

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130277/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 13 May 2021

Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension and part single storey and part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 23 Athol Road, Manchester, M16 8QW

Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Zeb, 23 Athol Road, Manchester, M16 8QW

Agent (if any): Mr Daniel Vaughan, Campagna Ltd, 43 Bagshaw Street, Hyde, SK14 4TN

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 August 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 August 2021

Standard consultations: Printed: 21 May 2021 Expired: 11 June 2021

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 21 May 2021 Expired: 11 June 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 features bay windows to the front and a single storey kitchen outrigger to the rear, with no previous extensions. The plot includes a driveway to the front and long garden to the rear.

Description of area

Athol Road is residential in nature and located within the Whalley Range ward off Alexandra Road South, between the Fallowfield Loop and Wilbraham Road. The area benefits from its proximity to several major bus routes and Hough End playing fields.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey side and part single part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents – One objector submitted two objections:

- *The proposed rear two storey extension would block the only view of greenery that we have from our kitchen window, and would greatly reduce the amount of light to our kitchen.*
- *I note that the size of the living accommodation is increasing. There are some problems with parking around 23 Athol Road. If the increase in living accommodation results in a*

corresponding increase in vehicles at the property, this is going to present a problem on the street.

- Our house has previously been underpinned (2003), adjacent to the corner of the proposed two storey extension and rear part of the side extension. I am concerned that any significant building work in this area could affect the underpinning to our property, as the proposed works come approximately a metre closer to us than the current building.*
- The proposed 50cm gap between the proposed side extension and our boundary fence seems inadequate for keeping this area clear and free of any rubbish.*
- The new proposed side extension is shown on the plans at 500mm from the existing boundary line and the foundations will be even closer; as this is within a distance of 3m from our neighbouring property is the excavation of the new foundations in line with The Party Wall Act 1996 and has a party wall surveyor been appointed to help mitigate risk? How deep is the proposed new excavation for the foundations and can it be guaranteed it will not adversely affect our property which has been underpinned in that area? We were also wondering how this excavation work is going to be carried out in such a confined space to the existing fence on the boundary line, and how much disruption the construction would cause to us as it is likely to take a number of months.*

MCC Flood Risk Management – Due to the location within flood zone 2, the FRM team requested that the applicant submit a flood risk statement. However, given the relatively small footprint of the extension and the fact the agent has shown the FFL as in line with existing (270mm) a statement/assessment was considered onerous. Their sustainable drainage informative has been attached.

Policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP 1995) - 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):

- 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 single storey side and part single, part two 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, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The side and rear extension would be sited on the east and south elevations of the house, projecting 3m to the rear at both ground floor and first floor, with a width of 6.6m, and 0.95m to the side at ground floor. The single storey side aspect would have an eaves height of 2.57m and a maximum height of 3.38m, occupying the full depth of the property and leaving a 0.5m gap to the boundary shared with No.25. The rear element would have an eaves height of 2.9m and ridge height of 3.3m at ground floor and an eaves height to match existing at first floor, with a ridge set 1.1m lower than the main ridge. The first floor would be sited along the boundary with the adjoining semi (No.21) for 2m, then stepped 3.3m away for a further 1m. The property lies within Flood Zone 2 and the agent has indicated on the plans that the FFL will be no lower than existing (270mm). The rearward depth of the extension accords with policy DC1 (less than 3.65m) and the side element (in isolation) could be built under permitted development. The extension is considered subservient to the main house and is sited and scaled appropriately, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red facing brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC windows/doors, which has been conditioned. The single storey elements would feature mono-pitched roofs and the first floor would feature a low double hipped projection with pitches to match existing. The rear elevation would feature 2no bedroom windows at first floor and a set of glazed sliding doors opening onto the garden at ground floor. The side elevation facing the adjoining semi No.21 would be blank and the side facing No.25 would contain 1 door and a small utility window. The rear extension would not be readily visible from Athol Road, thus the only element to feature within the street scene would be the single storey side, which is small in scale and built of matching materials with no fenestration, hence it would not form a prominent feature. The proposed materials are appropriate, and the design is to be expected of such development, therefore the appearance of the development is considered acceptable and is not thought to harm the visual amenity of the house nor wider area.

Residential amenity – The first floor aspect would be stepped away from the party wall to ensure the 45 degree rule applies, hence the outlook for both No.21 and No.25 should not be unduly impacted. The low hipped roofs and projection, of 2m and 3m, ensure the extension would not have an overbearing impact as viewed from neighbouring plots nor cause undue overshadowing of said plots, particularly as the rear gardens are over 20m long. There are no windows proposed for either side elevation at first floor, therefore a loss of privacy is also not deemed an issue.

Two objections were received, from one local resident, which cited concerns over excavations and impact upon neighbouring foundations, the proximity of the side extension to a shared boundary, the potential increase in occupancy and pressure on the highway for parking, loss of sunlight and loss of a view. The side extension is proposed to be 0.5m from the shared boundary which is considered appropriate, considering an extension could be built along the boundary itself under permitted development. Any overshadowing would occur at No.21 due to the orientation, though given the size of the gardens and scale of the extensions this is not deemed significant. Regarding parking and occupancy, the property is gaining 1 bedroom and is to remain a C3 family dwellinghouse, which will retain 2 off-street parking spaces on the driveway which is more than adequate. The issues relating to the party wall/fence and foundations are civil matters which need to be dealt with between neighbours or with a party wall surveyor. On balance the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impacts upon residential amenity.

Conclusion – The proposal complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF. Although it received objections, they carried limited weight and the proposal has been assessed as causing less than significant harm to the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring

occupiers. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and construction may continue 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 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 '280321', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 25th May 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.

4) The bin store shown on drawing '280321', stamped as received on the 25th May 2021, shall be implemented and be in place prior to the first use of the extension and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

Informatives

1) MCC records highlight that the underground Dog Kennel Brook is located within close proximity to the site (approximately 40m to the west of the site), while our records are frequently updated to ensure the highest level of accuracy, the records cannot guarantee 100% accuracy for all MCC underground assets. Therefore, we would request that the applicant informs the onsite contractor to remain observant and to take the appropriate safety precautions during excavation works. If any major unknown drainage assets are found beneath the site, then further investigation works should take place to identify the asset and MCC should be contacted immediately.

The applicant should design and construct drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. We recommend considering green SuDS components to mitigate for any loss of permeable area.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

Vida Range Stadium, Whalley Range High School, Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M16 8GW
34 Athol Road, Manchester, M16 8QN
25 Athol Road, Manchester, M16 8QW
21 Athol Road, Manchester, M16 8QW

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)

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle)

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle)

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH