

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130360/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 24 May 2021

Proposal: Installation of rear dormer and erection of first floor side extension to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 8 Willoughby Avenue, Manchester, M20 6AS

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Bernadette Lomas, 8 Willoughby Avenue, Manchester, M20 6AS

Agent (if any): Ian Grainger, Blu Room Architecture, 5 Uplands Road, Darlington, DL3 7SZ

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 2nd August 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	14 July 2021
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 4 June 2021 Expired: 25 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

The application site is a semi-detached, bay-fronted dwelling house of traditional design and construction situated on the south side of Willoughby Avenue in the Didsbury East ward. There is an existing garage at ground floor to the side and a single storey outrigger which is characteristic of this dwelling type in the local area.



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

Description of area

The surrounding area is largely residential comprising houses of a similar typology, some with extensions to the side.

Description of development

Installation of rear dormer and erection of first floor side extension to provide additional living accommodation

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 – no response has been received in respect of this application.

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

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 are no previous applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

Following raised concerns by the City Council, the agent amended the proposal by providing a larger setback at first floor from the front wall.

The applicant proposes to erect a rear dormer and erection of first floor side extension to provide additional living accommodation. The site benefits from an existing single storey side and rear extension which extends partway across the rear wall. A first floor side extension would be constructed over an existing garage. The extension would face the side elevation of no.10 which has also undergone enlargement to the side retaining a gap to the shared boundary with the application site.

First Floor

The extension on the side would be setback from the front wall of the property by 1.0 metres set down from the height of the original ridge height. The proposal would extend along the side above the existing ground floor extension and would end at the rear wall of the property. The footprint of the garage leaves a 600mm gap to the shared boundary and this would be retained. A window is proposed on the front elevation and therefore it is considered that there would be no overlooking or loss of privacy.

Given that the roof height would be lower than original roof height together with the gap to the shared boundary with no.10 Willoughby Avenue of approximately 600mm, it is considered that this together with the setback would be sufficient to reduce terracing within the street scene which will be sufficient to maintain the character of the street. No windows are proposed on the side elevation at first floor, so no privacy issues will arise from the proposal.

The roof

The applicant proposes the installation of a rear dormer window which would be set within the original roof space not encroaching into the first floor rear extension and set down from the ridge height of the original roof height in from the side walls of the house. Two windows are proposed which overlooks the rear garden. Given the distance to rear boundaries it is not anticipated that there would be any further overlooking afforded by these windows than already exist from the rear windows at first floor.

The City Council considers the change to the roof design as acceptable especially given that the ridge height is no higher than the existing property. This is considered to be an acceptable addition to the roof of the property and is therefore considered would not provide a detrimental outlook on the adjoining properties or the surrounding area and is therefore considered acceptable in this location and is not believed to impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

Overall, the extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene. The character of the area although has undergone some changes, has been retained with houses in the immediate vicinity themselves altered and extended. It is therefore considered that the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension and rear dormer 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.

The proposal complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and 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 would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching brick and tile as specified on the proposed application forms. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not unduly 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.

Refuse Storage

Existing arrangements are not altered by the proposal and therefore it is considered that the storage of refuse bins would remain within the garage space to the side of the property.

Parking

The existing car parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal, a driveway is still retained at the front of the property.

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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application.

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:

Stamped received on 2nd August 2021 numbered 04 Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Stamped received on 2nd August 2021 numbered 05 A Proposed First floor Plan

Stamped received on 2nd August 2021 numbered 06 A Proposed Loft Floor Plan

Stamped received on 2nd August 2021 numbered 07A 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 of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building 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 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

13 Adria Road, Manchester, M20 6SQ
11 Adria Road, Manchester, M20 6SQ
3 Willoughby Avenue, Manchester, M20 6AS
10 Willoughby Avenue, Manchester, M20 6AS
6 Willoughby Avenue, Manchester, M20 6AS
15 Adria Road, Manchester, M20 6SQ

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