MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	128252/FH/2020
Date registered valid:	8 October 2020
Proposal:	Erection of two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation
Address:	6 Rowood Avenue, Manchester, M8 0RF
Ward(s):	Cheetham Ward
Applicant:	Mr Nguyen 6 Rowood Avenue, Manchester, M8 0RF
Agent (if any):	Mr Kevin Foey Kevin Foey 28 Chew Vale, Oldham, OL3 7EQ
Case officer:	Janine Renshaw-Livesey Tel: 0161 234 4555 Email: janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	25 November 2020

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit:

Standard consultations:
Printed: 14 October 2020 Expired: 4 November 2020

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 14 October 2020 Expired: 4 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:

Tree Preservation Order:

Number 6 Rowood Avenue is a 2-storey brick semidetached residential property. The property has garden area to three sides, and there is an existing single storey rear extension to be demolished. The area is predominantly residential, comprising of properties similar in design and size to those of the proposal site, with the Metrolink line running to the rear of the properties on Rowood Avenue.

The proposal includes the erection of two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. The dimensions of the proposed extension at ground floor level is 3.6 metres rearward projection x 7.5 wrapping around the back and side of the dwelling house. The ground floor front elevation is set back by 1.3 metres and is 1.52 metres wide. The first floor front elevation is set back by 3 metres and first floor second floor extension is pulled away from the common boundary by 1.9 metres. A 750 gap is maintained between the two storey side extension and the common boundary.

Consultations & Notification Responses

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted and no representations were received.

Environmental Health have requested that a gas membrane condition be attached to the consent.

Issues

POLICY CONTEXT

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places
124. The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. 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. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

Manchester's Core Strategy

Policy DM1 states - All development should have regard to:
Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.
Impact on surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

Effects upon amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise.
Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.
Refuse storage and collection.
Vehicular access and car parking.

UDP CONTEXT

The following UDP policies are applicable to the proposed development:

Policy DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:
a). the general character of the property;
b). the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
c). the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs:
d). the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene;
e). the effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

Policy DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:
a). they are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
b). they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;

c). they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details;
d). they would not result in the loss of off-street parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

Policy DC1.3 states that notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:
a). rearward extensions greater than 3.65 metres in length;
b). 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
c). 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy he full width of the house;
d). flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
e). extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

Policy DC1.4 states in considering proposals for 2 storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:
a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.
As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Issues

Principle

The proposal seeks to create additional living accommodation in the form of a wc and an extended kitchen and dining room at ground floor level and an extension to the bedroom, including an en suite at first floor level. Saved policy DM1 states that extension which allow residents to change and adapt their homes should be supported. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

Matters which require consideration are whether the siting, scale and appearance of the extension is acceptable along with matters of residential amenity.

These matters will be considered in detail below.

Design and Layout

The extension will be sited to the rear and side of the property. The extension at first floor along the boundary with number 4 Rowood Avenue is set back from the front elevation by 3 metres and 1.5 metres at ground floor level. The roof is set down considerably by comparison to the ridge height of the existing property. There is a gap measuring 750mm between the shared common boundary between the application site and no 4 Rowood Avenue which also has a 600mm gap between then shared boundary and the gable. The neighbouring property no

4 Rowood Avenue has a similar extension (ref 111325/FH/2016) in terms of size and appearance, and this proposal was amended to reflect the proportions of the neighbouring extension. The extension has been designed to blend in with the existing property and it is considered that the design and siting of the proposed extension is considered acceptable.

Scale

The proposed extension remains subservient to the main property and is in scale with the house itself, and other properties within the area. The property is located within a large garden and contextually the extension is considered acceptable.

Appearance

The extension will be traditional in appearance and will take the form of brick structures with a tiled roof. This will ensure that the extension blends into the fabric of the existing building. The roof is considerably lower than that of the existing property, and the extension is set back from the front. As such, the proposal does not appear obtrusive within the street scene when viewed from the front.

Residential amenity

The side extension will not have any overbearing or overshadowing impact. The 2 storey element is set back from the front of the property by 3 metres at first floor level and whilst it will projects from the rear by 3.6 metres, there are no windows proposed in the side at first floor level, therefore, the proposal does not have a detrimental impact upon the privacy of the neighbouring residents. In addition, the extension will not give rise to any overlooking. The windows have been placed to only look over the applicant's own garden, with Metrolink occupying the site at the bottom of the large garden. The development gap between the 2 properties is still capable of being shared, as due to the set back from the front of the property there would be no issue of a terracing effect. The roof on the extension is proposed as a hip which reduces the massing on the neighbouring boundary. The two-storey rear extension is pulled away from the shared boundary of no 8 Rowood Avenue and coupled with the orientation of the properties and the extension would not cause any undue shadowing.

It is not considered that the development will unduly adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties, pursuant to policies DC1 and DM1. This is due to the context, the design of the extensions, and as the property is stated to be one family dwelling house, and will remain one family dwelling house, with a commensurate level of activity.

Refuse storage

External access to the rear of the property will still be maintained as a result of the extension maintaining access for refuse storage within the rear of the property, in accordance with policy DM1, to manage storage of bins out of view, in the interests of amenity.

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 polices 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:

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. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and is in accordance with the development plan.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

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 following drawings and documents:

The Location Plan, stamped as received on the 8 October 2020,
Proposed Drawings 4 of 7 Floor Plans, 5 of 7 Elevations and 7 of 7 Roof Plans, stamped as received on the 19 November 2020.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) The external facing materials to be used on the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing buildings in terms of type, colour, texture and scale.

Reason - To ensure that 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 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: 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 windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings, Proposed Drawings 4 of 7 Floor Plans, 5 of 7 Elevations and 7 of 7 Roof Plans, stamped as received on the 19 November 2020.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

5) The ground and first floor toilet facility shown on drawing numbers, Proposed Drawings 4 of 7 Floor Plans and 5 of 7 Elevations, stamped as received on the 19 November 2020, 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 properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

6) Prior to the commencement of development appropriate and comprehensive construction designs for the installation of a proprietary gas membrane, in order to alleviate any possibility of landfill had ingress to the building, shall be submitted for approval to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall then be implemented as part of the development.

Reason - The development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill had pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Transport For Greater Manchester

5 Rowood Avenue, Manchester, M8 0RF
3 Rowood Avenue, Manchester, M8 0RF
8 Rowood Avenue, Manchester, M8 0RF
4 Rowood Avenue, Manchester, M8 0RF

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 - Not Affected
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH1