

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 140355/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 17 July 2024

Proposal: Erection of hip to gable roof extension and erection of rear roof dormer extension

Address: 9 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr Ruifeng Li

Agent (if any): Mr Peter Entwistle PCE Designs Ltd

Case officer: Ellie Knowles
Tel: 0161 219 6633
Email: ellie.knowles@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 11 September 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 7 August 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 26 July 2024 Expired: 16 August 2024

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/area

The proposal relates to a semi-detached dwellinghouse on Macefin Avenue. The proposal features an existing two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The property features hardstanding to the front for off street vehicle parking and a garden to the rear.

The surrounding area is residential in character, featuring semi-detached and detached properties of varying form, constructed in a predominate arts and craft style.



Figure.1 The application property, no.9 and the adjoining semi, no.11.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of development

The applicant is proposing the erection of a hip to gable extension together with the installation of a rear roof dormer.

Hip to gable extension

The proposed side extension would sit atop of the existing first floor side extension continuing the main roofline to finish with a gable end on the common boundary, reading as a two storey side extension. The new side extension would be finished in matching render and tile.

Rear roof dormer

The proposed rear roof dormer would sit across the main roof and proposed side extension roof. The dormer would be finished with a flat roof, glazing and tile to match.



Figure.2 Existing and proposed plans and elevations

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local responses

None

Consultee responses

None

Relevant Planning History

At the application site –

067891/FH/2003/S2 – Erection of part single/part two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation and garage. Approved 20.10.2003.

History of negotiations

No negotiations were entered into with the agent, given that the proposal was considered unacceptable in principle, even in the event of significant revisions.

Local Planning Policies

Places for Everyone (2022-2039) – Places for Everyone is a long-term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth. It has been published by the

GMCA on behalf of the nine districts and took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

The PfE Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The PfE Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012-2027) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11 July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan. Parts of the policies have been superseded by the Places for Everyone Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant **Places for Everyone** policies for this application are as follows:

JP-S1 – Sustainable Development
JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

The relevant **Core Strategy** policies for this application are as follows:

DM 1 – Development Management
SP 1 – Spatial Principles (partially superseded by PfE)
EN 1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
EN 19 – Waste

The relevant saved **UDP** policies for this application are:

DC1– Residential Extensions

The relevant supplementary planning guidance documents for this application are:

- The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

A relevant material consideration is also:

- Manchester Residential Quality Guidance March 2017 (Manchester's Emerging Space Standards)

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF (2023) sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt. Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors. The Local Planning Authority consider the following sections relevant to this proposal.

- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4 – Decision-making
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Paragraph 137 – states that “Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design⁵⁴, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as

design guides and codes.”

Issues

Principle of development:

The principle of extending one's home is generally acceptable in circumstances where there is no overriding unduly harmful impact upon either the character of the property, or upon the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. In this instance however, the principle of the proposal is considered unacceptable by virtue of the proposed scale and design of extensions, which present harm upon the character of the host dwellinghouse, semi-detached pair and streetscene, which means the application cannot be approved. It is therefore believed that there are factors of sufficient weight that would warrant the refusal of this application.

Impact on visual amenity and the streetscene:

The proposal seeks permission for hip to gable extension together with the installation of a rear roof dormer.

The proposed scale, design and siting of the proposal is not considered to respect the character of the host dwelling. The semi-detached pair (no.s 9 and 11) are characterised by an original Dutch gable roof form, which has been retained through previous extensions to the host dwelling and is replicated on the adjacent property no.13 (see fig.1). Whereas the proposal would remove this feature by introducing an incongruous hip to gable form on this property, which would in turn erode existing space between neighbouring dwellings and detract from the symmetry retained between the host dwelling and adjoining property no.11 (see fig.2).

Furthermore, the proposed scale of development is not considered subservient to the host dwelling, by virtue of the continuation of the main ridge line and the addition of a large dormer across the full rear roof, as such there would not be a clear delineation from the existing dwellinghouse.

This visual amenity impact upon the host dwelling, semi-detached pair and streetscene is considered contrary to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Impact on residential amenity:

Due to the increase in massing along the common boundary with no.7, the proposed side extension overdominance concern upon this neighbouring property.

The proposed rear dormer windows and front rooflight will afford outlook across the hosts own rear garden area and front highway and as such raises no concern with the loss of privacy over and above existing.

Impact on Highway Safety:

The proposed development would not interfere with the existing parking provision on street, as such is considered acceptable in this regard.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

It is considered that the concerns about the scheme are significant and fundamental and cannot be overcome with simple amendments. The application has been dealt with in a timely manner and has, in this instance, been determined to be in conflict with the Development Plan.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposed hip to gable roof extension and erection of rear roof dormer extension by reason of the scale and design form an incongruous and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the area and would be unduly harmful to the character of the application property. As such the proposals are contrary to saved policies DC1.1 and DC1.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

7 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ
12 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ
10 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ
10 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ
12 Manor Drive, Manchester, M21 7GQ
14 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ
11 Macefin Avenue, Manchester, M21 7QQ

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA