

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 129342/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 16 February 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey front, two storey side and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation together with the installation of boundary fence to front

Address: 2 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Neil Murray, 484 Parrs Wood Road, M20 5WW

Agent (if any): Ian Grainger, Blu Room Architecture, 5 Uplands Road, Darlington, DL3 7SZ

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 April 2021



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: None during Covid-19 pandemic

Standard consultations:

Printed: 18 February 2021 Expired: 11 March 2021

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 26 March 2021 Expired: 9 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 application site concerns a detached inter-war dwelling situated on a large (393m²) roughly triangular corner plot at the northern end of the Selsey Drive cul-de-sac. It is orientated north-south, with the rear facing south.

It is bounded by Fairmile Drive to the south, Morningside Drive to the east, Laneside Drive to the north and the A34 Kingsway to the west. The River Mersey is located 141 metres to the east which puts the site within Flood Risk Zone 2.

There is a large paved garden at the front and side (7.7 metres widening to 11.7 metres) and a smaller garden at the rear which extends to the roadside boundary. The front and side gardens are enclosed by a low brick boundary wall with railings. Pedestrian access to the rear garden is also possible along the eastern side of the property.

Between the rear garden and side boundary is a free-standing garage and shed which can be accessed from both the front or side vehicular access points.

The property is constructed of brown brick with a red interlocking-tile hip-fronted roof.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The site is within a suburban residential estate towards the southern Metropolitan District boundary formed by the river, and 554 metres south of the Parrswood retail, leisure and transport amenities.

It is within an estate comprising a similar typology of mostly semi-detached inter-war housing in medium density garden plots with off-road parking. Being on a corner, the plot is considerably larger than others in both Selsey Drive and neighbouring streets.

Description of development

Erection of a single storey front, two storey side and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation together with the installation of boundary fence to front.

The application was amended to reduce the height of the boundary fence and provide a first-floor set-back.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbour notifications – First notification - 4 objections. Comments:

1. I am concerned about the height of the fence obstructing the view round the corner of what is a single track road. There are a lot of children who play on this street and this could be a danger to them if vehicles cannot see round the corner.

2. Selsey Drive is only a single-track road (the carriageway between the pavements being a mere 2.54 metres [100"] in width), with an almost right-angle corner as it passes No. 2. At present, from our front boundary with No. 2, we have an uninterrupted view right across the side boundary of No. 2 to its junction with its rear boundary with No. 7, Fairmile Drive; there is thus a clear sight of traffic approaching. However, the application presently under consideration proposes a new 1800mm-high fence along the side boundary, measuring some 27.4 metres long (less the new gate in it), plus another fence of similar height from the corner (by the right-angle of the road) to the front of the house. Since the drawing seems to suggest that this horizontal fencing could well be of 'solid' waney-lap design, the present sightlines across the property would disappear and there would thus be virtually no warning of any approaching vehicles of car height before they reach the front gate of No. 2 - a potential danger to residents and, more particularly, to any children playing (we have 14 in the drive, of whom 9 are under the age of 7).

3. The height of proposed boundary fence at the side of the property will obstruct the view of on-coming traffic, which may be speeding' making it difficult to exit our drive safely by car. Selsey Drive is narrow cul-de-sac allowing vehicles in one direction at a time. There are several small children (under 8 years) who play outside, supervised, which vehicles may fail to see.

4. I would be concerned if the proposed fencing would obstruct views as residents leave the cul de sac. At the moment we are able to see on-coming cars, if the proposed fencing is taller, then it would create an obstructed view of traffic. There are a number of families with young children and the height of the fencing would be a concern to many.

Second notification – No objections. Comments:

As a resident who previously objected to the high fence blocking the corner, I notice the plans have changed to provide children and drivers visibility round the corner so I support these plans.

Highway Services

The applicant should verify that the length of the driveway is sufficient so that the vehicle does not overhang on the footway. Each driveway space should provide a minimum of 3.0m x 6.0m in line with MCCs standard minimum dimensions.

It is noted that widening of the existing driveway opening will take place. Should any amendment be required to the adopted highway, this should be undertaken via a Section 184 agreement with MCC Highways and will be subject to the expense of the applicant.

The proposals will incorporate a new fence along the existing boundary line. The applicant should be advised that the fence fronting the adopted highway should be reduced in height to no greater than 0.6m to ensure visual permeability.

Should gating be proposed it must be inwardly opening to protect the footway from obstruction

Flood Risk Management

The site is within Flood Zone 2, the Didsbury Critical Drainage Area (CDA), and an EA Flood Warning Area.

Condition 1: Development shall not begin until a flood risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may take the abbreviated form of a desktop-study flood risk statement (FRS). For the avoidance of doubt, as per the government standing advice, the assessment must include the following:

- A description of your development.
- An assessment of the flood risk from all sources of flooding for your development (this does not require bespoke hydraulic modelling and may be based on data obtained freely via an Environment Agency data request and opensource data on the DEFRA and government platforms).
- The estimated flood level for your development (the estimated flood level is a river flood level with a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability, plus an allowance for climate change). The estimated flood level may be obtained freely from the Environment Agency.
- Provide a plan showing the finished floor levels (FFLs) and the estimated flood levels. FFLs should take into consideration predicted flood levels and should be set to an appropriate level, this may be either no lower than existing floor levels or 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level. All levels should be in mAOD.
- If you cannot raise FFLs 300 mm above the estimated flood level, you should demonstrate flood resilience and resistance in your design. Use the following guidance:
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice#extra-flood-resistance-and-resilience-measures>
- Details of your flood resilience and evacuation plans where required.
- Any supporting plans and drawings. - See <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice> for further guidance on preparing your documents and obtaining the required data.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system pursuant to policy EN17 of the Core Strategy.

Condition 2: The applicant must register the property to receive EA flood warnings at <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>. Evidence of sign-up must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. A copy of an email confirmation will suffice.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system pursuant to policy EN17 of the Core Strategy.

Informative: The following Informative is recommended to be included within the Decision Notice:

The applicant should design and construct drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. We recommend considering green SuDS components to mitigate for any loss of impermeable area.

Issues

Policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan

Policies SP1, DM1, EN17 and EN19 of the Manchester Core Strategy

Principle

The application is for extensions to a residential property within a residential area. It proposes to add a porch, WC/utility room and extended kitchen/living and dining room at ground floor, and bedroom 4 and enlarged bedroom 3 at first floor.

The proposals also include a widened driveway and 2 parking spaces on the north elevation, replacement of vehicular entrance to the side with a pedestrian gate and retention of the low-level boundary wall.

Saved UDP policy DC1 permits residential extensions to meet changing household needs subject to satisfactory compliance with those policy areas covering residential and visual amenity, parking, bin storage and flood risk.

Residential amenity

The proposal extends the ground and first floor of the property.

At the rear, the ground floor proposes a 4-metre flat roof extension to a height of 2.946 metres with windows on the rear and west-facing side elevation. It would be off set from the boundary with No.4 to the east by 1.35 metres. Being single storey only and as rear gardens are south-facing there will unlikely be any loss of amenity to the occupiers of this property.

At the side, a 4-metre wide, 2-storey extension is proposed, and at the front, a 1.5-metre deep porch/WC/utility room is also proposed. These are contained well within the front and side boundaries with no adjacent neighbours so there is no potential loss of amenity.

The extensions are therefore considered to have acceptable impacts in this regard.

Visual amenity

The proposal seeks extensions which are slightly larger than would usually be acceptable, particularly in terms of the 4-metre wide extension at the side. It is acceptable in this instance on several counts;

The Selsey Drive building line going south of the property extends out towards the west so that the extended gable would be roughly level with the eastern side of No.7 Fairmile Drive, also a corner property to the south. This would therefore maintain the existing hierarchy in the street scene through retention of a similar gap to the boundary as formed by the side of No.7 to the corner of Selsey Drive.

As there are no neighbouring properties adjacent and approximately 4.7 metres would be retained to the boundary from the front of the extended side elevation, a sense of the original openness to the front and side of the property would be maintained.

The extended property would have a similar appearance to the prevailing character of semi-detached dwellings in Selsey Drive without appearing as over-development given the uncharacteristic scale of the plot.

Similarly, the treatment of the roof, which is difficult to set down on account of the ridge running in the opposite direction to the roofs of the semi's, would give the finished dwelling a similar spread to the scale of the semi's, thus forming a congruent relationship with these properties in the street scene.

Lastly, and although no terracing effect could ensue from the side extension, the first floor is set back by 1 metre which gives a sense of subservience and articulation to the front and side elevations within the street scene.

The ground floor front extension which comes forwards of the principal elevation by 1.5 metres creates a porch which extends to form the front elevation of the side extension. This is acceptable given it would remove the current unsympathetic columned entrance and introduce a feature that is more common in the street scene.

The materials palette is proposed to match the existing as set out in the Householder application form which will help the extension to assimilate within the street scene.

No objections have been raised to this element of the proposal. Objections were however received from 4 No. neighbours in relation to the original proposal for a new boundary treatment.

Boundary treatment

The agent has amended the original proposal to introduce a 900mm high timber and concrete post boundary treatment to replace the low brick wall with railings. The applicant sought this treatment to give privacy to the large side garden which is proposed to be used as the main external amenity space.

As the property is on a corner, sight lines for vehicles approaching along Selsey Drive could have been compromised giving the potential for vehicular and / or pedestrian-vehicular conflict. All residents noted that raising the height of the fence was particularly problematic as children often play out in the relative safety of the cul-de-sac.

Highway Services also advised that the height should not go above 900mm for visibility. Consequently, the wall has been retained as a low wall in the revised plans.

The agent requested guidance on acceptable hedge heights and was advised that any soft landscaping treatment to form a hedge would need to pay regard to the advice from Highway Services given the emphasis on highway safety in this location.

The boundary treatment also seeks to widen the vehicular access at the front and to reduce the second vehicular access at the side/rear to a pedestrian gate. There are no concerns with these elements of the boundary treatment.

Parking

Although development comes forward of part of the front elevation, the amended drawings show 2 No. parking spaces in the front garden area which can easily be accommodated in the

large plot, even following any approval of the front extension. The retained space amounts to 40.32m² which is adequate to ensure no loss of in curtilage parking at the property.

Bin storage

Bins are shown as stored on the eastern side of the property where no development is proposed. This gap is 1.40 metres wide which is adequate to manage bins out of view in the street scene.

Flood risk

The site lies within Flood Risk Zone 2 on account of being 141 metres west of the River Mersey. It is also identified as being within a Critical Drainage Area and Environment Agency Flood Warning Area.

Core Strategy policy EN17 requires that development within flood sensitive areas must prevent an increased risk of flooding, improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

The applicant was requested to submit additional details on receipt of the application to demonstrate how the site would achieve these policy requirements. In response, the agent provided details of the existing (34.03 metres AOD) and finished (34.33 metres AOD) floor levels of the site which are compliant with the Environment Agency Standing Advice on mitigating flood risk.

The agent has also confirmed that the site would be drained via the mains drainage located on Selsey Drive.

The Flood Risk Management team have assessed the application and requested the above information as a pre-commencement condition, together with recommendations for guidance through Informatives as appended below.

The nature of the mitigation measures required means that they could not be applied retrospectively should the development go ahead without conditions for these details being discharged first. As a result, further details contained within the applicant's recent Homebuyers Report, together with an amended drawing showing the finished floor level were submitted and approved by the Flood Risk Management team.

The conditions recommended by the FRM team are therefore not appended and only Informatives for SuDS drainage and Flood Alerts are appended for the attention of the applicant/agent.

On the basis of the above, the proposals accord with saved UDP policy DC1 and Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN17 and EN19.

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 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 proposed extensions raised objections on first notification in relation to the height of the boundary fence. This element of the proposal was amended in revised drawings and drew no further objections on second notification.

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:

Application Form - 9 Feb 2021

Drawing - Location Plan Ref: 06 - 8 April 2021

Drawing - Site Plan Ref: 05 Rev B - 8 April 2021

Drawing - Existing Plans Ref: 01 - 8 April 2021

Drawing - Existing Elevations Ref: 02 - 8 April 2021

Drawing - Proposed Plans Ref: 03 Rev A - 8 April 2021

Drawing - Proposed Elevations Ref: 04 Rev A - 14 April 2021

Groundsure Homebuyers Report dated 15 February 2021 - 14 April 2021

Flood Risk Map - 16 Feb 2021

Flood Risk Assessment - 16 Feb 2021

Photos - 16 Feb 2021

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans pursuant to policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

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, as stated on the Application Form.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

4. Before first occupation of the extensions hereby approved, the first floor bathroom window on the rear elevation and the ground floor WC window on the extended side elevation shown on amended drawings ref: 03 Rev A and 04 Rev A received on the 8th April 2021 and 14th April 2021, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of 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 property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved UDP policy DC1.

Informatives

1. The applicant must register the property to receive EA flood warnings at <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>. This is to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system pursuant to policy EN17 of the Core Strategy.
2. The applicant should design and construct drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. We recommend considering green SuDS components to mitigate for any loss of impermeable area

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

13 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
11 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
3 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
5 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
4 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
15 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
9 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
7 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
1 Selsey Drive, Manchester, M20 5WW
9 Fairmile Drive, Manchester, M20 5WS
7 Fairmile Drive, Manchester, M20 5WS
11 Fairmile Drive, Manchester, M20 5WS

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH