Paul Butler Associates
Planning, Development & Heritage Consultants

Dr and Mrs Williams

11 Elm Road, Didsbury, M20 6XB

Planning and Heritage Statement

01 February 2012

Paul Butler Associates, 31 Blackfriars Road, Salford, Manchester M3 7AQ
t. 0161 835 3530 I e. pba@paulbutlerassociates.co.uk I w. www.paulbutlerassociates.co.uk

Professional Planning, Development & Heritage Advisors since 1992.
Members of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI). Recognised by the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) as a Historic Environment Service Provider (HESPR).

© Paul Butler Associates Ltd 2011. All Rights Reserved.

Job Number: 11/768

Project: Elm Road

Client: Dr and Mrs Williams

File Name: planning and heritage statement01.02.2012.doc

Document Preparation/Checking Record:

	Name and Qualifications	Position	Date
Prepared by:	David Tye BSc MTPI MRTPI	Director	18.01.2012
Checked by:	David Tye BSc MTPI MRTPI	Director	19.01.2012
Issued by:	David Tye BSc MTPI MRTPI	Director	19.01.2012

Document Revision Record:

Issue No.	Date	Details of Revisions

Contents

1. Introduction

2. The Application Site and Surrounding Area

3. The Proposal

4. Planning Policy Context

5. Assessment of Heritage Significance

6. Planning and Conservation Appraisal

7. Conclusion

1. Introduction

1.1 This Planning and Heritage Statement has been prepared by Paul Butler Associates Ltd on behalf of Dr and Mrs Williams to support a planning application for the erection of a side and rear extension to the existing dwelling house at 11 Elm Road, Didsbury. The extension will be erected following the demolition of the existing double garage to the rear of the property.

1.2 11 Elm Road is identified on the location plan that forms part of the application package. The building and curtilage is located within Blackburn Park Conservation Area which was designated in 1979. As such, in accordance with national Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment', a heritage statement which assesses the potential impact of the proposal on the setting of Conservation Area is therefore required to accompany the application.

1.3 This Planning and Heritage statement meets the requirements of PPS5 and includes:

- A brief description of the application site and surrounding area;
- A summary of the proposal;
- An overview of relevant planning policy;
- An assessment of heritage significance;
- A planning and conservation appraisal that assesses the contribution of the application site to the character of the Conservation Area and the potential impact of the proposal; and
- A conclusion.

2. The Application Site and Surrounding Area

The Application Site

2.1 The application site is bounded by Elm Road to the southeast, the rear garden of No. 3 Linden Road to the northwest; No. 9 Elm Road to the southwest and Stonecroft Court to the northeast. The application site accommodates a single detached dwelling house, No. 11 Elm Road. The dwelling was constructed just before 1890, later modified, and is three storeys above a cellared basement.

2.2 The existing house is a double fronted design with three roof gables. The elevation to Elm Road is red brick with timbering and rendered panels, below a slate roof. The side and rear elevations are simple and finished in rougher brick. There are gardens to the front and rear, with a driveway running parallel to the northeast elevation of the house to a detached double garage with carport. The garage and car port post date the house and are sited within the rear garden.

2.3 A search of the Council's online Public Access system revealed that there is no planning history associated with No. 11 Elm Road that might influence how this planning application is considered.



No.11 viewed from Elm Road

The Surrounding Area: Blackburn Park Conservation Area

2.4 Manchester City Council guidance describes the character forming features of the Conservation Area as follows:

2.5 *'Blackburn Park is principally an area of large family houses with spacious gardens, arranged along tree-lined roads which criss-cross the level ground of the park. Building materials and styles are very varied. The older houses generally have textured light red or buff brick walls with blue slate roofs, and in some cases brick or stone dressings in contrasting colours are used even for window mullions. The later houses are predominantly smooth red brick, though render, half-timbering and decorative tile fringing are extensively used. Red tile and occasionally green slate are used for roofs and vertical cladding. All houses have pitched roofs, some of them steep, and there are a variety of gables, hips and half hips topped with interesting finials.*

2.6 *Windows in the conservation area are even more varied than the walls, some being subdivided by glazing bars, some leaded and a great many having stained glass. Bay windows, bow windows and oriel windows are to be found in profusion. Entrance doors are varied with combinations of fielded timber panels and stained glass panels, and they always open on to a covered porch. These are formed by a projecting gable or some other overhanging element of the house. Some have a separate roof which is sometimes flat with a balcony, but they are usually pitched.*

2.7 *Chimney stacks are a notable feature of some of the houses, being tall and decorated with projecting strings and corbelled brickwork. Some chimney pots are tall and narrow, others are short and squat, while others still are especially formed to prevent down-draughts. Walls are mainly of brick with moulded terracotta copings, and occasionally the wall is divided into fielded panels with a plinth below and corbelled brickwork above. Sometimes brickwork is bonded in a darker red or in other brick colours. Gardens at both front and rear of houses are large by most standards, and their boundaries to public highways are marked by walls and/or privet hedges.*

2.8 11 Elm Road was built as part of a group of four dwellings understood to have been designed by the same architect and dating from c.1890. A plan of Elm Road from this time shows the application dwelling as 'Park Range' (Appendix 1). The plan shows that No.11 Elm Road and the three neighbouring properties; the Limes (No.5); the Anchorage (No. 7); and Mulacor (No. 9)] were all built with their northeastern gable wall directly on the northeastern boundary of their respective plots.

2.9 Although these four dwellings are detached properties, the streetscene here is an imposing arts and crafts three storey 'streetwall' extending across the four plots (No. 5 – 11). At first glance, when approaching the site, the four dwellings appear to be almost a continuous building. This close knit relationship and strong streetwall is a direct result of the managed release of these four parcels of land by Charles Blackburn when selling off the Parkfield House estate in the late nineteenth century.



Dense 'streetwall' of buildings viewed from Elm Road

3. The Proposal

3.1 The proposed extension has been designed by Fasciato Architects in direct response to the needs of the family living at the property who need to adapt the dwelling to meet their living requirements. The main modifications proposed as follows:

3.2 The need to make adequate kitchen provision: The existing kitchen is limited in size and is insufficient for family use. A minor rear extension coupled with some reconfiguration to the ground floor layout will create a larger more functional combined kitchen/family room which opens out onto a small terrace. A contemporary approach has been taken to the design of the rear extension, similar to the contemporary approach to the rear extension recently approved and erected at No. 9 Elm Road, the neighbouring property.

3.3 The need to provide adequate bathroom facilities: The property has insufficient bathroom and w/c provision and the seven double bedrooms are served only by two bathrooms. The first floor of the proposed side extension will remedy this deficit by creating two ensuite rooms to relieve pressure on the existing bathrooms.

3.4 The need to reinstate a larger more functional rear garden: One of the limitations of the property for family occupation is the small rear garden. Historically the rear garden was much larger than at present. The useable area has been reduced in size by the installation of a double garage, car port and associated driveway/hard standing. The application proposal reinstates a garden that is larger and better suited to family use. The restored garden will be similar in size to that which existed previously. On completion the larger garden will accord with the Council's character analysis of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area which describes the area as '*principally an area of large family houses with spacious gardens*'.

3.5 The need to provide easier access to the garaging: The existing double garage is difficult to use with an overly long driveway. The proposed garage will have a shorter more accessible driveway which is easier to access and allows the storage of two cars, broadly in the same position that they are generally currently parked.

Pre-Application Discussions

3.6 A pre-application meeting was held with Manchester City Council Officers (Dave Lawless and Jennifer Atkinson on 9 November 2011) at which a preliminary design was presented. Officer comments were then considered by the applicant and a revised series of four design options were presented to the Council. Each design option responded to officer feedback; by reducing the height of the proposed extension; by revising the shape of the extension roof to achieve greater subservience with the main dwelling; and by simplifying the detailing of the Elm Road elevation in order to address the Conservation Officer's assertion that the design approach was too similar to the main dwelling, 'competing' with, rather than 'complementing' it. The application proposal was selected as the most appropriate design response to achieve the client's aspirations and to address the Council's comments. It is understood that, as is normal, formal consultation with immediate neighbours, the Didsbury Civic Society and others will be undertaken by the Council in due course.

4. Planning Policy Context

National Planning Policies

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning Act states that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. This establishes the Development Plan as the primary decision making document when considering planning applications. In this instance the development plan comprises of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West and the 'saved' policies of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan. The relevant provisions of these documents are discussed in the following section and the appraisal below.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

4.2 Conservation Areas are formally designated under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 69 (1) defines a Conservation Area as '*an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance*'. It is the duty of local authorities to designate as Conservation Areas any area of special architectural or historic interest, whose character and appearance it is worth preserving or enhancing. Detailed guidance about the legislation is given in PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment and its practice guide, 2010.

Planning Policy Statement 5 Planning for the Historic Environment (and its practice guide)

4.3 Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5)' adopted on 23 March 2010 sets out the Government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment. It replaces longstanding Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG15) published on 14 September 1994; and also Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16) published on 21 November 1990.

4.4 PPS5 represents a major overhaul of the planning system for the historic environment although the changes are evolutionary rather than revolutionary. The fundamental principle of conserving heritage as a precious, fragile and finite legacy remains at the heart of national policy. At the core of PPS5 is the principle of supporting appropriate development that delivers the long term viability of heritage assets while conserving their significance for the benefit of generations to come.

4.5 Under PPS5 planning decisions will continue to be made on the individual merits of a proposal, although the way in which decisions will be made will differ from previously. PPS5 focuses on evaluating the significance of the heritage asset in question and places the burden on the applicant to provide the necessary information. The applicant is expected to focus on understanding what is significant about the asset (in this the case Blackburn Park Conservation Area) making it possible for the local authority to determine the impact of the proposed change.

4.6 In terms of decision making, the key policies of PPS5 relevant here are:

4.7 HE6 '*Information requirements for applications affecting heritage assets*'. This policy requires an applicant for planning permission to provide sufficient supporting information as part of their application to allow the decision maker to understand the impact of the proposal upon the heritage asset. This statement fulfils this requirement by appraising the potential impact of the development upon Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

4.8 HE7.2 advises that '*In considering the impact of a proposal on any heritage asset, local planning authorities should take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset and the value that it holds for this and future generations. This understanding should be used by the local planning authority to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposals'.* This statement appraises the heritage significance of 11. Elm Road.

4.9 HE10 '*Additional policy principles guiding the consideration of applications for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset*' advises that when considering applications for development that could affect the setting of a heritage asset (in this case the Conservation Area) the local planning authority should treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution.

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (February 2005)

4.10 PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and the accompanying good practice note, 'The Planning System General Principles' sets out the Government's overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

4.11 PPS1 advises that the key role of the planning system is to deliver homes, investment and jobs in a manner consistent with principles of sustainable development, in terms of minimising the need to travel; making optimum use of previously developed land and improving the quality of the urban living environment. The application proposal complies with all of these principles.

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (November 2006)

4.12 Adopted in November 2006, Planning Policy Statement 3 sets out the national planning policy framework for delivering Government's housing objectives. An objective of this statement is to secure the delivery of well-designed residential accommodation that is built to a high standard. The Design and Access Statement that accompanies this application demonstrates that the proposal meets this policy objective.

The North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 (Adopted 2008)

4.13 The Government intend to abandon Regional Spatial Strategies shortly, although at the time of writing this statement, a formal withdrawal announcement had not been made. The only relevant policies of the Regional Strategy for the North West, against which this application should be considered are Policy DP7 'Promote Environmental Quality' and

Policy EM1 (C) 'Historic Environment'. Policy DP7 'Promote Environmental Quality' encourages the protection the historic environment and promotes good quality design, aiming to ensure that new development respects its setting. Policy EM1 (C) 'Historic Environment' advises that schemes should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Local Planning Policies

The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (Adopted July 1995)

4.14 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) has reformed the development plan system and Manchester City Council is in the process of producing a Local Development Framework (LDF) to comply with this statutory legislation. Once formally adopted, the LDF will consist of a suite of Development Plan Documents (DPD) which will set out guidelines for spatial development in the city. In the interim, however, planning applications will continue to be determined in accordance with the saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP).

4.15 Saved local planning policies of relevance to this proposal are discussed below. They include DC1.1, DC1.2 DC1.3 and DC1.4 which set out the Council's approach to determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties. Policy DC18.1 sets out the Council's general approach to development proposals in Conservation Areas and Policy H2.2 seeks to ensure that the quality of residential areas is maintained.

5. Assessment of Heritage Significance

5.1 11 Elm Road was constructed c.1890 along with three of its immediate neighbours. The four dwellings are understood to have been designed by the same architect and form part of a sub group of Conservation Area buildings on Elm Lane with similar characteristics. The grouping exhibit many of the character and design features noted by the City Council in their character description of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

5.2 The four dwellings (5, 7, 9 and 11 Elm Road) were purposely built close together to present a strong and grand street wall. This street wall is not, however, overbearing in any sense since the three storey buildings were sited well back from Elm Road behind deep front gardens. The projecting bays of each property align along an identical building line (which later buildings such as Stonecroft Court have replicated). These siting and scale aspects, along with a common arts and craft style design with timber and rendering ensure that the grouping make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

5.3 The 1890 plan shows the original names of the dwellings. No 11 Elm Road was originally known as 'Park Range', No. 9 as 'Mulacor', No. 7 as 'The Anchorage' and No. 5 as 'the Limes'. It is important to recognise that each of the dwellings was constructed on the northeastern boundary of its plot. No.11 was no exception: the 1890 plan (Appendix 1) shows the gable end of the property was built to the boundary of the original plot.

5.4 An early owner of No.11 purchased adjoining land at the northeastern side of the dwelling and planted trees in the enlarged plot. Cartographic map regression shows that by 1956, these trees had been removed to allow for the installation of a driveway leading to a double garage, constructed in the rear garden.

5.5 The four dwellings of which No.11 forms a part, along with the adjacent Stonecroft Court apartments form a strong built 'streetwall' to Elm Road. Their compactness with, in general, limited views to the rear gardens form an important character sub group within

Elm Road. In contrast the opposite side of Elm Road is quite different in character with more dispersed dwellings standing in large gardens.

5.6 In terms of the significance of No.11, the front elevation makes the most significant contribution to the Conservation Area and this is little altered by the extension. The rear elevation of the dwelling is not visible from the public realm of Elm Road, nor is it prominent when viewed from the public realm of Linden Road also in the Conservation Area, to the north. The gable end of the existing building is a secondary elevation and unremarkable. It contains only a single window (to the kitchen) at ground level. The lack of fenestration in the gable elevation strongly suggests that originally it was envisaged that a new dwelling would be built close to the gable with the future siting perhaps to replicate the form of the four dwellings already constructed here. The principle contribution and significance of the application property to the character of the designated Conservation Area is made by the principal façade looking onto Elm Lane.

6. Planning and Conservation Area Appraisal

6.1 Having regard to the national and local planning policy context outlined above, the principal planning matters to be considered when determining this planning application are discussed below.

Compatibility of the extension with the existing property.

6.2 The existing house has not been 'over extended' in the past. Indeed the only minor extension has been the addition of a narrow (1.4 m wide x 6.4 m long) two storey element to the southwestern elevation. The dwelling can therefore accommodate a minor extension of the scale currently proposed without any risk of the integrity of the original dwelling being lost. The two storey side extension proposed has been designed to acknowledge the form of the existing minor extension and will clearly reads as a subservient extension to the dwelling.

6.3 The application drawings show that the two storey extension remains completely subservient to the existing dwelling:

- The application proposal is clearly subservient to the existing in terms of volume and has been designed to read as an extension to the existing building.
- The ridge of the two storey side extension roof is 2.0 m lower than the main ridge of the existing dwelling.
- The eaves of the two storey side extension roof are 2.2 m lower than the main ridge of the existing dwelling.
- The side extension is set well back (2.0 m) from the existing building line which is formed by the projection of the drawing room and dining room windows.

6.4 The proposed single storey extension to the rear is minor and the contemporary approach allows it to read as a later addition to the three storey dwelling, again remaining subservient to it.

Compatibility of the extension with the character of streetscene/Conservation Area.

6.5 As described at above, No. 11 forms part of a group of buildings (including No.9, No.7 and No.5) which contribute to the character of the conservation area through their architectural composition. The proposed extension will have little, if any, affect on this composition, being set well back from the common building line of the four properties, by 2.0 m.

6.6 The neighbouring building to the northeast is Stonecroft Court apartments, built following the demolition of Stonecroft House in the early 1980s. These apartments have been designed to continue the streetwall and building line established by 5-11 Elm Road. Had a large undeveloped gap been required between No.11 and the Stonecroft Court Apartments, the Council would not have permitted the siting of Stonecroft Court at the boundary with No.11. Instead a side garden would have been required. It is possible that the siting rational behind the juxta positioning of the apartments with No.11 was made in recognition that neither the existing gable of No. 11 nor the proposed apartment gable was a particularly positive influence on the Conservation Area, so the apartment siting might help soften the blandness of each elevation. In practice this softening has not been entirely successful and the apartment gable is still prominent.



View of Stonecroft Court apartments from Elm Road

6.7 During pre-application discussions, the Council expressed a concern that an overly large side extension could create a terracing affect between No.11 and the neighbouring dwelling.

6.8 The pre-application design has been revised to ensure no terracing effect is associated with the application proposal by lowering the height of the extension from three storeys to two storeys and by using a lean to roof that is perpendicular to the main roof of No.11. The extension is thereby of very different architectural composition to the two storey with mansard design of the apartments. A terracing effect is thereby avoided.

6.9 The existing juxtaposition of the buildings here permits no views to the rear garden of No.11: any potential vista from Elm Road being closed down by the existing double garage. The new side extension will narrow the gap between the two buildings to some degree, although this is achieved without detriment to any existing vista. Nor does the extension mask views of any fabric that contributes towards the character of the Conservation Area since neither the side elevation of No.11 nor the side elevation of the Stonecroft Court are of any significant architectural merit or historical interest. Neither elevation plays a positive role within the Conservation Area in terms of composition or detailing whilst the proposed extension, in comparison, is regarded as a positive architectural influence on the Conservation Area. It will achieve the high quality of design desirable within a Conservation Area. The extension will improve the streetscape by adding interest and reducing the blandness of the two existing gable ends. Whilst a reduced gap will occur between 11 Elm Road and Stonecroft Court, a unsatisfactory visual relationship will not result.

6.10 The extension is considered to be sympathetic to the character of the streetscene. The design approach to the building is explained in the Design and Access statement prepared by Fasciato Architects. The elevation of the extension to Elm Road takes a traditional approach in keeping with the existing streetscape: a vertically proportioned rendered elevation under a sloping roof. This approach works well and complements the existing dwelling and surrounding properties.

6.11 The single storey extension at the rear takes a contemporary approach, as has worked so successfully at No.9. The rear extension will not be visible from Elm Road nor prominent from Linden Road. Both the side and rear extension to 11 Elm Road respect and will enhance the character of Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

Removal of the Garage

6.12 No.11 Elm Road was originally constructed hard up against the northeastern boundary of the curtilage with an open garden to the rear (See Appended 1890 Plan). The purchase of additional land beyond the original north-eastern boundary permitted subsequently, the installation of a driveway and the erection of a large double garage. The garage clearly post dates the construction of the house by some 40-50 years. The garage has been modified over the years and a flat roofed car port has been added to it.

6.13 The garage and carport will be removed as part of the works although neither the garage or carport are architecturally or historically significant. At best these structures have a neutral influence on the Conservation Area, neither contributing to nor detract from it. The removal of both is considered to be acceptable, and in any event, at 111 cubic metres the demolition can take place at any time without the need for Conservation Area Consent.

Retention of Sufficient Car Parking.

6.14 The site currently accommodates garaging for two cars, although access to this provision is difficult so cars are generally parked on the driveway at the side of the house. The application proposal provides two garage spaces that are more conveniently sited. In addition the new layout provides a further two driveway parking spaces. The proposal, with a total of four car parking spaces, retains adequate parking provision for the household. The dwelling has sufficient on site dedicated car parking provision to ensure that the proposal will have no impact upon on street parking.

Relationship with Neighbouring Dwellings.

6.15 The proposed extension will have no impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.



Existing relationship with No.9



Existing Relationship with Stonecroft Court

6.16 No.9 has been tastefully refurbished and extended to the rear recently. A full application (No 091491/FH/2009/S2) for the extension was approved on 15 December 2009 for the '*Enlargement of existing basement garage including basement extension at rear, erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to the elevations and construction of a rear terrace*'. Amendments to this approval (application No. 091491/FH/2009/S2) including provision of pedestrian access ramp were approved 01 September 2010. The proposed extension to No.11 will be entirely compatible with the recent development at No.9. The proposed extension will have no impact on the amenity of No.9 by virtue of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of privacy or indeed by any other material consideration.

6.17 The property adjoining the northeastern boundary is Stonecroft Court. This building was granted outline planning permission (No. F12463) in March 1980 with a reserved matters application (No. F14595) having been approved in January 1981. The Council did not allow the installation of any habitable room windows in the gable in order to protect the privacy of the occupants of No.11. Two small obscure window were permitted to ancillary service rooms. The building projects well beyond the rear wall of No.11, this juxta positioning will ensure that the relatively small extension to No.11 will not impact in any way on the Stonecroft Court apartments.

6.18 The extension proposed will not have any material impact upon the relationship of Stonecroft Court apartments and No.11. The existing ground floor kitchen window of No.11 facing out onto the gable of Stonecroft Court will be removed and no further windows are proposed in the elevation. Instead of the side window, the glazed rear extension will provide natural light to the redesigned ground floor kitchen. At first floor level the proposed two storey extension includes a rear facing window to an ensuite utility room. This will be obscure glazed and will have no impact in terms privacy.

6.19 The removal of the double garage and the vehicular activity associated with its use, will help contribute to a quieter environment in gardens adjoining the application property.

6.20 In summary the proposed extension will not impact on detrimentally on any neighbouring properties.

Compliance with Policy

6.21 The application proposal complies with policies DC1.1; DC1.2; DC1.3; DC1.4; DC18.1 and H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester. For the reasons stated above the application proposal is considered to comply with DC1.1 since the proposal is in keeping with the general character of No.11, it does not effect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; it allows the family to adapt the existing house to meet their living needs and does this without impact detrimentally on the appearance of the street-scene. The extension is achieved without detriment to on-site car parking provision.

6.22 In line with DC1.2 the proposal is not excessively large. Indeed it has been reduced following pre-application discussions and demonstrates complete subservience with the original house. The extension is not associated with any loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy to neighbouring dwellings. The design, materials and constructional details are in keeping with the streetscape and with neighbouring dwellings.

6.23 The proposal does not breach DC1.3 which advises that the Council will not normally approve rearward extensions greater than 3.65m in length or 2-storey extensions with a flat roof. The application proposal accords with DC1.4 which advises that the development potential of a gap between properties should be shared equally. The Stonecroft Apartments have developed close to the boundary and there is no reason why the occupiers of No.11 should not do the same provided the design of the extension is acceptable, which it is.

6.24 The proposal complies with DC18.1. The extension will preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Areas and is compatible with neighbouring buildings. No major change to the appearance of existing building is proposed and the extension is clearly subservient to the existing dwelling. Finally Policy H2.2 is complied with since the extension will maintain the quality of the area in which it will be sited.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Many people prefer to extend their existing homes rather than move, and the planning system must accommodate this demand for more living space, whilst at the same time ensuring that appropriate residential environments are maintained. The application proposal will create essential new accommodation for the occupants of the dwelling delivering the long term viability of the building whilst ensuring that the character and streetscape of the Conservation Area is preserved and enhanced.

7.2 The development proposal complies with all relevant national, regional and local planning policies. It accords with the policy principles and guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment', Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing'.

7.3 The proposal accords with the relevant policies of the adopted Development Plan for the area which comprises of the Regional Strategy for the North West (2008) and the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

7.4 Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.5 This statement has demonstrated that the erection of the new extension will preserve the character Blackburn Park Conservation Area. It has been demonstrated that the proposed development is in accordance with the Development Plan and no material considerations have been identified which would weigh against the benefits associated with the proposal.

7.6 We would recommend that the development is supported by the Council as being compliant with established planning policy.