

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 129256/FH/2021

Date registered valid: 8 February 2021

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension together with second floor rear roof extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 20 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW

Ward(s): Chorlton Ward

Applicant: Elizabeth Ashworth, 20 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW

Agent (if any): Mr Chris Rodgers, Guy Taylor Associates, Trafalgar House, 5-7 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DJ

Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 May 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: 11 February 2021 Expired: 4 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 mid-terrace C3 dwellinghouse of red brick and slate, with a two storey rear outrigger, bay windows and a porch canopy. The plot includes front and rear gardens bounded by red brick walls.

Description of area

Scott Avenue is a short residential street within the north end of Chorlton, sited between Oswald Road and the Scott Avenue allotments. The area benefits from its close proximity to the district centre, tram stop and green space.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey side/rear infill extension and install a rear dormer/2nd floor extension along with rooflights, to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse, in line with nearby extensions.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – One letter of objection received:
I am concerned about being overlooked by the extension given it seems to sit flush with the rear of the house with very large windows and isn't set back at all. Other dormers on the street seem much less intrusive.

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 but certain 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):

- 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 and installing a rear dormer, 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 single storey extension would infill the space between the original two storey rear outrigger and the party wall shared with No.18. It would project 4.88m to the rear and 1.48m to the side, with an eaves height of 3m and a maximum height of 3.67m. It would be sited along the boundary shared with No.18 and would come flush with the outrigger rear elevation. The L-shaped dormer would be sited within the main rear slope and outrigger slope, occupying the full width and depth of the roof and an additional roof volume of approximately 38.33 cubic metres. The dormer would be set in 0.18m from the eaves of the main slope and 0.23 from the eaves of the outrigger slope and set down lower than the main ridge, but with a roof lantern which would exceed the ridge. Although the rearward projection of the ground floor would exceed the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m) the dimensions of the side and rear extension would accord with the GPDO (2015) if it were applied for under the Larger Homes Extension scheme. The dormer is also close to being permitted development, with minor tweaks required, such as increasing the setback from eaves by 2cm, removing the overlapping tiles from the outrigger gable and the lantern in the flat roof. Both extensions are considered subservient to the host dwelling, similar to nearby works and sited appropriately, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension and dormer would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red brickwork, grey roof slates and dark grey hanging tiles, along with aluminium windows and doors. The extension would have a mono-pitched tiled roof containing 2no rooflights and a set of aluminium bi-folding doors opening onto the garden. The side elevation would be blank. The tile-clad dormer would contain two side-facing windows (conditioned to be obscure glazed) and two rear facing windows. Neither the dormer nor extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore neither would feature within the street scene, hence the character of the area should not be negatively impacted, particularly given the high number of dormers in the vicinity (13 along Scott Avenue alone). The proportions and materials are in-keeping with the original property, and appear

similar to other properties in the vicinity, particularly those approved at No's 153, 167 and 169 Oswald Road round the corner from this site. The appearance of the development is considered acceptable and is not thought to significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor wider area, the latter of which is not a conservation area.

Residential amenity – As the gardens face south-west along this terrace and the single storey extension does not project past the original rear wall, it is not considered that the adjoining neighbour, No.18, would experience a significant loss of sunlight or outlook, particularly given these gardens will still receive plenty of afternoon and evening sun. An objection was received which raised concerns with the appearance of the dormer from their property as being 'intrusive', due to the overlapping of the outrigger gable, and overlooking from the large rear window at 2nd floor. Whilst the overlapping design differs to the rest of the dormers along Scott Avenue it is very similar to those at three nearby properties along Oswald Road, hence a precedent has been set. The large window will give views over the rear gardens of the surrounding properties on this terrace and the terrace to the rear, however these views will be no greater than those afforded by the existing rear windows within the outriggers. Due to the scale and orientation of the extensions, and taking the fallback position afforded by permitted development rights into account, it is not considered that the proposal would cause significant harm to residential amenity as to warrant a refusal.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly accords with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, and although it received an objection it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor significantly harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. The proposal is deemed acceptable and development may commence in accordance with the approved plans and 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 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

Officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Minor issues

have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the agent 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 drawings:
- '20-101' stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 1st February 2021.
- '30-101 P02' stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 7th May 2021.

Reason - To ensure 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 and dormer hereby permitted shall match those specified on the submitted application form and drawings, including: red brickwork and roof tiles to match existing and dark grey hanging tiles.

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.

4) Before first occupation the proposed second floor windows in the side elevation, facing No.18 Scott Avenue, 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

40 Cheltenham Road, Manchester, M21 9QN
36 Cheltenham Road, Manchester, M21 9QN
22 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW
21 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW
19 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW
18 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW
17 Scott Avenue, Manchester, M21 9QW
38 Cheltenham Road, Manchester, M21 9QN

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