

Planning**Growth & Development****Delegated officer report for planning application**

Application no. 128983/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 18 January 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, and rear dormer to form additional living accommodation

Address: 2 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF

Ward(s): Chorlton Ward

Applicant: Mr Paul McCormack 2 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF

Agent (if any): Mr Agustin Melero Guy Taylor Associates Trafalgar House, 5-7 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DJ

Case officer: Linda Marciniak
Tel: 0161 234 4636
Email: linda.marciniak@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 23 June 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: None during Covid-19 restrictions. Photos provided by agent.

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 11 June 2021 Expired: 21 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 an Edwardian semi-detached dwelling situated on the northern side of Glencross Road, close to the junction with Grange Avenue, in the Chorlton ward. The property is of red brick and render construction with gardens at the front and rear and access along the



eastern side. Parking is on street in this location.

The slate roof forms a cross gable giving a part recessed rear elevation.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The site is within a residential area comprising a similar housing typology and 325 metres north west of Chorlton District Centre.

The materials palette comprises of red brick and white render. There is some evidence of rear infill extensions and dormers in similar house types locally.

Description of development

Erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, and rear dormer to form additional living accommodation. The application was amended in the description to include the first-floor rear infill extension and drawings amended to set in the dormer.

The application is one of two submitted on the site with some overlap between the two. The second application, 128984 also includes elevational alterations (Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation with elevational alterations (including insertion of windows) and application of brick and render to existing elevations).

The application has been subject to amendments taking account some of the concerns raised on notification with residents. Two rounds of notifications were therefore carried out which resulted in the comments below.

Consultations & Notification Responses

1st Notification – Original scheme

Objection 1

1. It will cause us to lose a significant level of sunlight and daylight.
2. It will cause us to feel a greater sense of enclosure.
3. It will impact on the character of our property.

The application proposes a 3-storey extension with a dormer and a single storey flat roof extension with a combined length along the boundary line between our properties of 4932mm. This will create a section of garden wall to a height of 3368mm (nearly twice the existing fence) which will be 4000mm from our utility room door/ window and 5500mm from our lounge window. Both presently have low levels of light due to the garden being north facing and we believe this new wall will diminish that further. It is possible that the 2 storey extension will also cause shadow from the morning sun.

We feel that the single storey flat roof extension will create a sense of being closed in due to its height and close proximity to a frequently used brick shed and the rear door of our property. We also submit that the answer to question 6 of the planning application fails to identify that there are trees and shrubs on our adjoining property that are within falling distance of the proposed development.

We believe that the proposed addition of 3 extensions to the existing property will negatively impact on the character of our house and will be overtly dominant in terms of the host building. The proposed 2 storey extension will project 2832mm beyond the existing line of ours and other neighbouring properties. The character of our property will in our view be further affected by

proposed changes to window shape and brick patterning which do not reflect the Edwardian characteristics of neighbouring house.

(Objector 1 re-sent objection with contact details)

Objection 2

The 2 storey extension will extend beyond the existing building line and is therefore out of character with the rest of the neighbourhood that only have dormer or single storey extensions.

The proposed 2 storey extension will overshadow our property resulting in a loss of light, particularly late afternoon and evening sunlight and in one of the bedrooms, dining room and garden. We feel that this two storey extension of the existing property would be overbearing, visually intrusive and to the detriment of the amenity of our property. Our property (no67 Grange Road) is vertically aligned to No2 therefore we are already facing their side wall and adding 2-3m of uninterrupted wall will be overbearing and will lead us to feel more hemmed in/overshadowed.

The additional 2nd storey window on the first floor will be looking into one of the bedrooms and dining room and currently is not shown as 'obscured glass' in the design and would result in a loss of privacy should the internal use of the room change from a bathroom to a bedroom in the future. It is not stated if the window will be with white frame in line with the rest of the side of the house or not.

There are two additional windows in the 2nd storey extension on the east side (one very long and narrow and one very large window) on the ground floor that need to be both with obscured glass as they will be overlooking into the dining room and one bedroom resulting into loss of privacy. Having grey window frames is not in line with the rest of the windows of the east side of the property and therefore the visual amenity will be out of character with the rest of the properties. The windows on the east elevation should be consistent in type/design.

Proposed Elevations - East

The Proposed white render at the top and proposed brick to match the existing brick. This is not how currently the house is and we believe to be a mistake in the application.

Environmental Health - Gas membrane condition

Prior to the commencement of development appropriate and comprehensive construction designs for the installation of a proprietary gas membrane, in order to alleviate any possibility of landfill gas ingress to the building, shall be submitted for approval to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall then be implemented as part of the development.

Reason - the development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill gas pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

2nd Notification (Amended scheme)

Objection 1

The revised plans have removed a proposed window on the east elevation but they still retain all the elements that contributed to our previous objection. Although having a more direct impact on neighbours on Grange Rd, we strongly object to the additional footprint the proposed 2 storey extension will add to this property. This will project nearly 3 metres beyond the existing line of all other properties on the road and will be visible along the side of the house as you

enter the road. This is particularly important as the plans suggest changes to existing render and new brick work.

The new shadow study clearly shows the increased length of shadow created on our property from the proposed developments in both applications. This can be particularly seen in the illustrations for the mornings during Spring, Summer and Autumn. This is exceptionally disappointing as our garden is north facing and is already affected by shadow. We are concerned that this will create lower light levels in rooms to the rear of the house.

The single storey flat roofed extension is included in both applications 128983 and 128984 and its impact on the morning sunlight in our garden is well illustrated in the shadow study. This extension will create a garden wall along the boundary line of our adjoining properties which will be 3368mm high! Projecting from a 3 storey extension, this will have a combined length of 4932mm along the party wall line. It will be overbearing, significantly reduce light and take away the present open aspect at the rear of our property.

We object to the submission of 2 separate planning applications for the proposed extensions to this property. The overlap of the various elements has caused confusion in our understanding of the proposals and the nature of our response. We feel that it is 'playing the system' to benefit the applicants by avoiding any necessary reapplication if one application is refused. However, if both applications are approved then the result will be a green light for an enormous extension to a small Edwardian villa in a cul de sac of 12 houses. The applications together add up to a full house width single storey extension, a 2 storey extension and a 3 storey extension including a large dormer. This will in our view be an overdevelopment of the property and cause us to feel hemmed in and overlooked particularly as the gardens of our houses are small. We hope you will consider rejection of both schemes.

Objection 2

Proposed Elevations - East

The 2 storey extension will extend beyond the existing building line and is therefore out of character with the rest of the neighbourhood that only have dormers or single storey extensions.

The proposed 2 storey extension will overshadow our property resulting in a loss of light, particularly late afternoon and evening sunlight and in one of the bedrooms, dining room and garden. We note that the Shadow Study does not extend beyond 4pm and it is at this time where our property is impacted. We feel that this two storey extension of the existing property would be overbearing and visually intrusive and to the detriment of the amenity of our property. Our property (no67) is vertically aligned to No2 therefore we already are facing their side wall and adding 3m of uninterrupted wall will be overbearing and will feel like being hemmed in/overshadowed.

The additional 2nd storey window on the first floor will be looking into one of the bedrooms and dining room and although is now shown as 'obscured glass' in the design this can be changed in the future without need for permission and would result in a loss of privacy should the internal use of the room change from a bathroom to a bedroom in the future.

The Proposed white render at the top and proposed brick to match the existing brick. This is not how currently the house is and we believe to be a mistake in the application. Is the render going to be at the top or the bottom? It is a concern that there are still potential inaccuracies on these plans. Can you confirm that a final plan will be issued and accurate before any approval is made.

Issues

Policy

The following planning policy documents which make up the Development Plan for Manchester are material considerations in this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan. Several policies have been saved by way of a Secretary of State Saving Direction. For the purposes of this application, policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' is extant and therefore material to the assessment of the application.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. The following policies are relevant to this application:

- o Policy DM1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN18 – Contaminated Land
- o Policy EN19 – Waste

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (June 2019)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of the Development Plan.

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 UDP relate specifically to residential extensions and set out criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable subject to satisfactory impacts on residential and visual amenity.

Development in this application proposes a modest scale of rear extensions that are acceptable in principle subject to satisfactory impacts on residential and visual amenity, bin storage and parking in accordance with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

The proposals in this application are to provide an extended kitchen/diner at ground floor, additional space and bathroom at first floor and a bedroom with en-suite and storage space within the dormer.

Residential Amenity

The residential amenity impacts are acceptable in this application. Considering the impacts on No.4 Glencross, the adjoining semi first, due to the irregular footprint of the rear elevation, the single storey rear extension has a variable depth across the rear. Along the boundary with No.4, it has a depth of 4.935 metres and height of 3.2 metres to a flat roof. No windows are proposed on this elevation and the depth off the main part of the rear elevation reduces to 2.25 metres.

The first floor proposes a rear infill extension of 2.25 metres in depth (with a further 2-storey extension alongside of 2.7 metres deep x 3.66 metres wide – in application 128984). A shed-

type dormer is also proposed on the roof which has been amended to be set in 200mm off the eaves.

As with the application site, No.4 has a north-facing rear elevation and lies to the west of the site, and so gets the benefit of sun in the morning and late afternoon until sunset.

The occupier of this property is concerned that the extensions will lead to a loss of light into a utility room door 4 metres off the boundary, and into a lounge window 5.5 metres away. The loss of light is a very high test which must amount to an almost total loss into a habitable room window across the day.

The single storey extension will have some impact in the morning but this will not amount to a total loss as this occupier will still get the benefit of late afternoon and evening sun, plus any that reaches the far end of the garden that is not shaded by No.4 itself. It is also noted that the applicant could complete a much larger extension, up to 6 metres deep x 4 metres in height if the Prior Approval Permitted Development route had been followed.

In this context and given the nearest window affected by any morning light loss would be in a utility room door, the concerns do not warrant further amendments or a refusal of the application.

Concern by this neighbour has also been raised in relation to the proximity of the single storey extension to the objector's property and that its height and length will be overbearing, causing her to feel hemmed in. As the single storey extension is again within current Permitted Development planning parameters, and the applicant or objector could erect a fence on the boundary of up to 2 metres in height, the 'excess' of development which could be seen from No.4, would amount to 1.2 metres over any such fence. This is considered acceptable on the adjoining boundary.

Lastly, the adjoining occupier is concerned that the extension will impact on her shed and trees which are stated as being within falling distance of the extensions; concerns which are non-material to the application.

In considering the impacts on the occupiers at Nos. 67 and 69 Grange Avenue to the east, the single storey extension, first floor rear infill and dormer will have minimal impact, all being concealed behind the projecting rear elevation and gable roof slope. Comments have otherwise been made by the occupiers of these properties in relation to the 2-storey extension which is discussed in the accompanying application 128984.

Visual amenity

The extensions in this application will have no visibility in the street scene, all being contained behind the projecting rear gable or sitting behind the inner roof slope.

Notwithstanding this, the extensions are proportionate and subservient to the mass and scale of the original dwelling and the dormer has been set in to avoid creating the impression of a third floor as originally proposed.

The materials, brick to match the existing and a dark grey zinc-appearance cladding for the dormer face and cheeks, will assimilate appropriately with the materials of the original dwelling. Rear door and window frames are proposed in a dark grey aluminium which will be continued on the side elevation. These elements of the proposal could be replaced outside of the planning system but their inclusion in the application represents an acceptable alteration that will tie in satisfactorily with works across the remainder of the dwelling, giving a harmonious appearance.

Concern has been raised with respect to the impact of the proposals on the character of the Edwardian dwelling and that it will impact negatively on the adjoining property. As noted, as the works in this application are at the rear; there are no consequences for the impact on the character of the property itself, the adjoining property or the wider street scene. The impact of the proposed elevational alterations to the side and 2-storey rear extension are discussed in application 128984.

Finally, similar extensions at ground floor, first floor infill and dormers have been completed in Glencross Avenue at No.5 (119400/FH/2018, 125228/FH/2019 and 127018/NMC/2020), No.6 (059755/FH/SOUTH1/00), No.7 (071410/FH/2004/S1) and No.12 Glencross Avenue which sets precedent for these elements of the development proposed in this application.

Bin storage

Bins can continue to be stored on the east side of the property with no loss of amenity to the street scene.

Parking

Parking is on street and therefore unaffected by the proposals.

Gas Membrane

A condition for a gas membrane to be installed in the extension is appended in the interests of residential amenity to prevent the ingress of ground gas.

Conclusion

The proposal has acceptable impacts on residential and visual amenity and bin storage and therefore complies with saved UDP policy DC1 and policies SP1, DM1, EN18 and EN19 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Concerns have been raised with respect to the single storey extension in particular, and the impact on the adjoining occupier. The potential light loss and overbearing impacts have been assessed as partial and are not of sufficient material weight to warrant a refusal of the application.

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

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the delegated report. The application received objections on both notifications which have been taken into consideration in the assessment of the proposal.

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 as specified:

Application Form 13 May 2021

Drawing – Existing Site Plan	23 Dec 2020	20-0010-00-000
Drawing – Proposed Site Plan	9 June 2021	20-0010 Rev P1
Drawing - Existing Floor Plans	23 Dec 2020	20-0010-00-001
Drawing - Existing Elevations	23 Dec 2020	20-0010-00-002
Drawing - Proposed Elevations	9 June 2021	20-0010 Rev P2
Drawing - Proposed Floor Plans	9 June 2021	20-0010 Rev P2
Photos -	18 Jan 2021	

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, and as stated on the Householder Application Form and approved drawings.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) The first-floor bathroom window on the east elevation, and the ground floor extended kitchen window on the east elevation, shall both be obscure glazed to a specification no less than Level 5 on 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 properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document for the City of Manchester and saved UDP policy DC1.

5) Prior to the commencement of development appropriate and comprehensive construction designs for the installation of a proprietary gas membrane, in order to alleviate any possibility of landfill gas ingress to the building, shall be submitted for approval to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall then be implemented as part of the development.

Reason - the development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill gas pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

3 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF
65 Grange Road, Manchester, M21 9NX
1 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF
67 Grange Road, Manchester, M21 9NX
4 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF
69 Grange Road, Manchester, M21 9NX
3 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF
65 Grange Road, Manchester, M21 9NX
1 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF
67 Grange Road, Manchester, M21 9NX
4 Glencross Avenue, Manchester, M21 9NF
69 Grange Road, Manchester, M21 9NX

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