

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 129862/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 29 March 2021
Proposal: Installation of dormer to the rear and erection of single storey rear / side extension to provide additional living accommodation with raised patio
Address: 22 Alan Road, Manchester, M20 4WG
Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Caroline Forshaw 22 Alan Road, Manchester, M20 4WG
Agent (if any): Mrs Sonia Pabla-Thomas Space:Architecture+Planning The Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, West Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2NR
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 29th June 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	Site photos submitted
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 7 April 2021 Expired: 28 April 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 large semi detached property in the Withington Ward area of Manchester. To the front are brick bays on both ground and first floor with bay window on the side elevation. Gardens are to the front and rear and access along the side. Boundary treatment is low brick wall and hedging with some landscaping along the side.



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

Installation of dormer to the rear and erection of single storey rear / side extension to provide additional living accommodation with raised patio

Consultations & Notification Responses

In response to the original and amended proposal: There have been three letters of objection and one letter of support in relation to the proposal. Summary of comments as follows:

- Negative impact on our standard of living

- Size, appearance, layout and density of the proposed development and appearance
- The proposal is entirely out of character with the property, gardens and style of development in the street. Flat-roofed extensions are not in keeping with the Victorian street scene. Incongruous features such as the flat-roofed side extension and the aluminium-framed glazed door will be visible from the street and other out-of-place features such as timber slat cladding, aluminium grey cladding, aluminium-framed windows and feature brick façade will be visible from surrounding properties.
- The patio stone proposed is not in keeping with the type of material seen at other properties or used on the pavements in the street.
- The planning proposal for 22 Alan Road currently does not meet the criteria previously stipulated for planning approval to be given to others. This proposal is therefore at odds with the City's development strategy, policies and previous development criteria.
- This proposed extension runs counter to the citywide development control policy not to permit extensions in excess of 3.65m and would have a visually overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. In addition, as 22 Alan Road's rear garden has a pre-existing patio at the western-most end of the garden, creating an additional patio area adjacent to the house would further diminish the "existing green infrastructure"
- Anyone standing on the proposed raised patio would be able to easily see over the privet hedge and overlook the garden. "private outdoor amenity space" would no longer be private, thereby resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy. As a
- The proposed raised patio is in direct contravention of policy H1 and DM1 and does not This proposal is an un-neighbourly form of development that would be intrusive and detrimental to the amenity of our property.
- Potential impact on health. 22 Alan Road shares a sewer pipe This is not shown on United Utilities Sewer Record. Due to the transfer of private sewers not all sewers are mapped on the public records". Previous blockage as a result to property.
- Proposed elevated patio, kitchen and side extension would be built over this shared sewer. The size of the proposed development indicates that it would cover more than 12m of the shared sewer. In addition, ref UUPS-ORD-28907 indicates that the proposed development would result in having to cover a manhole on 22 Alan Road's property that provides access to this shared sewer.
- The proposed plans are potentially detrimental to the health of the residents as doing so would restrict sewer access.
- Planning application submitted although there is an ongoing boundary dispute
- The proposed patio would be built to the limits could only be done by destroying a hedge and a tree on our property. The hedge has existed in its current position since before 1983. Damage to these would therefore harm irreplaceable features of the garden and undermine the character and amenity of our property.
- Planning permission should be delayed until such time as the boundary dispute is resolved.
- The proposal contravenes City guidance and policy. It is to the detriment of the Victorian character of the area and to the amenity of neighbouring properties, invasion of our privacy,

undermine the health of residents (including young children) and result in irreversible harm to our property.

Withington Civic Society - The Society opposes the application.

- In this instance, the proposed development appears to run counter to several criteria in DC1, and particularly DC1.1b - the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- Further, the development - appears to be excessively large and bulky - contrary to DC1.2 a, creates a loss of privacy to the adjoining property –
- contrary to DC1.2 b - is out of character with the style of development in the street –
- contrary to DC1.2 c - a) the large and bulky main addition to the property, b) the dormer window; and c) the raised patio (with its particular impact on the adjoining property's privacy) d) the proposed extension appears to be greater than that allowed under DC 1.3
- In addition, the Society understands that the adjoining house has part of the proposed extension will extend upon this land, and there is a live dispute regarding this.

SUPPORT

- I support this application on the understanding that when the garage is demolished a replacement brick wall will be built to the same height and depth and abut the existing wall that runs between properties and adjoins the existing garage.

Further response to re-notification

- We note the changes to the planning application. The changes do not satisfactorily address our concerns this proposal will have a negative impact on our standard of living
- The proposal is entirely out of character with the property, gardens and style of development in the street. Flat-roofed extensions are not in keeping with the Victorian street scene. Incongruous features such as the flat-roofed side extension and the aluminium-framed glazed door will be visible from the street and other out-of-place features such as timber slat cladding, aluminium grey cladding, aluminium-framed windows and feature brick façade will be visible from surrounding properties.
- The patio stone proposed is not in keeping with the type of material seen at other properties or used on the pavements in the street.
- The raised decking currently in place to the rear of 22 Alan Road occupies a small footprint that does not protrude beyond the current limit of the property. The combined length of the proposed extension to the kitchen and raised patio can be seen from to extend beyond the rear of the property by 7.467m (not including steps from garden level to the first tier of the raised patio). The patio alone protrudes from the proposed extension by a minimum of 4.954m (not including steps from garden level to the first tier of the raised patio)
- This proposed extension would have a visually overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. The removal of further garden area from the property limits the future possibility for outdoor play, thereby undermining the City's initiative to secure the quality of the public realm (the garden being a collective, green infrastructure resource) for future generations.
- The current configuration to the rear of 22 Alan Road affords reasonable privacy to neighbouring properties. This would not be the case if the proposed raised patio were permitted.
- The proposed raised patio would allow views over the privet hedge and overlook the majority of garden, loss of privacy

- Intrusive and detrimental to the amenity of our property.
- Trellis can be seen through and therefore does not provide privacy.
- Garden remains overlooked by anyone standing on the majority of the protruding, raised patio
- The proposed trellis is out of keeping with the character of the property given the current boundary feature, which is a hedge
- The proposed trellis would be well over 2 metres high. This is not in keeping with the current height of the boundary feature, would be overbearing on our garden
- The document shows that the proposed elevated patio, kitchen and side extension would be built over shared sewer. The proposed development would result in having to cover a manhole that provides access to a shared sewer.
- Would restrict sewer access.
- Notwithstanding The Council's inability to take into account boundary disputes when considering planning permission, it is worth noting that this planning permission was submitted despite the fact that there is an unresolved boundary dispute.
- The hedge has existed in its current position since before 1983. Damage to these would therefore harm irreplaceable features and undermine the character and amenity of property.
- A decision on planning permission should be delayed until the boundary dispute is resolved.
- The changes made to the planning proposal only seek to address one of the many strong objections and is flawed
- We do not believe that attempting to resolve one objection (privacy) justifies a solution that contravenes planning legislation, further undermines our standard of living (trellis not in keeping with the general character of the property;

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 are no previous planning applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The application proposes the Installation of dormer to the rear and erection of single storey rear / side extension to provide additional living accommodation with raised patio. Concerns have been raised by a local group and resident concerning the size, appearance, layout, density and potential to overlook neighbouring gardens including not complying with policy or in keeping with the surrounding properties. Reference is made to an ongoing neighbour dispute.

Single storey

The extension would be set back from the front wall of the property considerably extending along the side to a length of approximately 6.0 metres projecting beyond the rear wall by approximately 2.6 metres and forming a wraparound of the property up to the adjoining semi-detached property. A further projection of approximately 4 metres is proposed for the raised patio. To address concerns of potential overlooking, the agent/applicant amended the scheme annotating privacy screens consisting of New Wood Trellis to replace existing wood fence at both sides of the raised patio running the length of the patio. Given the concerns of the boundary treatment, the agent has amended the scheme to show the retention of the boundary treatment including any existing trellis to ensure privacy is retained.

The roof would be flat and would have a 3 panel sliding door on the rear elevation and an elongated window facing the rear garden. A door would be facing the front elevation towards the street and 2 x high level windows are proposed on the side elevation.

Taking into consideration the changes to the scheme, it is not anticipated that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by the introduction of an extension to the rear or side including from the raised patio. Due to the fact that the neighbours on both sides have existing extensions, it is not anticipated that there would be harm given by the proposed structure to the side and rear. In addition, a letter of support has also been submitted with regards to the proposal which outlines the demolition of the existing garage and the replacement of a wall to the same height and depth.

The roof

The proposal includes the installation of a rear dormer window which would extend the width of the roof set down from the ridge height of the original roof height and in from the side walls of the house. Two large windows are proposed which would overlook the rear garden. However, 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 use of modern metal clad finishes to the dormer are not considered to be so harmful as to warrant refusal of the application.

The City Council considers the change to the roof design as acceptable especially given that the ridge height is no higher than the existing. 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 especially as roof dormers are a common feature to the rear of properties within the area.

The extension which would provide a contemporary addition to the property, would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene. However, given the setting of the extension back from the front elevation and its scale the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension and rear dormer is considered 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 and dormer 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 extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the side and rear and is considered acceptable. The design of the proposal whilst a contemporary addition would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials, these include brick to match existing as specified in the application form as well as more contemporary metal finishes. The design is not considered to 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.

Other matters

Concerns were raised in terms of boundary ownership; however, this would be a matter which falls outside of planning legislation and are a civil legal matter that would need to be resolved between the two parties. As set out within this report, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

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 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 policies within the Development Plan.

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 22nd June 2021 numbered 0241_20_201 Revision F Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 25th May 2021 numbered 0241_20_202 Revision F Proposed Elevations

Received on 25th May 2021 numbered 0241_ 20_203 Revision F Proposed Section and 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

23 Brunswick Road, Manchester, M20 4QB
20A Alan Road, Manchester, M20 4WG
20 Alan Road, Manchester, M20 4WG
31 Brunswick Road, Manchester, M20 4QB
37 Alan Road, Manchester, M20 4WG
24 Alan Road, Manchester, M20 4WG

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 (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH