

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130011/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 16 April 2021

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension, porch to front, installation of dormer to rear, conversion of roof from hip to gable and associated roof lights to front, enlargement of existing window to side, to form additional living accommodation

Address: 4 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD

Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Mr Tahir Ishaq, 4 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD

Agent (if any): N/a

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 1 July 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10 June 2021

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 22 April 2021 Expired: 13 May 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 with white rendered elevations and a red tiled hipped roof featuring a front gable. The property has not previously been extended. The plot includes a front garden, driveway and rear garden.

Description of area

Westdale Gardens is a residential cul-de-sac of similar white rendered family dwellinghouses arranged in pairs, located close to Errwood Road in Burnage.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a part single, part two storey rear extension along with a porch to the front, hip to gable roof alteration and a rear dormer, to form additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – Two letters of objection were received:

Objection 1 - Regarding the proposed planning application to extend the property at 4 Westdale Gardens, we wish to oppose the submitted plans we have received. Our reasons for this would be the position, size and density of a 2 storey extension to the back of number 4 Westdale Gardens, would most definitely impact daylight and shadowing onto our property. The whole of the planned extensions to the back of the property including the dormer extension in the roof would be a blot on the surrounding area/landscape whichever way you looked at it

from. The space between/side of these properties is not massive and they are quite close together.

Objection 2 - I am writing to appeal against the proposed rear development. Neighbours will incur substantial loss of daylight/sunlight, and overshadowing in back gardens (mainly due to the height and length of the proposed development). In addition, this will also have a huge impact on my main living area at the rear of the house. This will significantly reduce any daylight and in short, I will be looking at a brick wall through my patio window. The proposed development for the rear is overbearing, out of scale and also out of character in terms of its appearance, compared with existing houses in this area. Currently no other properties in Westdale Gardens have such an unimposing and significant impact on a neighbour. In addition there will be high level of activity required at the rear, which will generate extremely loud noise disturbance.

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, 2019):

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 – Extending a family dwellinghouse, via a part single part two storey rear extension, porch, hip to gable and dormer, in order to provide additional living accommodation is acceptable in principle, however, consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale, design, appearance and impact upon both residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The rear extension would project 3m at both first and ground floor, occupying the full width of the house at ground floor with a width of 3.7m at first floor. The single storey element would have an eaves height of 2.8m and a maximum height of 3.7m whilst the first floor projection would have a ridge set 1.5m lower than the main ridge. The first floor would be sited 2.77m from the party wall shared with No.2 and 1.55m from the boundary shared with No.6 (and therefore approx. 3.1m from No.6's rear elevation). The depth of the rear extension accords with that which is stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) and the first floor element leaves adequate gaps to shared boundaries.

The hip to gable alteration would extend the ridge by 3.3m, creating an additional volume of 9 cubic metres and the rear dormer would have a width of 5.7m, depth of 3.1m and height of 2m, creating an additional 17.6 cubic metres, which forms 26.6m³ in total. The dormer would be setback from the eaves by 0.57m and set in from each side by 0.4m. Originally the dormer was

greater in width and extended from the party wall and although the works could be built under permitted development normally, due to the dormer adjoining the roof of the two storey extension it could not be built without permission in this case, therefore negotiations took place to reduce its width so ensure a more subservient addition.

The porch would occupy an existing space in the footprint at the front, within a stepped principal elevation. It would have a width of 2.75m, a depth of 1.8m, and a maximum height of 3.3m. It would not extend beyond the original front and side elevations of the property and is considered subordinate, particularly as many properties already have similarly scaled porches.

An objector stated that the extensions would be 'out of scale' and another stated they would be sited 'too close' to neighbouring properties, however the extensions accord with policies DC1, DM1 and SP1 and are considered subservient to the host dwelling and sited and scaled appropriately.

Design and visual amenity – The works would utilise materials to match the existing dwellinghouse including white render, red roof tiles, hanging tiles to the dormer and white uPVC windows and doors. This has been conditioned. The single storey rear element would have a mono-pitched tiled roof containing a rooflight above a set of bi-folding doors. The first floor element would have a low hipped roof with a pitch to match existing, above a bedroom and a bathroom window. The side elevations would form blank walls. The porch would feature a hipped roof and glazing round the corner, along with a front door. The dormer would be clad in matching tiles with a flat roof and 2 windows and the front roof slope would contain 3 rooflights, projecting no more than 15cm from the plane of the slope.

Due to the siting at the rear and the relatively narrow gap between these properties, the dormer and two storey extension would not be readily visible from the highway and the porch is standard in design and scale, hence neither would form prominent features within the street scene of Westdale Gardens. The hip to gable alteration would however, given it would be the first hip to gable in this estate. The alteration can be carried out under permitted development therefore the fallback position with this element of the proposal would be the same. An objector stated that the works would form a 'blot on the landscape', however it is considered that as the design is in-keeping with the rest of the property and the proposed materials are to match the appearance of the revised proposal is considered acceptable and is not thought to significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor area, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Residential amenity – The orientation of the rear elevation is north-west-facing, therefore the adjoining semi No.2 is sited north of the rear extension and therefore may experience a loss of sunlight from midday until the evening, however this is not deemed significant given 3m rear extensions can be built under permitted development and the first floor element, with its low hipped roof, is sited 2.77m from the party wall/boundary. This property will still receive later evening sunlight. Given the distance to the shared boundary and orientation north, the adjacent property No.6 should not suffer an undue loss of sunlight. The objectors raised concerns regarding loss of outlook and overbearing impacts, however the 45 degree rule shows neither neighbour would have their outlook unduly impacted by the extensions and adequate gaps to the boundaries have been left which ensures this 3m projection would not form an overbearing feature as viewed from either adjoining property. In addition to this, the side elevations are blank, hence overlooking is not deemed an issue. Although objections were received, upon assessing the proposal it is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Conclusion – The proposal complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, it received no objections of sufficient weight and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor significantly harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. 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 agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. 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 drawings numbered '102', '103' and '105', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 28th June 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, dormer and hip to gable alteration hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form and elevational drawings.

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

60 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JE
1 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JA
6 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
2 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
5 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JA
3 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JA

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