

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141449/FH/2024
Date registered valid: 5 November 2024
Proposal: Erection of part two storey/part first floor side extension
Address: 2 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Ms Margaret Seaby
Agent (if any): Mr George Falzon, Falvia Services Limited
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 17th December 2024



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 20 November 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 12 November 2024

Expired: 3 December 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

This is a two storey detached dwelling house situated along Anerley Road in the Didsbury West ward area of Manchester. The property features previous enlargements to the side and rear in the form of single storey extensions. There is a garden to the front with paving for off street car parking and garden to the rear. The property is of brick and render to the front with red roof tiles.



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 planning permission for the erection of part two storey/part first floor side extension



Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per Appendix 1 – there have been comments raised from a local resident in relation to the scheme. Summary of comments as follows:

- Souchay Court is a retirement development of 37 properties which is managed by First Port on behalf of the landlord, Estates and Management.
- The residents are concerned about the proposed works as they feel it will impact the development. Given the narrow land to the side of the house, concerned how the builders will proceed and if this will include removing the boundary fence. Concerned about the requirement for access. Permission has not been requested, it would not be granted as the risk of damage to our property and gardens would be great as well as the health and safety risk caused by possible obstruction. We feel that there is a concern that access for the emergency services and care workers could be restricted.

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
- 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 Policy EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.
JP-S1: Sustainable Development
JP-P1 Sustainable Places

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

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.

History

Previous applications relating to the site as follows:

Planning reference: F11919– for the erection of a new garage, after demolition of existing wooden garage. This application was approved on 10.10.1979.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is proposing the erection of a of a part two storey and part first floor side extension. Comments have been received from local residents with regards to position of the extension and loss of access to land at the side. The proposal relates to the opposite side of where concerns have been raised, however, consideration must be given to the proposals appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity.

The ground floor would be set back from the principal elevation of the property measuring 2.5m, extending towards the side boundary measuring 2.29m in width and a length of 2.6m along the side adjoining an existing side projection. A window and door are proposed on the front elevation; no windows would be along the side.

The first floor would be set back from the principal elevation of the property measuring 2.5m, extending towards the side boundary measuring 2.29m in width and a length of 5.755m along the side ending in line with the rear wall of the property. This element of the proposal would sit above an existing ground floor extension. The roof would be hipped and set down from the main ridge line of the host dwelling. Windows are proposed on the front and rear. Given that the location of the windows, it is not anticipated that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy for the neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the introduction of an extension in this location is acceptable especially given the orientation of the property. The proposal is considered would not provide a detrimental outlook on the adjoining properties or the surrounding area and is not believed to impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene. However, although some of the surrounding properties have been altered and extended, the character of the area has been retained. It is therefore considered that the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered to be 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.

The proposal complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is therefore 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 as specified on the proposed application forms. 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

Existing arrangements are not altered by the proposal and therefore it is considered that the storage of refuse bins would remain within the garage space to the side of the property.

Parking

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

Conclusion

Although the proposal would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene, the character of the area is still retained. The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the existing property and is considered acceptable in this location, in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, or the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

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: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Positive and proactive working - 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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application

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 5th November 2024 numbered 1162/1 Existing and Proposed Site Plan

Received on 5th November 2024 numbered 1162/3 Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 5th November 2024 numbered 1162/5 Proposed 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 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

5 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BF

Flat 23, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 21, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 18, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 16, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 12, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 10, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 6, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

20 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF

Flat 4, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 1, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

Flat 39, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 37, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 34, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 32, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 29, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 27, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 24, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 38, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 36, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 35, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 33, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 31, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 30, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 28, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 26, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 25, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 9, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 8, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 7, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 5, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 3, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 2, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
3 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BF
19 Thurleigh Road, Manchester, M20 2DF
Flat 22, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 20, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 19, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 17, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 15, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
Flat 14, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR
4 Anerley Road, Manchester, M20 2DJ
Flat 11, Souchay Court, 1 Clothorn Road, Manchester, M20 6BR

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) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA