MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	129436/FH/2021
Date registered valid:	18 February 2021
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage to provide additional living accommodation
Address:	95 Darley Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QR
Ward(s):	Chorlton Park Ward
Applicant:	Mr Rory Kerins, 95 Darley Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QR
Agent (if any):	N/a
Case officer:	Constance Phillips Tel: 0161 234 5792 Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**29 April 2021**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: Photos received with application

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 22 February 2021 Expired: 15 March 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached brick C3 dwellinghouse. The property features a hipped roof, front bay windows and an original rear outrigger and includes front and rear gardens along with a driveway and detached rear garage.

Description of area

Darley Avenue is a long residential road which runs from Chorlton Park to West Didsbury, parallel to Barlow Moor Road. It contains a variety of family dwellinghouses and flats of varying ages. It benefits from being close to Chorlton Water Park and the shops and restaurants of West Didsbury.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey side and rear wrap around extension to provide additional living accommodation. Originally the proposal was for a part single part two storey side and rear extension but upon being told it needed to be scaled back, the applicant decided to only proceed with the ground floor element.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments or objections received.

Policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, however select policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 - Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019), in particular:

- Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

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

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a single storey side and rear extension to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The existing detached garage and single storey kitchen outrigger would be demolished to make way for the wraparound ground floor extension It would project 4.73m to the rear and 1.7m to the side, leaving a gap of 0.55m to the boundary shared with the adjoining semi, No.93, and 0.8m to the boundary shared with No.97. It would have an overall depth of 11.6m down the side and an overall width of 7.2m across the rear, with a parapet roof height of 3.2m. The rear extension exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m), however it only exceeds the adjoining neighbour's rear extension by 1.2m and larger could be built under the Larger Homes Extension scheme if no objections were received (which is the case here). The side extension is less than a third of the width of the original dwellinghouse and leaves an adequate gap to the boundary. The extension is deemed subservient to the host dwelling and appropriately sited and scaled, in accordance with policies DC1 and DM1.

Design, appearance and visual amenity – The extension is to be constructed of brickwork to match the existing house, helping it to assimilate with the dwellinghouse and neighbouring buildings, along with grey uPVC windows, aluminium doors and powder coated aluminium metal coping to the parapet. The existing windows in the rest of the property are to be replaced with grey to match and the roof is to be re-tiled with red clay tiles, both of which come under permitted development. The front elevation would contain a small window, the side would contain a grey door with a rooflight above and the rear elevation would feature a wide set of sliding doors opening onto the garden, with 3no rooflights above. The character of the area is mixed, consisting of a range of house types and ages, and should not be negatively impacted by these works, particularly as there are larger extensions approved at nearby properties, including No's 93 (119582/FH/2018) and 99 (120395/FH/2018). Due to the single storey nature, the improvement upon the existing garage and local precedence, it is not considered that it would significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor area. Although featuring a metal coping parapet roof, the design is still relatively standard, to be expected of a single storey extension and is considered in-keeping with the property, pursuant to policies DM1, DC1 and SP1.

Residential amenity – Due to the siting, orientation and scale of the proposed extension and the absence of side-facing windows, it is not considered that the development would result in an undue loss of light or privacy for the surrounding occupiers, particularly given the adjacent neighbour, No.97, has a large brick outbuilding located along the boundary shared with No.95, and the adjoining semi, No.93, features its own 3.55m rear extension close to the shared boundary. Adequate gaps have been left to these boundaries (0.55-0.8m) and the height and depth are not considered to cause undue overshadowing. In addition to this no objections were received from local residents, hence the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impacts on residential amenity.

Parking and refuse – Although the existing garage will be demolished, the driveway is mainly unaffected by the works hence there will remain space for a car off the street which is adequate for a single family dwelling. A gap has been retained at the side of the extension, leaving approximately 0.8m to the boundary which will allow for the transportation of refuse bins to the rear, in accordance with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy, saved policy DC1 of the UDP and the NPPF. The application received no objections and the works are not thought to harm the existing levels of residential amenity currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor the visual amenity of the dwellinghouse and streetscene. The proposed works are therefore deemed acceptable and may commence in accordance with the following conditions.

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

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. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the applicant to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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 revised drawing numbered 'A102 Rev A', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 26th April 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 specified on the submitted application form and drawings, including brickwork to match the existing dwellinghouse.

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

93 Darley Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QR
97 Darley Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QR
92 Darley Avenue, Manchester, M21 7GG
90 Darley Avenue, Manchester, M21 7GG

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