

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130793/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 5 July 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension following demolition of existing to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 116 Parkville Road, Manchester, M20 4TZ

Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Mr Richard Emmott 116 Parkville Road, Manchester, M20 4TZ

Agent (if any):

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: 12 July 2021 Expired: 2 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 Withington ward area of Manchester. The property has a hipped concrete tiled roof. Bay windows are to the front with recessed arch entrance. The property is built in brick on ground floor and render at first floor.



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

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature

Description of development

Erection of a single storey extension following demolition of existing 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. No comments, objections or representations in respect of this application were received

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 is one other application relating to this site as follows:

Planning reference number; 130577/PDE/2021 for Prior notification of proposed larger home extension projecting 5.39m to the rear with a maximum height of 4m and a height at eaves of 3m. This application was turned away on 09.06.2021

Residential Amenity

The rear of the property has a timber extension which does not form part of the original build. However, the property benefits from a single-storey brick rearward projection which is typical of the house styles in the locality and an obvious original element of the dwellinghouse.

The applicant proposes a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and original rear projection. The extension would project off the rear wall by 5.3 metres extending across the rear up to the side wall of the property retaining a gap to the shared boundary with no. 118 Parkville Road. The roof would be a dual pitch roof with the installation of 6 x no. roof lights. Bi folding doors are proposed on the rear with a window on the side elevation facing the adjacent property no. 118. A gap is retained to the shared boundary with this property, however given that there is a window to the side located within a rear projection on the adjacent property, a condition has been attached to ensure that there is no loss of privacy or overlooking given by the introduction of a window in this location.

Although the extension projects further than what DC1 policy would allow, there have not been any objections. It is considered that given the orientation of the property together with the fact that the proposal is single storey, there would be no overshadowing or loss of light as a result of the proposal.

The extension extends the width of the property and up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 114 Parkville Road and not beyond the side wall, however given that the property has an existing projection, together with the fact that a structure in this location has already been established, it is not anticipated that there would be a significant loss of light or overshadowing to the neighbouring properties which will impact upon the existing levels of residential amenity currently being enjoyed by occupants of adjoining properties.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and would not feature within the street scene, however, the character of the property would be retained and therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area. The proposal therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policy DC1

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. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is therefore 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 is in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the materials, these are set to match existing; as specified in the application form/drawings. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

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

The storage of refuse bins are not affected by the proposal, as there would be continued access to the rear, which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Not affected by this proposal.

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, EN3 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. 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 18th June 2021 numbered 03 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Received on 5th July 2021 numbered 04A Proposed 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.

4) Before first occupation the windows in the side elevation of the extension facing no. 118 shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

114 Parkville Road, Manchester, M20 4TZ
82 Cotton Hill, Manchester, M20 4XR
21 Parkville Road, Manchester, M20 4TX
118 Parkville Road, Manchester, M20 4TZ
19 Parkville Road, Manchester, M20 4TX
80 Cotton Hill, Manchester, M20 4XR

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) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH