

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130941/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 8 July 2021

Proposal: Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension with Juliet balcony following demolition of existing conservatory, installation of a rear roof dormer and elevational alterations to front porch together with the erection of a single storey outbuilding within rear garden

Address: 170 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DY

Ward(s): Fallowfield Ward

Applicant: Arfat 170 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DY

Agent (if any): Mr Mo Iqbal 899 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3PG

Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 18th August 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	11 August 2021
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 15 July 2021 Expired: 5 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 site relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Fallowfield ward area of Manchester. The front has a projecting two storey element which forms the original design of this pair of semis. A front porch infills the ground floor making the front flush. Off road car parking space is to the front with small garden, access along the side and rear garden with the benefit of a single storey outbuilding along the shared boundary with the adjoining property no. 168. A conservatory is located to the rear.



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

Description of area

This is primarily a residential area in character

Description of development

Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension with Juliet balcony following demolition of existing conservatory, installation of a rear roof dormer and elevational alterations to front porch together with the erection of a single storey outbuilding within rear garden

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. One letter of support was in respect of this application was received. Summary of comments as follows;

- Considered the plans and support them
- The proposed extension will not impact upon quality of life and will enhance the area
- The extension is being carried out to accommodate a growing family

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 EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal does not accord 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 is no other application relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The applicant proposes to erect a part single/part two storey rear extension with Juliet balcony following demolition of existing conservatory, installation of a rear roof dormer and elevational alterations to front porch together with the erection of a single storey outbuilding within rear garden. The property benefits from an existing single storey rear extension and front porch.

Ground Floor

Following demolition of the existing conservatory, the proposal would project 3.9 metres off the rear wall of the house extending across the rear wall by 7.4 metres in total up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. 2 windows and double doors would be present on the rear. No windows are proposed on the side. There would be a mono pitch sloping roof on the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property.

First Floor

The first floor would project 3.9 metres off the wall extending across the rear by a total of 3.5 metres retaining a gap of approximately 3.8 metres to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property. The proposed roof will be hipped set down significantly from the existing roof height.

A Juliet balcony is proposed on the rear, however, as it is generally observed that this style of balcony has a similar effect as a window due to its design effectively being non projecting, this is considered to be acceptable and would not provide any further overlooking than that of a bedroom window.

Given the orientation of the host dwelling to the properties both side and the retained gaps to the boundaries, it is not anticipated that the proposed development will impact upon the existing levels of residential amenity currently being enjoyed by occupants of adjoining properties including loss of privacy, light or overshadowing.

Rear Dormer

The applicant proposes the erection of rear dormer as part of the scheme. This would be set down from the existing ridge height considerably and in from the side boundaries of the property. The dormer would be box type in design with the inclusion of two windows, however, it is not considered that the windows would provide any further overlooking than already existing from the rear bedroom windows.

Outbuilding

Following demolition of an existing detached outbuilding/garage, the applicant proposes a single storey detached outbuilding which would be located west of the site to the far end of the rear garden close to the rear boundaries of Gatley Avenue. The outbuilding would measure 5.5 metres in depth approximately and 4.5 metres in width. The total height measures approximately 2.9 and 3.1 metres respectively with a mono pitch sloping roof. Double doors and a door are proposed on the front elevation facing the rear of the property with high level windows proposed on the sides.

Front Porch

The applicant proposes to make elevational alterations to the front porch by rebuilding with brickwork and removing the large expanse of glazing and replacing with two small windows. Given that the size of porch to the front has already been established, it is not anticipated that the replacement with brick would provide a harmful view within the street scene. The changes are therefore considered to be an acceptable.

There have been no objections to this proposal, however one letter of support has been received. It is considered that the garden can accommodate an outbuilding of this size and although has a

close relationship to the rear boundaries, given the distance to back of properties together with height and size, it is not anticipated that the proposal would provide a visual impact on the occupiers surrounding properties. In addition, some properties within this area have detached garages although these vary in height and size.

Overall, the impression of subservience is achieved by the height of the proposed roof being set down from the height of the existing roof. Given the height, projection and relationship to adjacent properties, it is considered that the proportions of the extensions are acceptable. The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and are considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. In terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use brick and tile as specified in the application form. The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the rear and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Disabled access

Not applicable

Refuse Bins

Bins storage is not affected by the proposal as there is space to the side of the property for the movement of bins from the rear to the front which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Off street car parking space would be retained to the site and therefore it is considered that car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area is still retained and the proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwellinghouse and the proposal

is considered 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, or the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

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. The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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:

Received on 5th July 2021 numbered A101 Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 5th July 2021 numbered A102 Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 5th July 2021 numbered A103 Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 5th July 2021 numbered A108 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Outbuilding

Received on 8th July 2021 numbered A104 Rev A Proposed Front Elevations

Received on 8th July 2021 numbered A105 Proposed Elevations

Received on 8th July 2021 numbered A106 Rev A Proposed Side Elevation

Received on 8th July 2021 numbered A107 Rev A Proposed Side 2 Elevation

Received on 5th July 2021 site layout plan identifying location of proposed outbuilding

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 of the hereby permitted development and outbuilding 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.

4) The outbuilding as shown on the approved drawing as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 5th July 2021 shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 170 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DY.

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

20 Gatley Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HE
22 Gatley Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HE
168 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DY
173A Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DX
171A Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DX
24 Gatley Avenue, Manchester, M14 7HE
172 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DY
175 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DX
173 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DX
171 Lloyd Street South, Manchester, M14 7DX

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 (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH