

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 129399/FO/2021

Date registered valid: 17 February 2021

Proposal: Erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Address: 136 Errwood Road, Manchester, M19 1HT

Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Ms Soraya Begum, 136 Errwood Road, Manchester, M19 1HT

Agent (if any): Mr Andrew Jones, 23 Langland Drive, Manchester, M30 7NJ

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 6 May 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

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 dwellinghouse of red brick with a hipped roof. The property does not feature any previous extensions and the sizable plot includes a front garden, driveway and rear garden. The property is set back from the road with access across the footpath and a grassy bank featuring established trees.

Description of area

Errwood Road is predominantly residential in nature and sited opposite Errwood Road within Burnage. This section of it contains of a mixture of housing association stock and owner-occupied semi and quasi-semi-detached family dwellinghouses, mainly arranged in small cul-de-sacs.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a part single part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation. Previously the applicant applied for a larger part single part two storey rear extension with hip to gable roof extension and rear box dormer under the reference 127358/FH/2020, which was refused and then dismissed at appeal. This is an amended re-submission.

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 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 conflicts with the principles of this policy document.

Issues

Principle – Extending a residential property, via a part single part two storey rear extension, in order to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable in principle, however, consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale, design, appearance and impact upon both residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The rear extension would project 5m at ground-floor, occupying a width of 5.66m, with an eaves height of 2.5m and a maximum height of 3.58m. The first floor would project 3m with a width of 4.4m, along with a stepped aspect towards the party wall which would project 1.5m, with a width of 1.5m, sited 1m from the party wall. The eaves would match on the side elevation facing No.134, but would be 0.26m higher adjacent to the party wall due to accommodating the stepped element, and the ridge would be set 1m lower than the main ridge. The extension would be sited 1m from the party wall shared with No.138 at ground floor also and 1.59m from the boundary shared with No.134. The depth of the ground floor extension exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) however a single-storey rear extension with a projection of 6m could be built under the Larger Homes Extension scheme, however this wouldn't apply here due to the total enlargement including the first floor element. The previous proposal had a ground floor projection of 6m sited 0.25m from the boundary and was deemed too large but the revised scheme is considered to alleviate some of the impacts and adequately addresses our concerns. The garden is large enough to accommodate a 5m extension, hence this element is acceptable. The first floor accords with DC1 in projection and although the original submission featured a full-width projection, the revised scheme following successful negotiations leaves adequate gaps to the shared boundaries. The extension is now considered subservient to the main house and is sited and scaled appropriately, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Design and visual amenity – The works would utilise materials to match the existing dwellinghouse including red brick, roof tiles and uPVC windows and doors. The single storey aspect would have a mono-pitched tiled roof containing two rooflights. The first floor aspect would have a dual-pitched roof with rear gable. Originally the plans included a hip to gable alteration and dormer but this was removed. The rear elevation would feature a bedroom

window and bathroom window at first floor and a kitchen window and glazed bi-folding doors opening onto the garden at ground floor. The side elevation facing the adjoining semi, No.138, would form a blank wall, with the side elevation facing No.134 containing a bathroom window at first floor (conditioned to be obscurely glazed) and a kitchen window at ground floor. Due to the siting at the rear, although the side elevation would be visible from the highway, it would not form a prominent feature within the street scene, particularly given the distance to the road (approx. 28m). The proposed materials are to match and the design is to be expected of such development, therefore the appearance of the revised proposal is considered acceptable and is not thought to significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor area, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Residential amenity – The orientation of the rear elevation is west-facing, therefore the adjoining semi No.138 is sited to the south and No.134 is sited to the north. Neither of these properties have extended towards the application site. Given the proposed height (3.1m at ground floor and 5.8m at first floor) and distance to the shared boundary of 1.59m, No.134 will suffer a loss of sunlight in the afternoon, however by evening their garden gets plenty of sunlight therefore this is not deemed a significant impact. The extension had the potential to have an overbearing impact upon No.138 adjoining, but the reduced depth at ground floor, increased gap to the boundary and stepped first floor element ensures the works do not cause undue harm in this respect. Their outlook should not be significantly impeded and their garden is large (approx. 18m x 9m). In addition to this, no objections have been received from the local residents notified of the development, therefore the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, it received no objections and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and construction may continue in accordance with the following conditions and approved drawings.

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. 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 revised drawings numbered '02 Rev 4' and '04 Rev 4' stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 20th April 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 hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form.

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 first floor window in the side elevation, facing No.134 Errwood Road, 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

66 Arbor Avenue, Manchester, M19 1EZ
134 Errwood Road, Manchester, M19 1HT
12 Avon Gardens, Manchester, M19 1FZ
138 Errwood Road, Manchester, M19 1HT
10 Avon Gardens, Manchester, M19 1FZ

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) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH