

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141825/FO/2025
Date registered valid: 14 February 2025
Proposal: Erection of front porch, installation of front driveway/garden and installation of rear patio/garden
Address: 27 Glendale Avenue, Manchester, M19 1EH
Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Mr Shaban Hussain
Agent (if any): Mr Jawad Hashmat JH Consultants Ltd
Case officer: Janet Lawless
Tel: 0161 234 4535
Email: janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 10 April 2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

Date of site visit: 9th April

Standard consultations:

Printed: 19 February 2025 Expired: 12 March 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 19 February 2025 Expired: 12 March 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 property that is the subject of this retrospective householder application is a red brick and render 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouse. It has a hipped tiled roof and UPVC windows with a part single part two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. There is a bay window to the front of the property and a porch has been constructed which forms part of this retrospective application. The front and rear gardens have been hard surfaced with the installation of drainage gullies to both areas.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Glendale Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac situated within the Burnage ward of Manchester, close to Cringle Playing Fields, Cringle Park, and Levenshulme High School. The area is primarily residential in terms of its character, consisting of detached and semi-detached residential properties and benefits from its proximity to outdoor green / amenity spaces.

Description of development

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey dual pitched roof front porch. It is constructed in brick with a tiled roof and Upvc door. It requires planning permission as it is over the 3 square metres when measured externally under the Permitted Development regulations. The front and rear gardens have also been hard surfaced with decorative concrete finish, both areas front and rear incorporate drainage gulleys via arco drains. The rear garden has a drainage gully centrally located and the front area has a drainage gully that runs the full front of the driveway hardstanding.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents were informed three letters have been received the main points of concern being as follows.

Despite the use of fencing built over the wall, Number 27 can still see into my property and are invading my privacy.

The proposed raised rear patio/garden puts our property in a disadvantageous position as it exposes us and other neighbours more to the flood risk, if any. It is disappointing to note from the application that the works on site have already been completed. Not sure what the Council can do now to rectify the situation.

The porch is too big, and should have been left as the previous porch and others on the Avenue. It also spoils my view down the Avenue.

I believe the overshadowing and overbearing presence of the porch is made worse because it is erected closer to my property. With regards to the hard standing constructed at the front of the property the installation of Number 27's hardened front driveway/garden is greater than 5 meters squared. I take issue with the installation of the rear patio/garden. This covers more than 50% of the existing garden and it is raised well beyond 300 millimetres. Arguments seem to suggest works were conducted due to risk of flooding on site. Historically there has only ever been one incident of localised flooding to a neighbouring properties garage due to a blockage of the Willow Brook caused by fly-tipping. It would seem the three properties nearer the Brook would be at a far greater risk of flooding if at all in comparison to 27. Certainly, The flood risk reports submitted echo much the same.

The remaining points of concern relate to previously approved development, and as such those issues are not forming part of the assessment of this current application which is purely for the installation of the hardstanding and hard surfacing to the front and rear gardens, and to the erection of the porch to the front of the property.

Flood Risk Management -have been consulted and have no objections to the proposal.

Issues

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) - Sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these should be applied. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has 3 overarching objectives:

An economic objective - to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land, of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

A social objective - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

An environmental objective - to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy

It states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term, but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visibly attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible, and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Section 12 'Achieving Well Designed Places' states that 'the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. paragraph 126).

The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.

Policy SP1 identifies the City Council's Core Development Principles and states that development in all parts of the City should:-

Make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including:-

- Creating well designed places that enhance or create character
- Making a positive contribution to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents
- Considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income.
- Protect and enhance the built and natural environment

Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible.

Improve access to jobs, services, education and open space by being located to reduce the need to travel and provide good access to sustainable transport provision.

Policy EN1 relates to design principles and strategic character areas and states that all development in Manchester will be expected to follow the seven principles of urban design listed below:

- Character: a place with its own identity

- Continuity and enclosure: a place where public and private places are clearly distinguished
- Quality of the public realm: a place with attractive, and successful outdoor areas
- Ease of movement: a place that is easy to get to and move through
- Legibility: a place that has a clear image and is easy to understand
- Adaptability: a place that can change easily
- Diversity: a place with variety and choice

Policy EN19 relates to waste and states that the Council will require all developers to submit a waste management plan to demonstrate how both construction and demolition waste will be minimised and recycled on site wherever possible and how the sustainable waste management needs of the end user will be met.

Policy T2 states that outside the City Centre all new development should provide appropriate car parking facilities, taking account of the guidance in Appendix B (of the Core Strategy). In all parts of the City proposals should have regard to the need for disabled and cycle parking, in line with appendix B (this indicates maximum car parking standards for various uses).

Notwithstanding the above, Policy T2 requires that consideration is given to the particular circumstances of each proposal to determine the appropriate levels of car parking that may be required. Policy T2 requires the provision of proportionate Traffic Impact Assessments and Travel Plans for all major applications and for any proposals where there are likely to be access or transport issues.

Policy DM 1 states that all development should have regard to the following specific issues for which more detailed guidance may be given within a supplementary planning document:-

- Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.
- Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.
- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality and road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise.
- Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes.
- Community safety and crime prevention.
- Design for health.
- Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.
- Refuse storage and collection.
- Vehicular access and car parking.
- Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage.
- Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private.
- Flood risk and drainage.
- Existing or proposed hazardous installations.

Unitary Development Plan - The site is unallocated within the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

Principle of works - The works applied for have already been undertaken, and the hardstanding has been implemented to both the front and rear gardens, together with the erection of the porch. Previously the front boundary treatment was a low brick wall with metal inward opening gate and parking alongside the property. However, following the implementation of a previously approved consent (planning permission reference 137277/FH/2023) for a part single part two storey side extension the parking provision was reduced, the proposal now enables in curtilage parking by extending the hardstanding to the driveway and across the front garden. The boundary wall has been removed, and the front garden has now been surfaced

with a concrete decorative surface. The drainage gulleys have been incorporated within both the front and rear hardstanding schemes.

The proposed vehicular access and hardstanding are considered acceptable, in principle, subject to consideration of drainage from the hardstanding and regard has to be given to the fallback position in terms of works that can be carried out as permitted development. The porch could be constructed up to 3 square metres when measured externally under Permitted Development, so the assessment of the additional size as constructed and its impacts on neighbouring properties should be taken into consideration, together with any impacts upon the character of the property itself. The porch constructed is larger than the previously demolished porch which carried across into a canopy over the front bay. The replacement porch is of a similar design and size to others that have been installed along Glendale Avenue in size and materials.

Amount of hardstanding - The submitted plans show all of the front garden being converted to hardstanding, to accommodate 1 additional vehicle parking space, the dropped kerb did exist previously, and this has now been widened to access the second parking space. The amount of hardstanding to the front of the property is comparable to others within the street and with the provision of a gulley drain is considered acceptable.

Following the development of the approved extensions the rear private amenity area has been hard surfaced in its entirety, again this area of hardstanding includes the provision of a gulley drain.

The Council's flood risk management team have been consulted on the application proposals and do not raise an objection to the works.

Visual/residential amenity – In relation to the works to the driveway there are examples of open frontages and full width driveways elsewhere within the area and the majority of such works including removing boundary walls do not require planning permission. In this instance it is considered that the changes made are acceptable do not have a detrimental impact upon visual or residential amenity.

Whilst the porch is larger than one that could be constructed under Permitted Development rights, it is similar to others that have been installed within the area and as such is not considered to be an alien or incongruous feature within the street scene. The materials used match those of the host property and are similar to approaches taken elsewhere.

Concerns have been raised around the siting of the porch and impacts on adjacent properties. The submitted drawings indicate that the porch would sit 3.2m from the shared boundary with number 25 and approximately 3m from number 29. Given these distances and siting of the porch it is not considered that it would give rise to significant impacts on these properties to warrant refusal of the proposals.

The provision of the hard surfacing within the rear garden could be undertaken under permitted development rights. However, the application proposals are not considered to give rise to significant impacts in terms of residential amenity, overlooking or loss of privacy. It is noted that the removal of vegetation at the property has given the rear amenity space a more open aspect and this is a change to the previous arrangement, such removals would not in themselves have required planning permission. Rear gardens to rear garden relationships are a common arrangement and in this regard the proposals are not considered to be unacceptable.

Surface water - The proposal includes the installation of a drain along the whole width of the frontage of the property, and the drainage gulley also runs along the centre of the rear garden

which has also been surfaced over. The drains link in with the existing combined main sewer as set out within the submitted application forms. The provision of hard surfacing to the rear garden could be undertaken under permitted development rights without a requirement for a drainage connection. The application proposals and arrangements are considered to be acceptable and as set out in the consultation section no objections have been raised to the proposals by the Councils flood risk management team.

Response to representations received- The comments relating to potential flooding have been assessed, in that the gully and connection to the main sewer is considered an acceptable approach and would assist with isolated pooling of water and run off into neighbouring properties. No objections or conditions were recommended by flood risk management.

As set out in the preceding sections of this report the provision of a single storey front porch would cause undue loss of light or overshadowing. It is noted that there may previously have been a limited view along the street from the bay window to the ground floor of the neighbouring property, however, it is not considered that the installation of the porch would cause impacts to warrant a refusal in this instance.

The other issues raised relate to previously approved applications which were assessed at the time of their submission and determination. The fencing along the common boundary to the rear is under 2 metres in height and as such is permitted development. If there are any boundary issues as a result Civil legislation would deal with that as opposed to planning legislation. The issue with regards to the free standing outbuilding will be investigated but does not form part of the current application proposals and would be assessed under a stand-alone planning application should it be determined that planning permission is required, and as such these two issues regarding the fencing and the impacts of the freestanding outbuilding are not forming part of the assessment of this current application, with this concerning the hardstanding created to the front and rear and the erection of the new front porch only.

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

Officers have worked with the Applicant / Agent in a positive and proactive manner in order to guide the application through all stages of the planning process, no significant problems arose and the scheme has been assessed in line with both local and national policies and has been determined in a timely manner.

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

1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

drawing 03-Proposed front elevation and proposed floor plan.

drawing 04-Proposed side elevations

drawing 05- proposed site plan.

All received 2nd January 2025

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.

2) Notwithstanding the details on drawing 05 (proposed site plan), received 2nd January 2025, this permission does not constitute or grant any permission for the detached outbuilding.

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

30 Glendale Avenue, Manchester, M19 1FF

28 Glendale Avenue, Manchester, M19 1FF

26 Glendale Avenue, Manchester, M19 1FF

29 Glendale Avenue, Manchester, M19 1EH

25 Glendale Avenue, Manchester, M19 1EH

28 Hembury Avenue, Manchester, M19 1FH

26 Hembury Avenue, Manchester, M19 1FH

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

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