

Supporting statement for two storey and single storey side extension to 77 Birchfields Road Manchester M13 0XX



Site and Surroundings

The site comprises a semi-detached property located on Birchfields Road close to the junction with Meldon Road. The property has a pitched roof gable and is of render appearance with brick features. The property is set back from the road with a parking area in front, which provides off street parking. The dwelling has an area to the side approximately two metres in width, which provides access to the rear.

Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises a part single storey and part two-storey side extension on the southern part of the elevation of the host dwelling.

The single storey extension would provide a bedroom and en-suite at the front, a utility room in the centre and a cardio room with sauna at the rear. The sauna is required as a form of heat energy and the cardio room is required to maintain movement in the muscles to support the needs of the applicant, which is discussed in more detail below. On the first floor, the proposal is for a sun room/therapy room situated towards the rear of the dwelling. From the submitted photographs, the proposal has been partly constructed and therefore the proposal is part retrospective. However, works on the extension stopped as of 7th May 2021.

Planning History

Planning permission was granted for a single storey extension. Planning reference: 125479/FH/2019 granted permission in April 2020 for the erection of a single storey side extension, hip to gable roof alteration and installation of a rear dormer to create additional living accommodation. This permission although not implemented remains extant.

Applicants Case

Planning permission was granted in 2020 for a single storey extension, which is still an extant permission. The previously approved single storey extension projected up to the southern boundary of the site and ran the full length of the host dwelling.

The proposed single storey extension is similar in size to the approved development. The only difference is a modest rear projection of approximately one metre. This projection into the rear garden is a modest addition to the previously approved plan.

The proposal also includes a first floor element, which is to be set back from the front of the dwelling by approximately 7.5 metres. This element will project beyond the rear part of the dwelling to the same extent as the ground floor element.

The sun room/therapy room will be approximately 7 metres in length by 1.9 metres. It would have a window facing the front, a side window facing across the width of the garden, a rear patio door with a small balcony facing the garden and glass blocks at high level on the southern elevation to prevent overlooking into the curtilages of the properties located on Meldon Road. The balcony is required for ventilation as 50% of the room is incorporating glass.

The location of the sun room/therapy room has been chosen so that the sun rises towards the back of the property and sets towards the front of the property. Therefore, this room will receive sunlight throughout the day.

Policy DC1 of the Councils UDP refers to residential extensions. DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

a. the general character of the property;

The character of the area is relatively mixed, with residential properties along Birchfields Road and a small retail area on Meldon Road. The first floor element of the extension would be set back from the road and it is not considered to be harmful to the character of the area or the property.

b. the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;

The nearest neighbours that would be affected by the proposal are No's 1 & 3 Meldon Road, which are commercial units. These two properties back onto the application site. The rear of No 1 faces the front part of the extension, which is proposed to be single storey. Given planning permission was granted in 2020 for a similar relationship, it is not considered to be harmful to the neighbouring property.

No 3 comprises a shop/office with a flat above. This is evidenced by a change of use approval in 1997 to a shop with living accommodation above, planning reference 051928/FO/CENTL1/97. The neighbouring building has an outrigger, which accommodates a kitchen on the first floor (see photograph below). This window is located approximately 6 metres from the southern boundary of the application site, however the window serves a room which is not considered to be a habitable room and would be overlooking the single storey element of the extension and not the two storey part. Therefore, the proposed extension would not be harmful to occupants of the flat above No 3 Meldon Road when looking out of this window. Furthermore, No 3 wants to construct an outbuilding along their rear boundary, which will partially conceal the proposed extension. The neighbouring

occupier has also allowed the applicant to use part of their yard for scaffolding and overall has no issues with the proposal.

The neighbouring property has another window, which serves a bedroom. This window does serve a habitable room, however the distance is about 11 metres to the southern boundary of the application site. This is considered a sufficient separation distance so that no harm is caused to the living conditions of the neighbouring residents.



- c. *the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;*

The applicant is seeking to adapt his dwelling to meet his changing needs. This is discussed in more detail in Policy DC1.5

d. the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene;

The proposed extension would set back from the front of the dwelling by a significant amount. Furthermore, the front of the dwelling is set back from the road, the proposed extension would have a width of about two metres, Therefore when viewed from the road, the combination of the narrow width of the extension, and its position means that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the street.

e. the effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

The site has parking provision for two/three vehicles in an area in front of the dwelling. The proposal would have no impact on the parking provision for the site.

Policy DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

a. they are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of the original buildings);

The proposed extension would not project in front of the original dwelling. Although the proposal is for a part two storey side extension, it is set back from the front of the dwelling and given it is only seven metres long and a width of two metres it is not considered excessively large or bulky and remains subservient to the host dwelling.

b. they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;

The neighbouring properties are located to the south of the application dwelling and therefore the extension would have no impact on sunlight to these neighbouring properties. The proposal includes glass blocks on the side elevation on the first floor extension, which would prevent any overlooking into the neighbour's property.

c. they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details;

The proposed development would not be particularly visible on the streetscene and therefore would not be harmful to the character of the area. The proposed extension would be constructed in matching materials to the host dwelling.

d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

The proposal would not result in a loss of off street parking

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;

The extension to the rear would be approximately one metre, which is in accordance with this element of the policy.

b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;

The design of the two-storey element of the extension is a flat roof, this is necessary for three reasons. Firstly, so that the roof can accommodate two lantern lights to provide as much

sunlight into the room and secondly given the extension is set back from the front of the dwelling, it is difficult to construct a pitched roof that would integrate successfully into the roof shape of the host dwelling. Thirdly, by providing a flat roof this reduces the mass of the extension to the minimum so that the impact on the properties on Meldon Road is reduced. Furthermore, in accordance with the policy the proposal would not be particularly visible from the public highway. Overall it is accepted that the proposal is contrary to this part of the policy, however consideration should be given to the applicant's needs which is discussed Policy DC1.5

c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;

The dwelling is a semi-detached property and therefore this part of the policy is not relevant to the proposal.

d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;

The dwelling is not a bungalow and therefore this element of the policy is not relevant to the proposal.

e. extensions, which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

The guidance on housing does not appear to include privacy distances for extensions

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;

The application dwelling is a semi-detached property, however on the southern side, where the proposed extension is to be located, there is no immediate neighbour. The two neighbouring properties No's 1 & 3 Meldon Road are served from a different street and back onto the application site. Therefore the proposal would not 'close the gap' between neighbouring dwellings and therefore this element of the policy is not relevant to the proposal.

b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;

Given there is no immediate dwelling to the south of the application site the proposal would not create a terracing effect and therefore this part of the policy is not relevant to the proposal.

c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

The proposed extension would not create a narrow gap between properties due to the orientation and location of the neighbouring properties on Meldon Road.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy.

Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be on the boundary of the site as would not provide the required separation. However given the proposal is not relevant to criteria a) and c) as stated above, it is considered in this instance the proposal accords with Policy DC1.4

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.

The extension is necessary for health reasons as the applicant has multiple sclerosis. This can cause a wide range of symptoms and affect any part of the body. Each person with the condition is affected differently. However, one main symptom is fatigue. To help with this condition it is necessary to provide solutions to relax the muscles and one way to achieve this is to provide sunlight. Therefore, the room is necessary for the applicant to be able to relax in an area, which is going to achieve significant levels of sunlight.

The room, will stop relapses of MS and extend life expectancy of the applicant. If this was diagnosed 10 years ago, less was known about this condition, however advances in current science and understanding has increased awareness and how to stop relapses

The applicant will provide a letter from his GP, which provides more information on this matter. Furthermore, as the proposal is for an application to alter and extend a dwelling to provide facilities designed to secure that persons greater health and comfort, the proposal is exempt from a payment fee. The previous application approved in 2020 was exempt from payment on similar grounds. The applicant is also entitled to the higher rate of disability for both care and mobility and has carers to assist him.

The proposal should be considered against Policy DC1.5 and provides an exemption against the above policies where the proposal is contrary to, in particular DC1.3.

Conclusion

The proposed development complies with Policies DC1.1 to DC1.4 and provides an exception in accordance with Policy DC1.5

For the above reasons the Council is requested to approve the planning application.

.