MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	141690/FH/2024
Date registered valid:	6 December 2024
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension and installation of access ramp to side and rear
Address:	31 Merewood Avenue, Manchester, M22 8DP
Ward(s):	Northenden Ward
Applicant:	Mr William White
Agent (if any):	Mr Paul Nish, Manchester City Council
Case officer:	Jake Walther Tel: 0161 234 1632 Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**31/01/2025**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 08/01/2025

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 2 January 2025 Expired: 23 January 2025

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
The application relates to a two-storey semidetached class c3 family dwellinghouse on Merewood Avenue. The property is finished in white render at ground floor level and has terracotta tile on the first floor continuing from the roof. The property has a front landscaped area, hardstanding for car parking and a rear garden.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area
Merewood Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac located in the Northenden Ward in South Manchester. The area is predominantly residential in terms of its character consisting of semidetached and terraced residential dwellinghouses.

Description of development
The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension and associated rear access ramp to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses
Neighbours, as per appendix 1 – no comments or objections received.

Policy
The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 - The City Council adopted the core strategy on July 11, 2012. It is the key document in the Manchester Local Plan. The plan determines how Manchester will grow and forms the framework that planning applications are assessed against. We consider the following Core Strategy Policies relevant to this proposal.

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas

Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The Core Strategy replaced much of the UDP, but some UDP Development Control policies are extant (remain). The following extant policy is still considered relevant to this proposal.

- DC1 - Residential Extensions

Places for Everyone
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 following policies are relevant:

- S1- Sustainable development

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- an economic objective
- a social objective and
- an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places.

Principle

The submitted application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension and instillation of an access ramp to the side. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter or adapt their homes rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families, including disabled access needs. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single-family dwelling house, it is not considered that the proposed instillation would give rise to ant significant additional waste or car parking measures.

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. The proposed alteration is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Sitting, Scale and Mass

The proposed extension would be single storey and located at the rear of the property, it would project back by 6.9m and span 3.94m across the rear wall of the building, it would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.4m. There would be gaps of 292mm to the boundary with the adjoining house and 4680mm with the neighbouring house. The extension would be sited entirely at the rear of the property and would not be visible from the street.

The proposed ramp would have a width of 1200mm and would span either side of the side doorway, each section measuring 2700mm. A gap of 1650mm would be maintained between the side of the ramp and the boundary to the neighbouring property.

The proposed extension is long; however, it makes use of setbacks and a low-level flat roof meaning that it would not provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. As a result, it is considered that scale and mass of the proposal is satisfactory as it would not result in 'excessively large or bulky' additions to the property. The proposal therefore is considered to accord with the principles for extensions set in polices DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

The rear extension would make use of a low-level flat roof, with a maximum height of 2.4m and would be set back from the boundaries slightly. The side elevations facing the adjoining property would remain blank and featureless, whilst the rear elevation would feature 1no window on the extension and 1no. new window on the main house, there would also be 1no. window and 1no. door on the side elevation, set in from the boundary to the neighbouring property by 4680mm.

The proposed ramp is subtle in form, not taking up any more amenity space than is required for its function. The railings are of a standard height and width and are to be painted black to best blend in with the character of the area.

In addition, there have been no objections received to the proposal.

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

Visual Amenity
The proposal is for a rear ground floor extension that would be constructed of brickwork to with white uPVC windows on the rear elevation and white uPVC windows and door on the side elevation. The addition would be wholly at the rear of the building so would not be visible within the street scene or public realm and, as such, should have a minimal impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

The design of the ramp is considered acceptable, handrails are to be painted black to ensure they do not stand out and or are prominent on the street scene, pursuant with the NPPF; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The design and appearance of the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as its impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Conclusion
Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as well as waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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 polices 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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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

1. 3-year time limit:
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. Specified plans:
The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

a. Drawing - Location Plan – 6th of December 2024
b. Drawing –Proposed Elevations - 6th of December 2024
c. Drawing –Proposed Floor Plans - 6th of December 2024

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

3. Specified materials:
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 policies DM1, SP1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

4. Additional glazing restriction:
Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional glazing, windows, or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted at the property unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residences, pursuant to policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

35 Merewood Avenue, Manchester, M22 8DP
279 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M22 4NY
281 Altrincham Road, Manchester, M22 4NY
29 Merewood Avenue, Manchester, M22 8DP
9 Merewood Avenue, Manchester, M22 8DP
33 Merewood Avenue, Manchester, M22 8DP

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA