COOMBS
Planning Services

PLANNING STATEMENT

PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE/ FIRST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION & TWO STOREY/ SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

21 FORDBANK ROAD, DIDSBURY



PREPARED BY COOMBS PLANNING SERVICES, STAPELEY HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, STAPELEY, NANTWICH, CW5 7JW

AUGUST 2016

RTPI
Chartered Town Planner

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Coombs Planning Services are instructed to submit a supporting planning statement to accompany a planning application for extensions and alterations to No. 21 Fordbank Road, Didsbury. This planning application follows the refusal of a previous planning application for larger extensions to the property. The current application seeks to address the previous reasons for refusal and sets out the background to the proposals, identifies the relevant planning policies and justifies the overriding reasons why planning permission should be granted for the amended development.

1.2 This statement should be read in conjunction with other supporting documentation which comprises:

- Application forms and Certificate
- Drawing No. E001_Rev_A: Existing Conditions
- Drawing No. P001_Rev_A: Planning Proposal: Floor Plans and Elevations
- 1:1250 Site Location Plan

2.0 THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The site comprises of a semi-detached brick and render two storey dwelling located within a residential area of Didsbury, close to the various shops and services available on the nearby Wilmslow Road.

2.2 The dwellings on Fordbank Road are predominantly semi-detached and most are of a similar form to the application site. However, many dwellings have been subject to extensions of varying sizes and designs. Many properties have been extended to the side and rear as can be seen on the photographs attached at Appendix 1.

3.0 THE PROPOSAL

3.1 The proposal is informed by a thorough assessment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the relationship of the property to adjacent dwellings. The scheme has taken on board the concerns reflected in the previous reason for refusal and presents a development which has an acceptable impact upon the streetscene and those living close by.

3.2 The amended proposals comprise of a number of elements which include:

- A modest first floor extension over the existing front porch area to enable the creation of a small study area;

- An extension to the side. While this runs along the side of the existing house, the bulk and mass is now broken up as it comprises of both single storey and two storey elements. Towards the front of the house, the extension is in effect single storey, retaining the characteristic catslide roof over the porch/ hall area. A two storey side element is set further back from the front of the dwelling, and this extends towards the rear of the house by approximately 7.1 metres;

- A first floor/ two storey extension to the rear. This has been significantly reduced since the previous submission. The two storey rear extension extends no further than the existing ground floor single storey addition projecting a maximum of 3.1 metres from the original rear wall of the house;

- A single storey extension which then projects rearwards from the two storey extension by approximately 3 metres. It should be noted that a single storey garage was located in a similar position at the site until very recently as can be seen on aerial photographs for the area and also on the submitted 1:1250 Location Plan.

3.0 PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Statutory Development Plan

3.2 The statutory development plan for the area comprises of the Manchester Core Strategy adopted on the 11 July 2012 and the 'saved' policies of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

3.3 The key policies against which this application should be assessed are:

Manchester Core Strategy

- DM1: Development Management
- SP1: Spatial Principles

Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

- DC1: Residential extensions

3.4 In addition to the statutory development plan, the following documents should be given due weight in the planning assessment:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published March 2012.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

3.5 The NPPF sets out the Government's view of what constitutes sustainable development and what this means for the planning system. Paragraph 7 considers there to be three dimensions to sustainable development:

Economic - contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available and in the right places at the right time to support growth and innovation, and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;

Social - supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being;

Environmental - Contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

3.6 The NPPF introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In decision making, development that accords with an up to date development plan should be approved.

3.7 The NPPF also details that planning should:

- Planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;

- Planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.

- Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

4.0 PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The following planning applications are of relevance:

111762/FH/2016/S2: Erection of first floor front extension, part single/part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation following demolition of the single storey attached garage. Planning permission refused 6 July 2016.

0499335/FH/SOUTH1/96: New Entrance Porch with WC and part single/ part two storey rear extension to form lounge with bedroom over. Planning permission granted.

5.0 ASSESSMENT

5.1 The key issues are as follows:

Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

5.2 Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy details that all development should have regard to the impact of the proposal upon the surrounding area in terms of the design, scale

and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

5.3 Policy SP1 of the Core Strategy states that developments which make a positive contribution and enhance areas for residents will be supported.

5.4 Saved policy DC1 also contains useful guidance and it requires that development has regard to the character of the property and the surrounding area.

5.5 These policies are considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF given that achieving good design is one of the core planning principles embodied within the policy document.

5.6 The alterations to the front and side of the dwelling will be visible within the streetscene. While the dwellings within Fordbank Road are of similar form, many have been subject to alteration and extension. As a consequence there is a degree of variety within the street as can be seen at Appendix 1. The proposed front/ side extensions appear as subordinate additions to the dwelling and the development is similar to many other permitted side extensions within the area.

5.7 Furthermore, it should be noted that no objection was raised by the Council to the previous application in terms of the impact of the development upon the streetscene. The proposal therefore complies with Policies DM1, SP1 and DC1 of the Core Strategy and Saved UDP.

Impact upon residential amenity

5.8 Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy details that development should take account of the impact upon amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality , road safety and traffic generation.

5.9 Saved Policy DC1 advises that the impact of development upon the amenity of neighbouring properties should be considered.

5.10 The previous decision focused upon the impact of the development upon residential amenity in terms of the cited reasons for refusal. These reasons have been carefully considered and the amended scheme successfully breaks up the bulk and mass of the proposal and in doing so, it reduces the impact of the development upon No. 19 Fordbank Road.

5.11 It is unlikely that dwellings to the front or rear of the dwelling will be unduly affected by the development proposals given the separation distances involved and indeed no concerns were previously raised in this regard. The development has the potential to impact only upon the attached dwelling at No. 23 and the neighbouring dwelling to the north at No. 21. The impact of the proposals upon these dwellings is carefully considered below.

Impact upon No. 23

5.12 No.23 is the attached semi. This property has benefitted from an extension to the front and side which is of a similar appearance to the application proposals. The extension built to the front and side of No.23 has effectively unbalanced the front elevation of the pair of semi's. The proposed development will redress this balance and it will improve the appearance of the pair within the streetscene.

5.13 To the rear, No.23 currently has a single storey extension to the rear alongside the common boundary. It should be noted that planning permission was granted recently for a two storey rear extension under LPA Reference 111789/FH/2016/S2. The proposed extension at No. 21 aligns itself with the permitted two storey extension at No.23 projecting the same depth from the rear of the dwelling. This ensures that no loss of amenity will result.

5.14 The proposed alterations to the side of the dwelling will not impact upon No. 23 given that they are on the opposite side of the existing house. The proposed single storey rear extension is set some distance from the boundary with No. 23 and no

loss of amenity will therefore result. It is noted that no objections were received to the previous application from the occupier of this dwelling. The development will not have an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of No. 23 having regard to relevant development plan policies.

Impact upon No. 19

5.15 No. 19 sits to the north of the application site. Given this positioning, it is unlikely that the development at No. 21 will result in any significant loss of daylight to this property.

5.16 At present, a gap of approximately 4.2 metres exists between the side walls of No. 19 and No. 21. The proposed side extension will reduce the spacing between the dwellings by 1.3m. At present, No. 19 has a ground floor kitchen window in the side elevation and a further 2 small windows that are obscurely glazed. The ground floor kitchen window within the side of No. 19 currently faces a 2m high fence with the side elevation of the application site beyond. The window does not currently enjoy an open aspect at present.

5.17 The proposed extension to the side of the house by virtue of its limited width and incorporation of single storey elements is unlikely to significantly erode the outlook from the existing side, front or rear windows of No. 19. The Council have approved similar side extensions within Fordbank Road which project closer to adjacent neighbours, for example that seen at No.27.

5.18 The current proposal has been carefully considered. The roof of the extension slopes away from the neighbour and the rearwards single storey extension incorporates a hip. In addition, a gap of 800mm has been retained to the boundary and this ensures that the development does not have an overbearing impact and it avoids the possibility of any future terracing effect.

5.19 In addition, it should be noted that the occupiers of No. 19 have recently obtained planning application for a two storey side/ rear extension to the dwelling under LPA reference 112388/FH/2016/S2.

5.20 The submitted plans for the extension at No. 19 present a blank side elevation to No.21. The two storey extension projects rearwards by a similar depth to the proposal at No. 21. The relationship between the proposals is annotated on the submitted plan. With or without the proposed extension in place at No. 19, the submitted plan shows that the impact of the development upon the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling is acceptable having regard to relevant development plan policies. Again it is noted that no objections were received from the occupiers of this property to the previous planning application.

5.21 Finally it should be noted that the amended proposal is not dissimilar in dimensions to a development that could be conceived utilising permitted development rights. The proposed two storey extension projects 3.1 metres from the depth of the original rear wall. The single storey extension projects 6.1 metres from the original rear wall. Further the impact of the single storey rear extension is likely to be less than the longer garage that stood at the site or any outbuilding that could also be constructed utilising permitted development rights.

6.0 Conclusions

6.1 Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the application should be determined in accordance with the adopted statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development which is the 'golden thread' through decision making. The NPPF makes clear that Local Planning Authorities should approach decision-making in a positive way in order to foster the delivery of sustainable development. Planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles

or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.

6.3 The extensions to the dwelling are acceptable in terms of their impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene. The development is similar to many other extensions that have been permitted and built within the area. The proposal has been carefully designed to ensure that no loss of amenity will occur to those dwellings adjacent.

6.4 The proposal represents sustainable development, in social, environmental and economic respects and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as referenced in the NPPF should apply. Accordingly, planning permission should be granted without delay.

APPENDIX 1: EXAMPLES OF EXTENSIONS WITHIN FORDBANK ROAD/ VICINITY



Application site and the attached dwelling at No. 23. No.23 has been extended to the side/ front similar to the application proposal.



Extension at No. 15 Fordbank Road which has extended the dwelling to the side/ front.



No. 13 Fordbank Road



No. 5 Fordbank Road



No. 8 Westmoreland Road



No.10 Granville Gardens



No. 21 Westmoreland Road



No. 45 Dene Road



No. 50 Dene Road