MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	126346/FH/2020
Date registered valid:	28 February 2020
Proposal:	Erection of a 2 storey side extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.
Address:	78 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
Ward(s):	Hulme Ward
Applicant:	Mr J Henry, 78 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
Agent (if any):	Mr A Gilbert, 403 Parrs Wood Road, Manchester, M20 5WA
Case officer:	Constance Phillips Tel: 0161 234 5792 Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	12 June 2020

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: Photos received from agent and objector

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 18 May 2020 Expired: 28 May 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 modest modern two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of red brick with a grey gable roof and an enclosed porch. The property sits within an unusually shaped plot which includes a front, rear and side garden bounded by wall and fence. The house has not previously been extended or noticeably altered.

Description of area

The property lies on Royce Road within the Hulme ward, in close proximity to the inner ring road (Mancunian Way), Hulme Park, the shops and services along Stretford Road and MMU's Birley campus. The surrounding houses are a mixture of types, sizes and materials, with a large number of flats nearby due to its proximity to the City Centre.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation in the form of a 3rd bedroom, another bathroom, a larger kitchen and a snug.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – Two letters of objection were received, from the same objector, one following each consultation. They raised the following concerns/points:

- The housing stock around Manchester city centre is lacking 2 bed starter homes.
- The aesthetic of house and surrounding houses when viewed from street will be harmed.

- Privacy to garden of 76 Royce Road will be reduced.
- Access to rear garden of 78 Royce Road will be disrupted/removed, where will bins go?
- Disruption to shared boundary fence during construction period.
- View from living room window of 76 Royce Road disrupted.
- Level of light within living room and main bedroom of 76 Royce Road greatly reduced.

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 broadly accords with the principles of these policy documents.

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a two storey side and 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 rear aspect of the extension would project 3m to the rear, occupying the full width of the original house and the side extension, at 5.8m wide, leaving a minor gap to the boundary shared with the adjoining semi, No.80, and a 0.6m gap to the boundary shared with No.76. It would have an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 3.4m. The two storey side aspect would project 3.2m to the side, with a depth of 6m and a setback from the principal elevation of 1.5m at both ground and first floor. It would have a ridge set 0.5m lower than the existing roof and matching eaves. The side extension would be sited 0.6m from the shared boundary at the front and rear. Originally the proposal included a wider side projection, no setback nor a ridge set-down, no gap to the boundary and it would have provided 2 additional bedrooms, however the design was considered to have too great an impact upon both residential and visual amenity, therefore negotiations took place to reduce the scale of the works. Following this, the rear projection wholly complies with policy DC1 and the two storey side aspect is not at risk of causing a terracing effect, nor sited too close to the next property, therefore the scale and siting of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

Appearance and visual amenity – The materials proposed for the extensions match the existing dwellinghouse, including the red brickwork, grey roof tiles and white uPVC windows. The side extension would feature a matching gable roof with parapet-style detailing along the edge. The rear aspect would feature a mono-pitched roof, containing two rooflights, and a set of bi-folding doors opening onto the garden. The front and rear elevations of the two storey side aspect would each contain two windows, one for each floor. The design and appearance of the

proposal is in-keeping with the original dwellinghouse and the materials are considered appropriate, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1. The objector raised concerns with the appearance of the house within the street scene, however this street is of mixed building types and materials. In addition, of these 6 semi-detached dwellings, only the application site reasonably has the room for a two storey side extension, therefore it is likely to remain the only example on this block. It would be sufficiently set back from the principal elevation and highway and has been designed to read as a subservient addition, leaving a gap to the boundary fence, hence it is not considered to significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor area.

Residential amenity – Two objections were received from a local resident, one for each neighbour consultation. The resident raised concerns with the scale of the two storey side extension and the resultant (perceived) loss of natural light to habitable rooms and reduced outlook from a secondary (staircase) window. Following the first objection negotiations took place to reduce the scale, and consequently the impact, of the proposal. The resulting amended scheme should not have an overbearing impact upon the adjacent property, No.76, due to the distance between, approx. 1.5m, the side elevations, and due to only a small staircase window being overshadowed. Regarding light, the neighbouring property's main living room and bedroom windows are sited on the front elevation facing north and will not be overshadowed, therefore the addition of this extension, should not result in an undue loss of light compared to the existing situation. Regarding the loss of outlook from a staircase window, residents do not have a right to a view under planning law, therefore this is a civil matter, as is their point regarding any disruption to, or issues with, the boundary fence during construction. It is not considered that these works would cause significant harm to the neighbouring property, nor the adjoining semi, due to the scale of the works and the orientation of these properties and gardens. The design leaves space to the plots boundary, the rear aspect could be built under permitted development and the proposed windows have been appropriately located, hence the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Refuse storage – A gap of 0.6m would be retained between the extension and boundary wall, which is not quite wide enough for wheelie bins. It was mentioned by the objector that the bins were shown as being stored at the rear but that the estate has an issue in the rear car park with refuse storage therefore the agent has included a secure bin store within the front garden. Details of a secure bin store have been provided and it has been marked out on the site plan as within the front garden, which has been conditioned as part of this approval, hence the storage of refuse accords with policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, received no objections and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor significantly harm the visual amenity of the house or wider 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 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: 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 undertook negotiations with the agent to reach a satisfactory solution.

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 revised 'Proposed Plans and Elevations', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 14th May 2020 and the revised 'Site Plan', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 8th 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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwellinghouse, 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) The bin store, detailed on the revised drawing 'Site Plan', stamped as received on the 8th June 2020, shall be implemented and be in place prior to the first use of the extension and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

76 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
80 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
78 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX

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
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH