

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 127113/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 15 June 2020

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 2 Headingley Road, Manchester, M14 6RR

Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Mr Kato Tsang, 28 Hazelhurst Drive, Middleton, M24 6TL

Agent (if any):

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 5 August 2020

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: Photos received with the application

Standard consultations: Printed: 19 June 2020 Expired: 10 July 2020

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 19 June 2020 Expired: 10 July 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 dwellinghouse of red brick with bay windows and white render to the front elevation and a red pantile gable roof. The plot includes front and rear gardens and a large driveway.

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature and located within the Withington ward, close to Mauldeth Road local centre.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation in the form of a larger open-plan kitchen-diner.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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

MCC Flood Risk Management – The drainage of the site can be approved and we have the following recommendation: As the proposed development is within Flood Zone 3 and 2, floor levels should be set either no lower than existing floor levels or 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level.

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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, 2018)

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 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 single storey extension would be sited at the rear, facing south, replacing the existing outrigger, projecting 4m to the rear with a width of 5.25m, an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height of 3.2m. It would be sited along the boundary with the adjoining semi, No.4, and 2.3m from the other side boundary. Although the rearward projection exceeds the limit that is stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) by 0.35m, the dimensions fall under that which is allowed under the Larger Homes Extension scheme, granted no objections are received, which is the case here. The plot can easily accommodate the extension which is deemed subservient, therefore the siting, scale and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be brick built with a hipped tiled roof, containing 2no rooflights. In the rear elevation would sit a window and a set of french doors opening onto the garden and in the side elevation facing west would be a window and single door. The materials would match the existing dwelling, including facing red brickwork, red pantile roof tiles and white uPVC windows. The proposal is standard in design and to be expected of this type of development. The extension would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene. The character of the area has already changed over time as the houses in the vicinity are themselves altered and extended, single storey side and rear extensions are particularly popular. Therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

Residential amenity – There are no windows proposed for the side elevation facing the adjoining neighbour, therefore the surrounding occupiers' privacy should not be impacted. Due to the southerly orientation of the extension and these properties' gardens, it will block some evening sunlight to the adjoining semi's rear, however this is not deemed significant given the hipped roof is relatively low in height, with eaves of just 2.3m and No's 46 and 48 Edgeworth Drive to the west will block out the late evening sun already. In addition to this, the application

received no objections from local residents. Hence the extension is not considered to cause undue harm to the neighbours' amenity, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Conclusion – The storage of refuse and provision of off-street parking would remain as existing. The proposal broadly with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and it is not thought to cause undue harm to the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the area, therefore the 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 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 drawings numbered:
- HR005

Stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority with the application form on the 9th June 2020 and

- HR006
- HR007
- HR008
- HR009
- HR010

Stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 15th June 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 the existing dwellinghouse in type, size, texture and colour, 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

44 Edgeworth Drive, Manchester, M14 6RS
34 Edgeworth Drive, Manchester, M14 6RS
4 Headingley Road, Manchester, M14 6RR
48 Edgeworth Drive, Manchester, M14 6RS
46 Edgeworth Drive, Manchester, M14 6RS
36 Edgeworth Drive, Manchester, M14 6RS
13 Headingley Road, Manchester, M14 6RR
42 Edgeworth Drive, Manchester, M14 6RS

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Flood Zones Type 3 (high risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH