

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 126523/FH/2020
Date registered valid: 19 March 2020
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 35 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PW
Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Mr Naim Baydar 35 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PW
Agent (if any): Mr Muthahar Khan Studio Tashkeel Architecture 89 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 4HT
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: t.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 12th May 2020



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 1 April 2020 Expired: 22 April 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

The site comprises a two storey brick built semi-detached property in the Whalley Range ward area of Manchester. The property has fronted bay windows and enclosed recessed porch to the front with coping stone header design entrance. The property benefits from a front hardstanding garden and drive, rear garden and access along the side. A detached garage lies to the rear on the common boundary with no.37 Springbridge Road. The property is bounded by brick wall and railings to the front with high hedging to the rear.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of area

This area is predominantly residential in character

Description of development

The applicant is seeking the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. No comments, objections or representations in respect of this application were received

Policy and Issues

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

The site comprises a semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area of Manchester with similar size properties some of which undergone enlargements over the years.

There is an existing single storey outrigger to the rear which forms an 'L' shape elevation. The applicant proposes to erect a single storey rear extension which would project out from the original wall of the house by approximately 6.0 metres extending the full width of the house leaving a gap to the shared boundary of 600mm. The roof of the extension would be a dual pitch roof with four roof lights. Double doors would be on the rear with a window, and a door is proposed on the side of the property.

Although the extension exceeds City Council's saved Policy DC1 of 3.65 metres, there are no objections to the proposal and in addition the adjoining property has an existing brick and glazed conservatory on the boundary and the adjacent property no. 37 has a two storey side and rear extension and therefore, it is considered that there would not be any residential harm caused by

the extension. In addition, should the applicant build a single storey extension under the Larger Homes scheme in the same materials independently and receive no objection and comply with all other relevant limitation, this would be allowed to be built under permitted 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 immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended, two storey side extensions and rear conservatories are particularly popular. Therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property.

Scale and Mass

The extensions would not present an unusual feature in the immediate area and due to the existence of other similar extensions to a variety of house types in the immediate area, the size of the extension is considered acceptable within the surrounding environmental context.

It is believed that the design of the extension is sympathetic to the architectural style of the original house with matching materials to be utilised. It is therefore considered that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design.

The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials by way of brick and tile as specified in the application form. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not unduly impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Refuse Storage

The proposed development does not impact on the refuse storage arrangements for the property; amenity space is still retained at the side and rear.

Parking

The existing car parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal, a driveway is still retained at the front of the property.

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

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:

Received on 17th March 2020 numbered 2001101-PL004 Proposed Ground Floor Plans

Received on 17th March 2020 numbered 2001101-PL005 Proposed Rear Elevation

Received on 17th March 2020 numbered 2001101-PL006 Proposed Side Elevations

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 materials to be used on the external surfaces hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form/drawings in type, size, colour and texture.

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 structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

21 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
19 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
37 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PW
33 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PW

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