

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 128842/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 10 December 2020

Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 65 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WY

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Tariq Bourdouane, 65 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WY

Agent (if any): Mr Barry Bradley, Bradley Building Design Ltd, Keepers Cottage, Lyme Park, Disley, Stockport, SK12 2NS

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 3 February 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: Photos received with application

Standard consultations: Printed: 10 December 2020 Expired: 31 December 2020

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 10 December 2020 Expired: 31 December 2020

Site notice: Posted: 21 December 2020 Expired: 11 January 2021

Press advert: Published: 15 December 2020 Expired: 5 January 2021

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order:

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached red brick C3 dwellinghouse featuring white render, bay windows and a pantile gable roof. The property has not been previously extended and the plot includes a driveway and front and rear gardens bounded by established hedges.

Description of area

Old Lansdowne Road is a residential road in West Didsbury comprising of large Victorian houses, many since converted into flats or house shares, which differ slightly in detail and shape at each section of the street. The applicant's garden backs onto the tennis club and bowling green. It is sited within the Albert Park Conservation Area (1988) and benefits from its proximity to Burton Road local centre and good transport links.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey side and rear wrap around extension to provide additional living accommodation in the form of a larger kitchen, a w/c and utility.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – 1 letter of objection was received for both this application and the application for the dormer () however the points for this particular application were more to point out inaccuracies than object to the extension:

There are two separate planning applications that are clearly interdependent regarding the property at 65 Old Lansdowne Road. Neither application considers or cross-references the impact of the other application or the alterations and changes in structural integrity of the building and footings at the boundary. I am concerned that the footings illustrated do not consider both applications thereby nullifying either application should one be successful.

There are some minor errors in the application such as window material – All are currently timber. There is a shared hedge on the boundary shared with 63 Old Lansdowne road that will require minor pruning.

I have no significant objections to the scale (I have mentioned that because the extension extends further than our extension the hedge will be impacted), materials or siting of either proposal.

West Didsbury Residents Association – No objection to the proposal.

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
- Policy DC18 - Conservation Areas

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
- Policy EN3 – Heritage

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018)

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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, is acceptable however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance, impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity and upon the character of the conservation area.

Siting, scale and massing – The single storey extension would be sited at the side and rear, wrapping around the south-west corner, much like the adjoining neighbour No.63 has done. It would have an overall depth of 9.58m, with a projection past the outrigger of 3.5m, and an overall width of 7m, with a sideward projection of 1.46m. It would be setback from the principal elevation by 2.37m, set away from the side boundary shared with No.67 by 0.8m and set in from the party wall shared with No.67 by 0.15m. It would feature a flat roof with a height of 3m and glazed roof lanterns with a maximum height of 3.2m. Although the extension would be sited very

close to the boundary it shares with No.63, but will leave a nominal gap as it is not attached to their extension, which has a depth of 3m and a height of 4m. The rearward depth accords with the limit stipulated within policy DC1, of 3.65m, and has an acceptable height and width, therefore the proposal is considered subservient to the main house and is in proportion as a single storey addition, pursuant to policies DC1, DC18, DM1 and SP1.

Design and impact upon visual amenity and conservation area – The flat roofed extension would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red brickwork and white timber windows. A condition requiring these materials to match those specified has been attached to the decision. The front elevation would contain one small window, the side would contain a door and the rear would feature a wide set of crittall style bi-folding doors with a stone lintel above and a wide step facilitating access onto the garden. The extension would be visible from the highway but due to its relatively small scale, 3m in height and 1.46m in width, and significant setback of 2.37m, the extension is not considered to form a prominent feature within the street scene. Extensions are a relatively common feature in the area, with similar side extensions visible at the adjoining semi No.63 (092303/FH/2010/S2), as well as No's 33, 37 and 45 Old Lansdowne Road. Both policy EN3 and saved policy DC18 state that applications within conservation areas should preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area and that it is desirable for retention of existing features, such as boundary walls, gardens, trees and, where possible, preserving, enhancing the character, setting within the conservation area. The proposal does not remove or affect any important features of the property and there is no original boundary wall. As the objector stated, the hedging along the side boundaries will require some pruning but no trees are proposed to be affected. The principal frontage would remain unchanged. Due to the design and siting of the side and rear extension it is not considered that the proposal will have an unduly detrimental impact upon the character of the Albert Park Conservation Area and as a result it is considered that the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.

Residential amenity – An objection was received from a local resident, which pointed out the original windows are timber, not uPVC as stated on the application form, and that the hedge will require pruning, both points on which the agent agreed was correct. No further objections were received. Due to the existing similar extension at No.63 it is not considered that the proposal would have any further impacts on these occupiers in terms of loss of light or an overbearing impact and the property shares its south-western boundary with No.67 which is orientated as not to experience an undue loss of sunlight. In addition there are no windows proposed for this elevation hence privacy is not deemed an issue also. Therefore the proposal is now considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Refuse storage and parking – The proposal would leave an adequate gap to the boundary (0.8m), meaning the refuse bins can be stored in the rear garden, out of sight. Due to the setback the driveway would be retained with space for 1-2 cars, therefore off-street parking provision and the storage of refuse accords with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, it received no objections of weight and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor cause substantial harm the visual amenity of the house nor Albert Park Conservation Area. The proposed development is 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 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 applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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 numbered '02', '03' and the site plan, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 10th December 2020.

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, including: red brickwork to match existing and white timber windows.

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

West Didsbury Residents Association

86 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WX
12 Avoncourt Drive, Manchester, M20 2QD
67 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WY
10 Avoncourt Drive, Manchester, M20 2QD
63 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WY
88 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WX
84 Old Lansdowne Road, Manchester, M20 2WX

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
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH