MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	129800/FH/2021
Date registered valid:	26 March 2021
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer to form additional living accommodation
Address:	3 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
Ward(s):	Chorlton Ward
Applicant:	Sarah McCall Ward 3 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
Agent (if any):	Mr Paul Lillie Insight (NW) Ltd 1 St Leonards Drive, Altrincham, WA15 7RS
Case officer:	Tracie Simpson Tel: 0161 234 4537 Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**18th May 2021**



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 29 March 2021 Expired: 19 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 two storey terraced property in the Chorlton Ward area of Manchester. The site benefits from a single storey rear outrigger, rear yard and small garden to the front. Boundary to the front is low brick wall with timber fencing to the rear.






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

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of a rear dormer to form additional living accommodation

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. A comments has been received from the owner of a adjacent property. The issues raised relate to matters of the Party Wall Act, the request for a separate water supply to the property and construction hours.

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o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 erection of a single storey rear extension and rear dormer to form additional living accommodation. The site benefits from an existing single storey rear outrigger.

Single storey

The extension would project approximately 2.9 metres from the rear wall measuring approximately 2.9 metres in height with an additional 1.0 metre approximately parapet walls to side elevations with Grey concrete coping stone to cap parapet wall. The structure would extend across the rear wall of the property and up to the boundaries on each site. The roof would have a roof light with double doors on the rear elevation leading into the rear garden and a window, no windows are proposed on the side

The extension is within what would normally constitute permitted development due to the projection off the rear wall. Given that the neighbour's on both side have existing extensions, it is not anticipated that there would be harm given by the removal of the existing structure to the rear and replacement of a new extension. Comments have been received from the owner of 1 Hartley avenue that raise issues relating to the party wall that would need to be resolved between the applicant and adjacent landowners. It is not considered that such matters would warrant refusal of the submitted proposals on the planning merits of the proposals.

The roof

The proposal includes the installation of a rear dormer window with the inclusion of 3 x roof lights to the front elevation. The dormer 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. A Juliet balcony and small window is proposed which overlooks 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 introduction of roof lights to the front are considered acceptable in this location and are not believed to impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

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.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area has already changed over time as the houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended and therefore 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 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 proposal is in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the materials, these are set to be Dormer Wall Clad with standing seam zinc panels to match existing roof covering and EPDM-covered flat roof to the extension and brick to match existing as specified in the application form. 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.

Disabled access

Not applicable

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.

Other matters
A neighbouring homeowner has suggested that a separate water supply should be provided to the property by UU. These matters are outside of the planning merits of the application proposals and the Council is unable to impose such a requirement on the applicant.

Comments have also been made in respect of construction hours of the project. It is considered that given the relatively small scale nature of the application proposals imposition of working hours in this instance would be unreasonable. There is separate legislation available to the Council to deal with noise generated by construction sites if works were to generate complaints.

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 polices 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 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/101 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Received 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/102 Proposed First Floor Plan
Received 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/103 Proposed Second Floor Plan
Received 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/104 Proposed Roof Plan
Received 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/106 Proposed Side Elevation
Received 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/107 Proposed Rear Elevation
Received 22nd March 2021 numbered 20201230/INW1668/108 Proposed Side Elevation

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

4 Lynton Road, Manchester, M21 9NQ
5 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
2 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
2 Lynton Road, Manchester, M21 9NQ
4 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
First Floor, 1 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
Ground Floor, 1 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG
6 Lynton Road, Manchester, M21 9NQ
1 Hartley Road, Manchester, M21 9NG

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH