

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 131160/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 27 July 2021
Proposal: Erection of two storey side and first floor rear extension to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 39 Harefield Drive, Manchester, M20 2SZ
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Keatley 39 Harefield Drive, Manchester, M20 2SZ
Agent (if any): David Allen GDA Design Associates Ltd 4 Oakleigh Court, Congleton, CW12 4NP
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 20th September 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	15.09.2021
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 30 July 2021 Expired: 20 August 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

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property which benefits from a front and rear garden. The rear garden slopes towards Didsbury allotments to the rear. There is also a driveway to the side of the property. The site benefits from a previous single storey rear projection and front extension.

The property is a 1930 semi-detached house and the property style is replicated across the street scene.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of area

The application site is situated in a popular residential area where the property type and sizes are the same. Didsbury allotments abuts the rear garden of the application site.

Description of development

Erection of two storey side and first floor rear extension to provide additional living accommodation

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. One letter has been received in respect of this application as follows:

- No objection, however, would not like to have the light from window removed

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 EN 19 - Waste Management
- 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 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.

History

There has been one previous application relating to this site as follows:

Planning reference number: 097430/FH/2011/S2 – for the erection of two storey front extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. This application was approved on 10.11.2011.

Residential Amenity

The applicant proposes to erect a two storey side and first floor rear extension to provide additional living accommodation

An objection has not been raised but comments have been made in relation to the loss of light to a window.

Ground floor

A resident has made comments that they do not wish to object to the proposal however has commented in relation to the loss of light to a side window. The applicant proposes to set back the ground floor significantly, extending along the side and projecting beyond the rear wall by 2.280m adjoining the existing ground floor rear extension forming a wrap around. The projection toward the side boundary would be 1.650m with a retained gap of 667mm to the shared boundary with no. 41 Harefield Drive. A window would be located on the front with a small window located on the side with a door to the rear and bi folding doors leading into the rear garden. Given the gap to the shared boundary together with the existing boundary treatment and the fact that there is a garage to the adjacent property no. 41, it is not anticipated that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by the side window.

First floor side and rear

The first floor element of the proposal would extend along the side wall of the house setback from the front wall significantly projecting beyond the rear wall by 2.280m in line with the ground floor element. A gap would be retained to the shared boundary with no. 41 Harefield Drive. Whilst it is acknowledged that there may be some loss of light first thing in the morning to no. 41, this is alleviated into the afternoon and evening and therefore given the gap retained to the boundary, height and projection this is considered to be acceptable in this case.

The extension would form a wrap around extending along the rear wall and up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 37 Harefield Drive. The applicant has angled the rear element of the wall along the boundary to reduce the expanse of brick along this element of the of the extension. The roof would be hipped to reflect the existing roof style of the property. Given the combined height and projection and the fact that the adjoining neighbour has an existing ground floor rear extension, it is not considered that the erection of a first floor extension up to the shared boundary would provide a harmful view to the occupiers of this property and therefore is considered to be acceptable in this case.

In terms of its size and given the proposed extensions location, it is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area and therefore is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity and is therefore considered to be in accordance with saved UDP policies DC1 and Core Strategy policy DM1.

Scale and Massing

The height and the location of the extension has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwellinghouse, is not excessively large or bulky and is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Design and Appearance

The application proposes a design that fits the aesthetic of the original dwelling utilising the space available at the side and rear of the property. It is proposed that where possible materials shall match the existing dwelling house. A materials condition has been attached to ensure that the materials are adhered to as stated in the application forms.

For the reasons stated above it is considered that the extension would be in keeping with the character of the original dwelling.

Car Parking

It is considered that the proposal does not affect the existing car parking provisions as car parking is still available on the front driveway.

Disabled access

Not affected by this proposal

Bins

The bins storage is not affected by this proposal as there is sufficient room to the side of the property.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be 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.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, 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

Positive and proactive working - 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.

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:

Revised plans received on 20th July 2021 numbered 21.12.02 Proposed Plans and Elevations

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 materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form/drawings in type, size, colour and texture.

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 structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

23 Westmorland Road, Manchester, M20 2UB

1 Granville Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SX

41 Harefield Drive, Manchester, M20 2SZ

37 Harefield Drive, Manchester, M20 2SZ

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) -

Green Belt Land - Greater Manchester Green Belt Local Plan 1984

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH