

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 128221/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 7 October 2020

Proposal: Erection of a part single part two storey side extension to include roof terrace to form additional living accommodation

Address: The Coach House, 58 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA

Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: Mr Ryan Lewis, The Coach House, 58 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA

Agent (if any): N/a

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 8 February 2021

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: 13 October 2020 Expired: 3 November 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 detached C3 dwellinghouse set within a modest plot, containing a side garden and front driveway, at the rear of No.58 Central Road (3 flats within an older detached property). The coach house-style newbuild was approved in 2001 (061895/FO/SOUTH1/01). In 2011 a single storey timber store attached to the side of the property was approved (096507/FH/2011/S2) and in 2015 an application was approved to add a 2nd storey on top (110545/FH/2015/S2). This latter permission was not implemented and has expired.

Description of area

Central Road, within Didsbury West, is residential in nature and predominately consists of large two storey semi-detached Victorian dwellinghouses, many of which have since been converted into flats or HMOs. Although not within a conservation area, the character of the area is defined by attractive period properties. The area benefits from its proximity to Burton Road and the tram stop.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a part single part two storey side extension, with a roof terrace and balustrade, to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments or objections received.

Environmental Health – Requested a gas membrane condition be attached if approved.

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 these policy documents.

Issues

Principle – Extending a residential property, via a part single part two storey side extension, in order to provide additional living accommodation 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 extension would project 7.2m to the side at ground floor and 2.36m at first floor, occupying the majority of the depth of the original property at 5.16m, to come almost flush with both the principal and rear elevation at both floors. The ground floor element would have an eaves height of 2.3m, with a 1.1m balustrade above for the roof terrace, taking the height to 3.4m. The first floor element would have a height of 5.3m, 0.8m lower than the main ridge. The extension would be sited 0.5m from the boundary shared with the rear garden of No.60, and 2.4m from the rear curtilage of No.58. The width of the existing house is 9.3m, therefore the sideward projection of 7.2m far exceeds half of the original width, which would be approx. 4.65m. The width is therefore considered excessive for the host building and could not be considered a subordinate. The excessive width together with the lack of a setback and its high roofline results in an extension which does not read as a subservient addition to the dwellinghouse. Subservience is a key factor for residential extensions as detailed in policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy and DC1 of the UDP. Originally the proposal was taller and the applicant was asked to reduce the width to 4.65m and remove the first floor element, but the only revisions made were to reduce the height by 0.6m, which did not address our concerns. Therefore the proposal as it stands is not considered to be appropriately scaled or well designed nor subservient to the host dwelling, contrary to residential policies DM1, SP1 and DC1.

Impact upon visual amenity – The extension would consist of a timber clad ground floor, with a roof terrace above bounded by a low glazed balustrade, and a metal clad first floor element, with aluminium doors and windows. These materials would not be in-keeping with the red brick and slate property, or surrounding area, and are not considered to complement the rest of the

dwelling. If sited at the rear these materials may be acceptable, but the clashing materials would be visible from the highway, which is not deemed appropriate, particularly given the scale of the development. The existing street scene of Central Road is fairly uniform and traditional in appearance and the character has not been significantly altered with many modern additions and certainly not with contemporary design or materials. The proposed extension, sited on a highly visible plot, opposite a crossroads, is visible from 3 directions along two roads (Central and Hague), would be visually dominant and it is considered that the proposal would form an incongruous feature within the street scene, which would be out of character for the property and immediate area, to the detriment of visual amenity, contrary to the residential development policies contained within the Core Strategy.

Impact upon residential amenity – The property was built within what would have originally been the rear garden of No.58. The rear area between No.58 and the Coach House is a tarmacked area, used mainly for parking and refuse storage. Several windows and a balcony on the rear of No.58 faces the Coach House, as well as the school field and railway lines which lie behind to the south and west. The proposed extension would occupy the majority of the space between the Coach House and boundary with No.60, creating an unbroken expanse of building, 16.5m in width, which would block afternoon and evening sunlight from the rear elevation and rear yard of No.58 and would form an overbearing structure, limiting occupiers' outlook and creating a feeling of enclosure.

It is considered that the removal of the majority of the ground-level outdoor amenity space within the Coach House plot, for the extension and rooftop garden, is of concern. It is acknowledged that the rooftop garden would provide approximately 16m² of outdoor amenity space, however, it would render the remaining curtilage practically obsolete, as it leaves a strip of land just 1m deep to the rear and a strip 0.5m deep to the side. Rooftop gardens and balconies are appropriate for flats, where no other meaningful outdoor amenity space exists, but for this family dwelling house with a modest garden already, in an area where traditional gardens are the norm, it is not considered appropriate.

Conclusion – For the reasons explored above, it is considered that the proposal is of an unacceptable design, materials, scale and siting and the resultant development would have an overbearing massing that would not appear subservient to the host dwelling nor complement it's character, to the detriment of the street scene and host dwellinghouse. The applicant was informed of the above concerns and asked to make changes to the proposal, however the minor revision submitted did not address our concerns. Policy DC1 states that the alteration and extension of residential properties may be required to accommodate changing household needs, however, this proposal is considered to cause undue harm to the character of the property and the visual amenity of the area, thus acting against the principles set out in the aforementioned policies, hence the proposal cannot be supported by the City Council.

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. Significant issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and a satisfactory resolution has not been reached.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

1) The proposed side extension by reason of its scale, massing, materials and design; would not be subservient to the host dwelling; would form an overly dominant and visually obtrusive feature within the street scene; and would be incongruous with the character of the property and area, to the detriment of visual amenity and as such is contrary to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2) The proposed extension, by reason of its height, sideward projection and close proximity to the site boundaries would create an undue loss of light and have an overbearing impact on the adjacent dwelling No.58 Central Road, to the detriment of the residential amenity currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

62 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA
Flat 2, 58 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA
Flat 6, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 3, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 17, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 15, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 12, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 1, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
58 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA
60 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA
Flat 3, 58 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA
Flat 1, 58 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4ZA
Flat 9, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 8, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 7, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 5, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB

Flat 4, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 2, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 18, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 16, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 14, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 13, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 11, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB
Flat 10, Hague Court, Hague Road, Manchester, M20 4ZB

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