

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 126707/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 16 April 2020

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

Address: 76 Ashdene Road, Manchester, M20 4RZ

Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Mr Syed Islam, 76 Ashdene Road, Manchester, M20 4RZ

Agent (if any): Mr Ahmed Choudhry, NADA Architects, 169 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 2ND

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 18 June 2020

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: Photos received with application form

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 20 April 2020 Expired: 11 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 two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of red brick with a hipped roof, featuring bay windows, a porch, an existing single storey rear extension and a dilapidated detached garage to the side. The plot includes a driveway and front and rear gardens.

Description of area

Ashdene Road sits within the Withington Ward. It is residential in nature and characterised by similar red brick semi-detached family dwellinghouses with driveways and gardens. The area benefits from its proximity to Withington District Centre, Mauldeth Road train station and Ladybarn Park.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to demolish the existing dated garage and build a single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation in the form of family room and larger kitchen.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 side 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 extension would project 3.6m to the side as viewed from the front and 1.56m as viewed from the rear, with a depth of 8m, an eaves height of 2.65m and a maximum height of 3.8m. It would be sited along the boundary at the rear but brought away from the boundary at the front, leaving a gap of 0.87m. It would be setback from the highway by 6.3m. The original design showed the extension as coming right up to the boundary at the front with a width of 4.67m and a height of 4.46m. The height was deemed unnecessary given the type of extension, particularly sited on the shared boundary, therefore negotiations took place to reduce the proposal's width and height in order to achieve subservience and better visual proportions. The siting, scale and massing of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be brick built, with a dual-pitched tiled roof, featuring 2 no rooflights in the front slope and 1 in the rear. The proposed materials include red brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC all to match the existing building, helping it to assimilate with the dwellinghouse and neighbouring buildings. The existing detached garage is dated and constructed of materials which are not in-keeping with the property. This extension would replace that structure, arguably improving the visual amenity of the property and creating more space for changing household needs. Originally the width was much larger, at 4.67m, but given the width of the original house is 5.86m this was deemed unacceptable and negotiations took place to reduce this by 1m to improve the proportions, subservience and appearance in the street scene. Although the property is sited on a visually prominent corner plot, due to the 6.3m setback from the road and its relatively small scale, the improvement upon the existing garage and the existence of side extensions at the two properties opposite the application site, it is not considered that it would significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor area. The design is to be expected of a single storey side extension and is considered acceptable, pursuant to policies DM1, DC1 and SP1.

Residential amenity – Due to the siting, orientation and scale of the proposed extension, it is not considered that the development would result in an undue loss of light or privacy for the surrounding occupiers, particularly given the adjacent neighbour, No.19 Stephens Road, is sited

south-west of the extension. No windows are proposed for the side gable elevation and the height and massing along the shared boundary has been reduced. In addition to this no objections were received from local residents, therefore the proposal is acceptable in terms of impacts on residential amenity.

Conclusion – The proposal complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and it is not thought to harm 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. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the agent in order to reach a satisfactory solution.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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 drawings numbered '(01)001-PL0' and '(02)001-PL0, 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.

4) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwellinghouse, as specified 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.

3) The bin store, detailed on the submitted site plan 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

77 Fairholme Road, Manchester, M20 4SA
75 Fairholme Road, Manchester, M20 4SA
50 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XE
48 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XE
23 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XA
21 Stephens Road, Manchester, M20 4XA
74 Ashdene Road, Manchester, M20 4RZ

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