

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141803/FH/2024
Date registered valid: 23 December 2024
Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension to form additional accommodation
Address: 7 Hayescroft Gardens, Manchester, M20 2AA
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr David & Mrs Louisa Hesketh
Agent (if any): Mr Ewen Miller, Calderpeel Architects
Case officer: Jake Walther
Tel: 0161 234 1632
Email: jake.walther@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 25/03/2025

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Standard consultations:

Printed: 21 January 2025 Expired: 4 February 2025

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 7 January 2025 Expired: 28 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 three-storey semidetached class C3 dwellinghouse within Hayescroft Gardens. The property features hardstanding for vehicle parking to the front with a garden to the rear, there is an existing single storey outrigger on the rear elevation.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Hayescroft Gardens is a private residential neighbourhood off Palatine Road in Didsbury. It comprises of semidetached and detached class C3 family dwellings.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per Appendix 1 – No comments or objections received.

West Didsbury Residents Association – Object to the proposal on the grounds the proposed development could impact the local badger clans in the adjacent area.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – Requested the applicant provide a construction method statement – upon receiving the CMS the GMEU is satisfied with the measures put in place to protect the nearby badger setts.

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
- Policy EN15 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- Policy EN19 – Waste

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 2023)

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 single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter or extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. 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 dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed alteration would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

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 extension 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 rear extension would project back by 3180 mm and span the width of the property at 8780mm across, leaving gaps of 200mm to the boundary with the adjoining property. It would feature a lean-to roof with a maximum height of 4420mm, sloping down to 3255mm at the eaves.

The 3180mm rearward projection does not exceed the guidance set out in policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3650mm), and the proposed extension is not more than 50% of the existing floor space and makes use of a low-level roof. In addition, the proposal does not increase the footprint of the house by a significant amount, given the existing rear outrigger that will be replaced. As such, the development is considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of its dimensions and would not result in 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the property.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would make use of a lean-to roof that has a maximum height 4420mm where it joins the main building and slopes down to 3255mm at the eaves, additionally it would project out by only 2080mm more than the existing rear outrigger it replaces, as a result it is not anticipated that the proposal should cause issues associated with unacceptable levels of overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. Moreover, its blank side elevations should ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers is not infringed upon.

There is a glazed bifold door proposed on the rear elevation, with three skylights on the roof slope, the side elevations would remain blank. It is not anticipated that the new glazed doors will cause any privacy issues for the residents or neighbours.

The proposal therefore accords with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension would be finished in brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse. Its side elevations would be blank and featureless, whilst its rear elevation would feature a set of glazed bifold doors, and the roof would feature 3no. skylights.

The proposal is relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Set at the rear of the property, the proposal 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. Moreover, its use of matching materials should provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, thus ensuring that it does not form a prominent visual feature. Hence, the overall character of the property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The design and appearance of the proposed developments therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Impact on wildlife

The applicant site is located adjacent to a small woodland area that is home to several active badger setts; badgers and their setts are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act (1992) and therefore developments must be carried out in accordance with Natural England Guidelines. A badger survey was provided within this application, which was submitted to the

GMEU for consideration, following this a construction method statement was requested to which the applicant subsequently provided. Upon review, the GMEU are satisfied the proposal would not pose a significant harm to the badgers and setts subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the CMS.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed rear extension 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 policy DC1 of the UDP, 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 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 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 – 23 December 2024
- b. Drawing – Proposed Plans and Elevations – 23 December 2024 – Ref: 24100(PL)100
- c. Drawing – Proposed Site Plan – Ref: 24100 (PL) 050
- d. Supporting Information – Construction Method Statement – 17 February 2025 – Ref: CMS/001

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.

5. Badger Protection

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction Method Statement referenced CMS/001 received 17th of February 2025.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Natural England
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

8 Hayescroft Gardens, Manchester, M20 2AA
6 Hayescroft Gardens, Manchester, M20 2AA
5 Hayescroft Gardens, Manchester, M20 2AA

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