any works of demolition, until a basic Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by Manchester City Council. Further details can be found via the Metrolink Website at; <https://www.tfgm.com/public-transport/tram/working-safely>

Reason - To ensure safe methods of working to meet the safety requirements of working above and adjacent to the Metrolink system, as specified in policies T1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

7) Works to the outbuilding shall not take place until a geotechnical report to confirm that the works will not adversely affect the stability of the Metrolink cutting slope has been submitted to and approved in writing by Manchester City Council. Developer to pay for slope monitoring during works to ensure that construction works do not adversely affect the Metrolink cutting slope stability.

Reason: To protect the integrity of Metrolink infrastructure pursuant to policies T1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

8) Works to the outbuilding shall not take place until a detailed design for the drainage of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risks associated with water run-off which may affect Metrolink infrastructure and tramway pursuant to Policies DM1 and T1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the policies and guidance within the NPPF and NPPG.

9) Works to the outbuilding shall not take place until full details of any changes to the boundary treatment adjacent to the Metrolink tramway have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that a safe and secure boundary treatment is installed on the boundary of the Metrolink, pursuant to policies T1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

10) Works to the outbuilding shall not take place until full details of the root protection to the trees located within the Metrolink boundary have been submitted to, and approved in writing by Manchester City Council, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To protect trees against root damage and to maintain the status quo with regards the stability of the cutting slope, pursuant to policies T1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

11) Works to the outbuilding shall not take place until a scheme for acoustically insulating the proposed development against noise and vibration from the adjacent Metrolink line has been submitted to and approved in writing by Manchester City Council as local planning authority. The approved noise insulation scheme shall be completed before the use of the development commences.

Reason - To secure a reduction in noise from Metrolink in order to protect future residents from noise nuisance, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Transport For Greater Manchester

89 Buckingham Road, Manchester, M21 0QT

93 Buckingham Road, Manchester, M21 0QT

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 (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH