

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 128763/FO/2020

Date registered valid: 6 January 2021

Proposal: Erection of ground, first and second floor rear extension in association with the change of use of ground floor to retail/office use and ancillary storage and formation of 2 upper floor apartments with associated elevational alterations

Address: 1046 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX

Ward(s): Levenshulme Ward

Applicant: Mr Sheraz Ahmed 22 Glendale Avenue , Manchester, M19 1FF

Agent (if any): Mr Zeeshan Aziz 22 Arnside Street, Manchester , M14 7PF

Case officer: Carl Glennon
Tel: 0161 234 4530
Email: carl.glennon@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 26 February 2021

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Dwellings

Date of site visit: 23 December 2020 (as part of the assessment of neighbouring application Ref: 128744/FO/2020)

Standard consultations:

Printed: 7 January 2021 Expired: 28 January 2021

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 7 January 2021 Expired: 28 January 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: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

This application relates to the northern half of a pair of traditional semi-detached houses. The properties are situated between Kevin Street to the north and A former railway used cutting, now used as a walking route, runs to the south of the site. The main part of Levenshulme District Centre is located to the north of the site.

The property presents 2-storeys to Stockport Road with semi-hexagonal ground floor bay. The property composes pitch and grey slate pitched roof. The frontage incorporates sash windows with detailed lintels replicate at the eaves of the ground floor bay. The main entrance has recessed arch and steps formed as result of the incorporation of the semi-exposed basement. The site is separated from Stockport Road by a low boundary wall. Changes to the roof pitch allows the formation of 3-storeys to the west (rear). The west elevation also incorporates a 2-storey rear outrigger that spans the shared boundary with 1048 Stockport Road and extends to a mid-point on the rear elevation. Access to the rear of the site is maintained by a footpath within the site adjacent to the Kevin Street boundary and leading to a retained rear garden area.

The property formerly had a far larger garden but its size was reduced to facilitate the development of a Erection of a single storey detached office building (Use Class B1) within the

rear garden of existing residential property with access from Kevin Street (ref: 118050/FO/2017 approved on appeal ref: APP/B4215/W/18/3196589 date: 20 June 2018). This permission has not been implemented but the site has recently been the subject of the following planning refusal (dated 27 January 2021) Ref: 128744/FO/2020 - Erection of two storey detached office building (Class E) within rear garden of existing property. The application site originally formed part of the garden area of 1046 Stockport Road. Both the application site and the adjacent development site have been enclosed with 1.8 metre high timber boarded fencing. The property is currently vacant following the cessation of its use as a house in multiple occupation.



Fig.1 – 1046 Stockport Road (Front and rear)

Description of development

The development comprises of a retail / office use (Class E) and upper floor residential elements. The proposed Class E use would be located at ground floor level with retained access to the basement area. The submission details the complete removal of the ground floor frontage, including the bay. Details of perforated roller shutters have been provided along with projecting boxes. However, details of the provision of glazed shopfront have not been provided. Whilst the applicant has indicated that a ramped access would be provided, specific details to address quite significant differences in ground and internal floor levels have not been provided. There is also an absence of details relating to the relationship of the ground floor the ground floor basement, including the means of enclosing the exposed basement.

To the rear, a part 3, part 2 storey extension would be formed with the ridge line maintained at its existing height. The existing 2-storey outrigger and recess would be subsumed into a 3-storey extension that extend across the rear elevation and have an overall rearward projection of 7.39 metres, ie, 4.65 metres beyond the line of the existing outrigger and extending along the shared boundary with No 1048 forming continuous blank brickwork terminating at the western site boundary. The 2-storey element would have a width of 2.79 metres with a lean-to roof. The recess in the built form would facilitate the formation of an open space that would accommodate proposed waste storage area. New windows would be incorporated into the northern elevation of the enlarged part of the building and adjoining extension. Windows in a vertical configuration would be positioned in the 3 floors of the enlarge western (rear) elevation.

Internally, the ground floor would comprise of a main retail unit accessed via a new shopfront with a secondary access formed from the northern elevation via the retained passageway. A second office / retail unit would be formed within the extended rear of the ground floor. Again, with a secondary access formed from the northern elevation but with an access retained through the main retail unit. Shared kitchen and WC would be formed within the ground floor

The submitted details are unclear but appear to show a separate access to two upper floor apartments via an internal staircase. At first floor level, a one bedroom flat with en-suite and separate shower rooms, kitchen /diner and living room would be formed. The second floor a studio apartment would be formed. Again, the arrangements for accessing the first and second floor are unclear and it is not apparent as to whether the apartments would be fully self-contained.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents and neighbouring businesses – One email has been received from a local resident who is concerned that the development would increase traffic around the site and exacerbate localised parking problems.

Environmental Health – Recommend that any planning application be conditioned to ensure:

- i. Noise insulation of the residential uses from noise, including Stockport Road;
- ii. Implementation of the submitted waste and recycling details.

Highway Services – The following comments have been received:

- i. In the absence of any on-site car parking we would recommend that secure cycle storage and that a travel plan be conditioned as part of any approval;
- ii. It is noted that whilst Kevin Street is unadopted, it appears that the applicant owns part of the adjacent land on Kevin Street and therefore has access rights to the rear;

- iii. Whilst the waste storage proposals are acceptable to Highways, clarification should be provided regarding arrangements for refuse collection via Kevin Street, particularly if cars are parked on the street in close proximity to the site;
- iv. Pedestrian access arrangements are acceptable from a highway perspective;
- v. Should the planning permission be granted it is recommended that a construction management plan be conditioned.

Flood Risk Management Team – Recommend that consideration be given to the incorporation of a drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage.

GM Police Design for Security – Recommend that, if access to the proposed flats is to be formed at the side of the building, natural surveillance should be improved through the replacement of the timber fencing with visually permeable metal railings or similar. The development should also demonstrate that it responds positively to Secured by Design standards.

GM Ecology Unit - As works are proposed to the roof and given the location of the application site, proposed development should be supported with a preliminary bat survey.

Issues

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - This Framework came into effect on 27th March 2012 and was amended and updated in February 2019. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It defines the Government's requirements for the planning system 'only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so'. It provides a mechanism through 'which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities'.

The Framework re-iterates that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory status of the development plan remains as the starting point for decision making. However, paragraph 10 states that 'at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development' and, in 'decision-taking', this means that development proposals should accord with the development plan should be approved without delay unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The Framework has been related to the proposed development, with particular emphasis given to the following:

- ii. Chapter 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes - States that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that: a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed; the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay (paragraph 59). This should be reflected in the consideration of the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community (paragraph 61). In this case the development would result in the loss accommodation that is capable of occupation by a family and is therefore required to meet an identified housing need within the city. The development would not, therefore, accord with chapter 5.

Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities - States that planning decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive, accessible and safe places, where crime and disorder (and the fear of crime) do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion (paragraph 91). These considerations have been related to the layout and design of the proposed development and the incorporation of measures to address issues of security and potential opportunities for criminal and anti-social behaviour.

The applicant has not clearly demonstrate that ground floor units could be satisfactorily separated to secure self- contained units with appropriate access. Similarly, the appropriate separation of access to the upper floor flats has not been demonstrated. The reliance access to the retail unit and apartments with the side elevation is concern particularly at night when natural surveillance would be less effective. The proposed alterations to the principal elevation would undermine the character of the existing building and its relationship to the adjacent property. It would also bring retail / commercial activity into proximity to the doorway of No 1048, which would be potentially excessive and harmful to residential amenity. The proposed rear extensions present significant concerns, due to their magnitude and siting in relation to the adjoining No 1048. The proposed extensions would result in the cramped over development of the site. The development would result in the expansion of retail / commercial use and lead to the loss of a property capable of providing much needed family accommodation. It is therefore considered that the development would fail to respond positively to Chapter 8.

iii. Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport - States that in assessing specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) Appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- b) Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- c) Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree (paragraph 108).

The development is within a sustainable location with access to transportation links. Notwithstanding the comments of Highways Services, it is considered that the development would result in some traffic generation that would not be supported within the application site, in relation to the proposed mix of uses, The impact of additional congestion and parking on the highway is a concern.

iv. Chapter 11: Making effective use of land - States that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land. It is acknowledged that an appeal decision permitted the formation of a single storey office building. However, the formation of a part 3 and 2-storey building would significantly increase the magnitude of built form in the site with an accompanying increased intensity of activity. It is not considered that the development would be appropriately related to the scale, proportions and character of the host building and the limited capacity of the application site. Chapter 11 would not, therefore, be accorded with.

v. Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places - States that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities (paragraph 124). The proposed rear extensions would fail to acknowledge the character of neighbouring built form in relation to its composition, scale and massing. The proposed shopfront would represent an obtrusive and incongruous addition that has not been related to the appearance of the existing building. The application has not been supported with details of a glazed shopfront or an indication of how the intervention to might be reconciled to the principal elevation. It is thereby concluded that the proposed design would fail to accord with chapter 12.

Planning Practice Guidance - On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched this planning practice guidance web-based resource and is relevant to key planning issues of significance to applicants and local authorities. In considering this application consideration has been given to the following aspects of the PPG:

- i. Consultation and pre-decision matters
- ii. Health and well-being
- iii. Noise

Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ('the Core Strategy') was adopted by the Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.'

The following policies are relevant to the proposed development:

Policy SP 1 - Specifies the Core Development Principles for parts of the City. In this case the relevant principles relate to the extent to which the development:

- i. Makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including the creation of well designed places that enhance or create character; making a positive contribution to the health, safety and well-being of residents, considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income and to protect and enhance the built and natural environment;
- ii. Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible;
- iii. Improve access to jobs, services, education and open space by being located to reduce the need to travel and provide good access to sustainable transport provision.

It is considered that the proposed Class E use would generate additional levels of activity, noise and disturbance that would be harmful to residential amenity and well-being. The extensive elevations and excessively large rear extensions would fail to achieve a quality of design that would enhance the character and appearance of the streetscene to Stockport Road and Kevin Street. The limited employment opportunities presented by the development would be offset by the incongruous nature of the design and the loss of potential family accommodation. It is not considered, therefore, that the development would be satisfactorily related to policy SP1.

Policy C 1 Centre Hierarchy - States that the development of town centre uses (as defined in national planning policy) will be prioritised in the centres identified in this policy, taking account of the different roles of the City Centre, District Centres and Local Centres. Policy C1 states that district centres, such as Levenshulme, have an essential role in providing key services to the City's neighbourhoods including shopping, commercial, leisure, public and community functions, ensuring that residents can access such services easily. They are also a focus for the City's residential neighbourhoods, providing an important opportunity to define local character. It further states that these centres should primarily respond to the needs of the catchment and recognise the need to support the vitality and viability of other centres. The application site is located on the periphery of Levenshulme District Centre and it is not considered that the formation of a further Class E use would particularly enhance the existing retail offer.

Furthermore, given the poorly of the design associated with the development, it is not considered that a significant contribution would be made to quality the appearance of street frontage of Levenshulme District Centre. The development would thereby fail to comply with policy C1.

Policy C 2 District centres - States that development will support thriving district centres, with distinct local character, providing a good range of accessible key services, including retail, health facilities, public services, leisure activities and financial and legal services. The delivery of this floor space should respect the network of centres across the City and in neighbouring districts. As discussed above, it is acknowledged that the development would make a limited contribution to local employment but would be offset by its harmful impact in terms of the introduction of excessive built form and activity associated with the use. Policy C2, therefore, would not be positively accorded with.

Policy EC9 South Manchester - States that within South Manchester, including Levenshulme District Centre, development proposals and planning applications should have regard to: ensuring efficient use of existing employment space; improving public transport, walking and cycling connectivity between residential neighbourhoods and employment locations. In this case the development relates to residential rather than employment space and would not contribute positively to the character of the district centre. Furthermore, development would provide additional floorspace and unduly increase activity around the site to the detriment of residential amenity. The development would not, therefore respond positively to policy EC9.

Policy EC1 Employment and Economic Growth in Manchester - The relevant sections of policy EC 1 include the contribution of the development to:

- o Improving access to jobs for all via public transport, walking and cycling;
- o Demonstrating that employment-generating development has fully considered opportunities to provide jobs for local people, through construction or use;
- o Ensuring the continued social, economic and environmental regeneration of the City;

It is considered that the benefits of providing an expanded Class E use with additional employment opportunities would not satisfactorily compensate for the previously outlined harm to residential and visual amenity and loss of family housing. Policy EC1 would not be accorded with.

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) - States that all development in Manchester will be expected to achieve an appropriate standard of urban design, as identified in national planning guidance and have regard to the character area in which the development is located. In this case the relationship of the proposal to both the existing building and the surrounding context, including neighbouring housing is not considered to be acceptable.

Policy EN 14 (Flood Risk) – Relates to the provision of appropriate drainage and the management of flood risk. The development is in Flood Zone 1 and the scale of the development would not usually have a significant increase the risk of flooding.

Policy EN18 Contaminated Land and Ground Stability - States that any proposal for development of contaminated land must be accompanied by a health risk assessment. No issues have been identified by Environmental Health.

Policy H1 (Overall Housing Provision) – Discusses the need to manage the supply and availability of housing in the city. It also the need to ensure that housing supply contributes to creating mixed communities by providing house types to meet the needs of a diverse and

growing Manchester population. The development would conflict with policy H1 by reducing the supply of accommodation that is capable of being occupied by a larger family.

Policy H 6 (South Manchester) – Discusses the delivery of new residential development in South Manchester, including Levenshulme. It also identifies the need to address the need to meet shortfalls in housing need, including the provision of family housing. For the reasons previously discussed the loss of housing suitable for family accommodation, which would be contrary to policy H6.

Policy T1 Sustainable Transport - Relates to the delivery of sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, which encourages a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking and prepare for carbon free modes of transport. In this case, the application site is in a sustainable location with easy access to bus routes on Stockport Road. Cycle storage would not be provided. Policy T1 has not been responded to positively.

Policy T 2 Accessible areas of opportunity and need - The Council will actively manage the pattern of development and the relevant section of the policy states: that new development should provide appropriate car parking facilities, including meeting the needs of disabled people and the provision cycle parking. The development would not supported with cycle storage or on-site car parking. Notwithstanding the sustainable location of the site, there is concern the development would have the potential to generate car parking in relation to the Class E and residential use that would not be satisfactorily accommodated in the adjacent Kevin Street. The resulting congestion being harmful to residential amenity. The development therefore would not responded positively to policy T2.

Policy DM1 Development Management - States that all development should have regard to the following specific issues, which are relevant in relation to the proposed development:

- o Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail;
- o Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development;
- o Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area;
- o Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, road safety and traffic generation;
- o Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes;
- o Community safety and crime prevention;
- o Design for health;
- o Refuse storage and collection;
- o Vehicular access and car parking;
- o Flood risk and drainage.

As previously discussed, it is considered that the scale and magnitude of the proposed development, together with the related intensity of the use, would be harmful to the amenity and well-being of residents and the wider locality. Policy DM1 would therefore not be accorded with.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) saved policies - The following saved policy is considered to be relevant:

Policy E3.3 Upgrade the appearance of radial and orbital routes - This policy (E3.3) is relevant given the views of the site from Stockport Road, which is a major radial route to the City Centre. It requires that new development contributes to the improvement of the appearance of such routes. This is to be achieved through improvements to the appearance of adjacent premises; encouraging new development of the highest quality; and ensuring that landscape schemes are

designed to minimise litter problems. As discussed, the interventions the Stockport Rod elevation would undermine the appearance and character of the building and its relationship to the streetscene. It is not considered that the development would achieve a standard of design that would contribute positively to Stockport Road as a radial route, policy E3.3 would not be accorded with.

Policy DC26 Development and Noise - Is relevant to the proposed development due to its potential to generate noise and disturbance through the operation of the proposed use and any external associated equipment. The following aspects of this policy (DC26) are considered to be relevant to the proposed development.

Policy DC26.1 - Has been related to the proposal potential contribution of the development to the local noise environment.

Policy DC26.4 - Requires that where an existing noise source might result in an adverse impact upon a proposed new development, or where a new proposal might generate potentially unacceptable levels of noise, consideration is given to measures to deal with it satisfactorily. This is particularly relevant given the proximity of the site to established residential uses.

Policy DC26.5 - Has been related to the assessment of the development, in terms of measures to control noise, including the provision of noise insulation.

Based on the comments of Environmental Health, it is considered that these noise issues are capable of being addressed through a noise attenuation condition. However, the more unpredictable impact of additional activity generated by customers and traffic movements potentially into the later evening has the potential to significantly harm residential amenity, particularly with regard to the occupants of the adjoining No 1048. It is therefore not considered that policy DC26 would be appropriately accorded with.

Guide to Development in Manchester - States that throughout the City, the Council will encourage development that complements Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance. The Guide aims to support and enhance the on-going shaping of the City by providing a set of reasoned principles which will guide developers, designers and residents to the sort of development we all want to see in Manchester. The following aspects of the guide have been given consideration in this case and have been appropriately responded to:

- i. Paragraph 4.11 - States that all developments should be supported with a waste management strategy to ensure that adequately sized bin storage areas, access for collection crews and vehicles, and other aspects of waste management are designed into the development at the earliest stage;
- ii. Paragraph 11.24 - States that district and local centres are an important feature of neighbourhoods and contribute to the image and sense of place of an area;
- iii. Policy 11.25 - State that, whether they play a district or local function, centres should accommodate a range of facilities and services, not simply shops and hot food premises.

For the reasons previously discussed, it is not considered the above guidance would be positively responded to.

Positive and proactive engagement with the applicant - An amendment to the DMO, which came into effect on 1st December 2012, requires every decision notice relating planning permission and reserved matters application to include an explanation as to how the local planning authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems, which arise during the determination of the planning application.

This includes the identification of issues and 'problems' associated with the proposals that have required positive consideration, dialogue and negotiation to secure positive outcomes.

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. In this case, the applicant was advised that the principle of the development was not supported due to its excessive magnitude, incongruous relation to its surrounding context and potential harm to residential amenity. In addition, advice was issued regarding the need to submit additional drawings to address identified discrepancies in the submitted application. The applicant was given the opportunity to withdraw the planning application but requested its determination. The applicant has not sought to address the discrepancies in the submitted drawings. The planning application has therefore been assessed with regard to the submitted information and without further negotiation.

Principle of the development – The application site is located in close proximity to Levenshulme District Centre. The nearest commercial use is a bar located at the junction of Kevin Street and Stockport Road. There is also an extant planning permission for a single storey Class E office building in the former garden of No 1046 (Appeal ref: APP/B4215/W/18/3196589). Notwithstanding the above, the application site is located within a section of Stockport Road where there is a transition from retail/commercial to residential use. There is concern the development would result in the incursion of retail/commercial use into a residential area with a resulting loss of some residential accommodation. The development would prevent the application property from being used as a home for a larger family, which is a form of accommodation that is needed within the city. The introduction of a ground floor use would also introduce levels of noise and activity that would be harmful to residential amenity. This would particularly affect No 1048, which would experience significant activity, disturbance and loss of privacy in close proximity to its entrance to Stockport Road. The additional floorspace would also increase the intensity of the use and related activity in and around the site, which would be significant as the development is not supported with on-site car parking. The principle of the development is not considered to be acceptable in this case.

Loss of family accommodation - The proposed development would result in the loss of housing that has capability of providing residential accommodation for occupation by a family. The development would thereby reduce the supply and availability of family housing and would fail to positively respond to an identified housing need and undermine the formation of cohesive and sustainable neighbourhoods where people would choose to live.

Siting – The proposal would lead to an excessive overdevelopment of a site with insufficient capacity to accommodate so much additional built form. The proposed increase to the building footprint would result in the presentation of part 3 and 2 storeys of continuous brickwork along the shared boundary with adjoining No 1048. Given the tight constraints of the application site it is considered the excessive formation of built form would have an overbearing and harmful impact on residents' outlook from No 1048 and enjoyment of its garden. The impact of the intensive site coverage would be exacerbated through the implementation of extant planning permission ref: 118050/FO/2017 relating to a single storey office building. Very limited open space would be maintained within the site, which would be utilised for waste container storage. The siting of the development combined with its height, scale and massing would also lead to the formation of a disproportionately large addition to the building. Its adverse impact would be emphasised by the loss of distinctive spaces across the site.

Height, scale and massing – The development would increase the amount of built form at second floor level. The existing 2-storey outrigger would be subsumed into the development. The new 2-storey element would be higher than the existing circumstance with a far more significant rearward projection. The impact of the additional height of the building would be

significantly experienced by the residents of No 1048. However, the incorporate recess would not relieve the impact of additional height on Kevin Street. The formation of a disproportionately large building would result in comprehensive harm to the surrounding context. It is therefore considered that the development would be poorly related to the style and character of surrounding built form and would thereby produce an incongruous addition to the host building.

Design - The applicant has been advised of a number of discrepancies in the proposed design but has chosen not to provide revised details. These inaccuracies relate to the internal layout the enlarged building and an access to the proposed upper floor apartments. Full details have not been provided in relation to the details of commercial shopfront. It is apparent, however, that the existing principal elevations of both Nos 1046 and 1048 have notable architectural merit defined by a symmetrical arrangement of arched doorways and ground floor bays. These features would be lost through the formation of a large and prominent roller shuttered frontage. It is considered that this aspect of the proposals would be harmful to the residential character and appearance of both No 1046 and 1048. The excessively bulky canopy over the roller shutter box would emphasise the incongruous nature of this addition. To the rear, attempts to acknowledge the style of the existing roofscape and the formation of a partially recessed 2-storeyy outrigger have been overwhelmed by the additional height and projection of the rear extension. The use of expansive brickwork would be emphasised by a lack of detailing or architectural expression that might relieve the oppressive elevational composition. The proposed design is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

Inclusive access – The applicant has not provided details of how the change in levels between ground and internal floor levels the partial exposure of the basement. In addition, details have not been provided to demonstrate how inclusive access in response to these levels would be addressed. All secondary access points would incorporate steps. It is not considered that appropriate access would be provided to the public areas of the building. Ambulant access to would be provided via staircases to apartments, which would be a suitable arrangement for this type of development. However, the formation of a side access would be a concern is respect of residents security as set out below.

Residential amenity – The development would harm the amenity of the residents of No 1048 through the formation of a disproportionately large rear extension. Residential amenity would be further harmed by the noise activity and disturbance from the operation of the proposed ground floor Class E uses. This would be particularly significant due the proximity of the shopfront to the entrance of No 1048 and the potential for activity within the forecourt to be formed within the application site; which may extend into the later evening period. There is also concern that the applicant has not demonstrated the internal layout would provide self-contained apartments would achieve appropriate access, security and privacy. It is therefore considered that the development would fail to deliver appropriate safeguards to residential amenity.

Car parking and highways issues – It is acknowledged the previous residential was not supported by off-street car parking and it is unlikely that the proposed apartment would generate significant traffic. Servicing could be undertaken from Kevin Street. Traffic generation is likely to transient of limited in relation to the Class E use, if it were to be respectively limited to retail and commercial activity. However, the likely increase in vehicle movement within eth vicinity of the site, would be experience by residents as part of a more general increase in activity, noise and disturbance that the would be harmful to residential amenity.

Cycle storage – No provision has been made and given to the limited external space retained within the site, it is difficult to envisage how such provision might be delivered to secure sustainable transportation options as part of the development.

Crime reduction and site security – The development presents concerns regarding the appropriate provision of appropriate external and internal access arrangements to the proposed apartments. It may be argued that a review of the internal layout may address some of these concerns. The applicant has failed to demonstrate how the passageway to the side of the building would be secured to prevent unauthorised access to the upper floor apartments. This would be particularly significant should the ground floor operate as two separate Class E units with access to the rear unit being taken from the side of the building. However, the comments of GM Police indicated that the external layout could be reviewed to safeguard residents' safety and security.

Waste management – Whilst the waste management arrangements the requirements of Environmental Health, it is considered that the related siting of Eurobins would result in substantial loss of very limited amenity that might otherwise be used by residential. It is also considered that the siting of these bins in a tightly constrained space would emphasise the extensive footplate and cramped configuration of new built form.

Land conditions – No historic land contamination issues have been identified.

Flood risk – The site is in Flood Zone 1 and the provision of improved drainage would be encouraged, as appropriate, should a more suitable development be brought forward in the future.

Ecology – The comments of GM Ecology Unit have been forwarded to the applicant but the requested bat survey has not been submitted.

Conclusion – It is considered that the development, for the reasons set out above, would resulting in the overdevelopment of the site through the formation of an overly large building with an incongruous relationship to the streetscene. The development would also result in excessive activity in and around the application site and adjacent unadopted highways. The development would thereby be unacceptable due to its be harmful impact on residential amenity, the character of the area and pedestrian and highway safety.

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: Refuse

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. In this case, the applicant was advised that the principle of the development was not supported due to its excessive magnitude, incongruous relation to its surrounding context and potential harm to residential amenity. In addition, advice was issued regarding the need to submit additional drawings to address identified discrepancies in the submitted application. The applicant was given the opportunity to withdraw the planning application but requested its determination. The applicant has not sought to address the discrepancies in the submitted drawings. The planning application has therefore been assessed with regard to the submitted information and without further negotiation.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. The proposed extensions to the rear elevation and roof would, by virtue of their height, siting, scale, massing and design, would form an overly dominant, excessively bulky and incongruous feature that would: be poorly related to the constraints of the site and result in its overdevelopment; harmfully affect the relationship of the application property to neighbouring housing and character of the area and have an overbearing impact upon the streetscene. The proposed development would thereby adversely affect the residential and visual amenity contrary to policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 of Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development would result in the loss of boundary walls and architectural detailing including a bay window and arched doorways features to the principal elevation to Stockport Road. The development would thereby harmfully impact upon the character of 1046 Stockport and its relationship to and symmetry with the adjoining 1048 Stockport Road and adversely affect residential and visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene presented to Stockport Road. The development would thereby be contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, saved policy E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The replacement shopfront, involving incongruous roller shutters with an overly prominent canopy above it, would fail to secure an appropriate standard of design (including arrangements for inclusive access) and has not been supported with a programme of remediation works to ensure the reinstatement of brickwork and the enclosure of the exposed basement area. The development would thereby be contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, saved policy E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The development, involving the operation of ground floor Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) use within the would introduce levels of activity, noise and disturbance that would be harmful to the amenities and privacy of neighbouring residents, particularly the occupants of 1048 Stockport Road. The development would thereby be unduly harmful to residential amenity and contrary to policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The proposed development, involving a mix of Class E and residential uses, would result in the loss of housing that has capability of providing residential accommodation for occupation by a family. The development would thereby reduce the supply and availability of family housing and would fail to positively respond to an identified housing need and undermine the formation of cohesive and sustainable neighbourhoods where people would choose to live. The

development would thereby be contrary to policies SP1, H1, H6 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management
United Utilities Water PLC
Greater Manchester Police
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Flat 3, 1A Crayfield Road, Manchester, M19 3NX
23 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
1 Crayfield Road, Manchester, M19 3NX
1C Crayfield Road, Manchester, M19 3NX
1B Crayfield Road, Manchester, M19 3NX
Flat 2, 1042A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 1, 1042A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Ground Floor, 22 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
First Floor, 22 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
Flat 2, 1A Crayfield Road, Manchester, M19 3NX
Flat 1, 1A Crayfield Road, Manchester, M19 3NX
979 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 2SY
1040A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
1038A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 3, 969 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
Flat 1, 969 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
Flat 2, 969 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
Basement Flat, 1048 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 5, 1048 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 4, 1048 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 3, 1048 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 2, 1048 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 1, 1048 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
1044A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
16 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
14 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
12 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
10 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
8 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
6 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
4 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
2 Mandeville Street, Manchester, M19 2SS
1038 - 1040 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
21 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
1042 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
22 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW

973 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
969 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
975 - 977 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
971 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
1044 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
1046 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX

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
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH2