

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 128185/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 8 October 2020

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

Address: 1 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF

Ward(s): Northenden Ward

Applicant: Anna Rowley, Wythenshawe Community Housing Group, 460 Palatine Road, Wythenshawe, Manchester, M22 4DJ

Agent (if any): Mr Andrew Darbyshire, AD Design, 5 Wessex Close, Standish, WN1 2TJ

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 11 December 2020

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: 9 October 2020 Expired: 30 October 2020

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 red brick dwelling house with a gable roof and bay windows, featuring white render and red hanging tile detailing to the front elevation. The plot includes a driveway and front and rear gardens.

Description of area

Marylon Drive is a residential cul-de-sac within the Northenden ward, characterised by two storey semi-detached family dwelling houses with decorative red tile frontages. The area benefits from its proximity to Northenden District Centre and ample greenspace.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a two storey side and rear extension to provide additional living accommodation, in the form of a dining room and utility at ground floor and 2 small single bedrooms at first floor.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – One objection was received:

In light of the proposed proximity to the boundary and being a two storey extension that extends to both the side and rear of the property, we have concerns of overshadowing and that daylight and sunlight will be diminished to the directly neighbouring properties on Hollyway. We note no windows/doors are proposed to the new side elevation and would object to any

windows/doors being permitted to this elevation, in light of overlooking. Again, given the proximity to the boundary to our property of the proposed extension.

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)

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 two 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 and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The two storey extension would be sited on the south-east side of the house, projecting 2.16m to the side, with a depth of 7m, projecting beyond the rear wall by 1.35, with an eaves height to match the existing roof and a ridge height stepped down from the main ridge by 0.15m at the side and 1.14m at the rear. The front elevation would be set back from the principle elevation by 0.63m and set off the side boundary shared with No.3 Hollyway by 0.6m. Originally the proposal was to be flush with the principal elevation with a matching ridge height but negotiations took place to include a 0.6m setback and reduced ridge. This neighbouring property is sited perpendicular to the application site, with a gap of 9.2m remaining between the properties at first floor, once built, therefore it is not considered that the extension would lead to a terracing effect, hence a larger setback has not been requested of this proposal. The extension is stepped down at the ridge and set back from the principle elevation and accords with the dimensions set out in DC1, thus it is considered subservient to the main house and appropriately sited, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red brickwork, concrete interlocking roof tiles, white render, red hanging tiles and white uPVC windows/doors. The extension features two windows in the front elevation and 2 in the rear, one for each floor, with a back door opening onto the garden and blank side elevations. The roof is hipped with a pitch to match the existing roof. The extension features a setback to ensure a subservient appearance and protect the visual amenity of the house and area. Due to the orientation and arrangement of the property and neighbouring properties, the addition of a two storey side extension should not lead to a terracing effect or form an obtrusive feature within the street scene, particularly as similar two storey side extensions can be seen at No's 12 and 13 Marylon Drive and a very similar proposal was approved at No.1 Hollyway last year (124652/FH/2019).

Residential amenity – One objections was received from a local resident notified of the development. They raised concerns with the proximity of the extension to the boundary shared with the pair of semis on Hollyway and resulting loss of sunlight for these properties. However, due to the proposals orientation, north of this pair of semis, it is unlikely that they will experience a noticeable loss of sunlight. A gap of 0.6m is to be left to the boundary and the extension already has a relatively small sideward projection, at 2.16m, which is just over a third of the original width of the house, which is deemed acceptable. Due to the siting of the extension and neighbouring properties, it is not considered the works will be overbearing. In addition to this, the proposed side elevation will be blank, whereas the current gable wall contained windows, therefore this would increase the privacy of the neighbouring gardens and rear rooms south of the site. Hence the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Conclusion – Although it received an objection, the proposal complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and it is not considered 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 works 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 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 drawing numbered '20.029 PL03A', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 4th 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.

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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no first floor windows shall be inserted into the side elevations of the extension hereby approved, without permission from the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

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

4 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF
47 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS
3 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF
5 Hollyway, Manchester, M22 4WS
45 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS
2 Marylon Drive, Manchester, M22 4WF
7 Hollyway, Manchester, M22 4WS
3 Hollyway, Manchester, M22 4WS
1 Hollyway, Manchester, M22 4WS
43 Royle Green Road, Manchester, M22 4NS

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