

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130676/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 9 June 2021

Proposal: Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension together with installation of raised rear patio following the demolition of the existing outrigger

Address: 76 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XD

Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ucar, 76 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XD

Agent (if any): Mr Anil Mistry, Bricks & Pieces Ltd, Broadstone Mill, Broadstone Road, Stockport, SK5 7DL

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 18 August 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 27 July 2021

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 21 June 2021 Expired: 12 July 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 a single storey rear outrigger and the plot includes a front garden, driveway and rear garden containing a detached garage.

Description of area

Stephens Road, in Withington, is residential in nature and characterised by similar redbrick semi-detached family dwellinghouses with gardens. The area benefits from its proximity to Withington District Centre and Ladybarn Park.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a part single part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation, along with a new raised patio.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 – The principle of building a 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 extension would be sited on the south elevation of the house, replacing the existing outrigger and raised patio. It would project 4.8m at ground floor and 2.4 at first floor, with a width of 5.8m at ground floor and 2.88m at first floor. The single storey element would have an eaves height of 3m and a ridge height of 3.6m, and would leave a gap of 0.2m to the party wall (No.78) and a gap of 1.15m to the boundary shared with No.74. The first floor would have an eaves height to match existing and a ridge set 0.78m lower than the main ridge. The first floor would be sited 3.25m from the party wall shared with No.78 and 1.2m from the boundary shared with No.74. The replacement raised patio would extend 2.47m to the rear with a width of 3.8m and a height of 0.46m. It would leave a gap of 1m to the boundary shared with No.78 and the boundary fence is 2.1m high. The rearward depth of the first floor accords with policy DC1 (less than 3.65m). The ground floor exceeds this, however larger could be built (in isolation) under permitted development if no objections are received, which is the case for this application. 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 element would feature a dual-pitched roof containing 3no rooflights and the first floor would feature a dual-pitched roof containing 2no rooflights, with a pitch to match existing. The rear elevation would feature a bedroom window at first floor and a kitchen window plus set of glazed bi-folding doors opening onto the new patio. The side elevations would be blank aside from a ground floor window facing No.74 (as existing in the outrigger). The works would not be readily visible from Stephens Road and therefore would not feature within the street scene. The proposed matching 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 sited over 3m from the party wall to ensure the 45 degree rule applies, hence the outlook for both neighbouring properties should not be unduly impacted. The small projection at first floor (2.4m) ensures the extension would

not have an overbearing impact as viewed from neighbouring plots nor cause undue overshadowing of said plots, particularly as these rear gardens are long and south-facing. There are no windows proposed for either side elevation at first floor, therefore a loss of privacy is also not deemed an issue. In addition to this, no objections were received from local residents, hence the proposal is deemed acceptable in terms of its impact upon residential amenity.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and did not receive any objections. It is not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenity currently enjoyed by surrounding occupiers nor to the visual amenity of the house or area. The proposed development is therefore deemed acceptable and construction 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 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 titled 'Proposed plans and elevations', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 9th August 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

39 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XA
74 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XE
73 Heathside Road, Manchester, M20 4XH
71 Heathside Road, Manchester, M20 4XH
69 Heathside Road, Manchester, M20 4XH
78 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XD
41 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XB

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 (Middle)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH