

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130176/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 10 May 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 137 Nesfield Road, Manchester, M23 0HR

Ward(s): Brooklands Ward

Applicant: Ritchie, 137 Nesfield Road, Manchester, M23 0HR

Agent (if any): Kimberley Smith, Urban Road Architects, 91 Urban Road, Sale, M33 7TS

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 16 July 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 July 2021

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 14 May 2021 Expired: 4 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 mid-terraced C3 dwellinghouse of brownish-red brickwork and roof tiles. The property features a single storey rear outrigger and has a shared ginnel providing access to the gardens of both No's 137 and 139. The plot includes a paved front garden/driveway and a rear garden.

Description of area

Nesfield Road is residential in nature and characterised by modest terraced family dwellinghouses and purpose built blocks of apartments. The area lies within Brooklands and benefits from its proximity to Northern Moor metrolink station.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey rear extension adjoining the existing outrigger, to create additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – One letter, neither supporting nor objecting to the development, was received:

I have no objection to a single storey rear extension, but have a 'shared access' with a fence dividing the two gardens. If erected too near to my house, could block direct sunlight? Unsure? Or impede my privacy, i.e. noise level etc. However, I am under the impression from my neighbour, she has taken this into account and has considered having the extension more

towards the kitchen area, rather than the actual fencing. This would hopefully sort the problem, and would be happy with that plan.

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 single 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 project from the rear elevation of the house as well as the side elevation of the original 4m outrigger, facing north-west. The rearward depth would be 3m, with a width of 4.56m, a height to eaves of 2.7m and a maximum height of 3.58m. It would infill the space between the outrigger and ginnel, leaving a gap to the boundary shared with No.139 of 0.85m. In terms of its dimensions the extension would be considered permitted development (under the Larger Homes Extension scheme) if it didn't adjoin the outrigger. The extension would infill a space in the existing footprint and the rearward depth accords with that which is stipulated in policy DC1 (3.65m) and does not project beyond the outrigger, therefore the scale and siting of the extension is considered acceptable.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed from mixed red brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC to match the existing dwellinghouse. The extension would feature a dual-pitched roof containing two rooflights, with a small rear facing gable. The rear elevation would feature a window and a set of glazed sliding doors opening onto the 0.28m high decking. The design of the proposal is standard for this type of development, constructed of matching materials and is considered acceptably in-keeping with development in this area. The development would not be visible from the highway and therefore will not feature within the Nesfield Road street scene and the property is not located within a conservation area, hence the visual amenity of the house and area are not considered to be harmed by these works, pursuant to policies DM1, DC1 and SP1.

Residential amenity – The extension, by way of its siting, orientation and scale, is not considered to significantly affect the levels of residential amenity currently enjoyed by the

surrounding occupiers. The adjoining property to the north-west, No.139, should not experience a noticeable loss of sunlight as these gardens face north-west and the eaves at just 2.7m high sited 0.85m from the shared boundary. There are no windows proposed for the side elevation, therefore it would not impede the neighbours' privacy. One comment was received relating to a potential loss of light but it sounded as if the resident had not actually viewed the plans as the comment was vague and questioning. It also raised the question of shared access, however the ginnel is to remain unaffected and access to the neighbouring garden would not be impeded in any way. In addition to this, no objections have been received, thus the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impacts on residential amenity.

Conclusion – The storage of refuse and provision of off-street parking remain as existing, though a new bin store has been provided on the site plan, sited on the driveway. The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1 and SP1 and the NPPF, did not receive any objections and is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or area, therefore the development is deemed acceptable and 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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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 drawings numbered '005' and '006', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 26th April 2021, and drawing numbered '007 Rev2' stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 10th 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 permitted shall match those of the existing building, as specified 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

1 Marsett Walk, Manchester, M23 0HJ
44 Nesfield Road, Manchester, M23 0JD
42 Nesfield Road, Manchester, M23 0JD
139 Nesfield Road, Manchester, M23 0HR
135 Nesfield Road, Manchester, M23 0HR
2 Sedgefield Walk, Manchester, M23 0HH

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) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH