

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 130594/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 1 June 2021

Proposal: Retention of a 2.17 metre high brick wall with wooden gate and a 1.6 metre high brick wall with railings

Address: 1 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Chris Wilson 1 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL

Agent (if any):

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 21st July 2021



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application	
Development type:	Householder	
Date of site visit:	14 July 2021	
Standard consultations:	Printed: 11 June 2021	Expired: 2 July 2021
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 11 June 2021	Expired: 2 July 2021
Site notice	Posted: 17 June 2021	Expired: 8 July 2021
Press advert	Published: 15 June 2021	Expired: 6 July 2021
Departure from Development Plan:	No	
Environmental Statement:	Not required	

Description of site/building

The proposal relates to the boundary wall at the site of 1 Talford Grove in the Albert Park Conservation area of Manchester. The wall is constructed of Cheshire Brick and ornamental railings. The property is a large semi detached Victorian property with fronted bay window to the ground floor, hardstanding front driveway/garden, garden to the rear and access to rear through a timber gate.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature.

Description of development

Retention of a 2.17 metre high brick wall with wooden gate and a 1.6 metre high brick wall with railings

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.

West Didsbury Residents Association - no comments received as a result of this proposal

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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.
- 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 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- o Policy EN3 - Heritage - seeks to encourage development that complements and takes advantage of distinct heritage features. New developments must be designed to support the Council in preserving and where possible enhancing the historic environment, character and setting of buildings and areas.
- o DC18.1 - Conservation Areas - The Council will give particularly careful consideration to development proposals within Conservation Areas.

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle - The proposal is for the retention of a 2.17 metre high brick wall with wooden gate and a 1.6 metre high brick wall with railings which is considered acceptable.

Notwithstanding this, consideration must be given to the proposed developments siting, design, appearance, scale and massing, and to the proposal's impact upon existing levels of residential amenity.

Furthermore, as the property is within a conservation area policies EN3 and saved policy DC18 are applicable, and assessments against the proposal's impact upon the character of the conservation area must be made.

Residential Amenity

The characteristics of the properties along this street frontage are predominantly large Victorian properties with original boundary treatment. The City Council received a complaint prior to the submission of this application due to the removal of the front wall and the installation of hardstand to the front of the property.

The applicant is seeking to retain the existing wall which included the removal of hedging and the replacement of a wall together with ornamental railings. The wall includes brick piers to a total height of 1.660 metres and wall height of 910mm. In addition the applicant has replaced a 2.0 m high timber fence with a brick wall setback from the front wall of the house separating the front from the rear measuring at 2.170 in height to a width of 2.340 from shared boundary to side wall of the property.

The wall is visible from the public highway and therefore is featured within the street scene, however, the character of the area would not be altered, therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

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 conservation area.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed wall 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 proposal 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 match the existing property which are Cheshire bricks with the introduction of wrought iron ornamental railings painted black and are considered an acceptable choice of material. 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.

Impact on the Albert Park Conservation Area

In terms of its size, the front boundary treatment and wall set back from the house would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the conservation area. The proposal is slightly above what is considered to be permitted development. Material choice will be Cheshire brick with the inclusion of black ornamental railings along the front boundary section and would be an acceptable selection for the conservation area. On balance it is considered to enhance the character of the Conservation Area and therefore the proposal accords with Core Strategy Policy EN3 and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC18.

Parking

There is off street parking provided by the driveway at the front of the property, which accords with the principles for residential extensions set out in policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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. 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:

Received on 1st June 2021 as drawn by Chris Wilson Proposed Elevations

Received on 1st June 2021 proposed site plan

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

West Didsbury Residents Association

38A Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
Flat 5, 36 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
2 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL
Flat 2, 36 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 4, 36 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 3, 36 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
Flat 1, 36 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2HN
40 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
38 Clyde Road, Manchester, M20 2WJ
3 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL
Flat 5, 2 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL
Flat 4, 2 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL
Flat 3, 2 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL
Flat 2, 2 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL
Flat 1, 2 Talford Grove, Manchester, M20 2HL

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
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH