MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	141241/FH/2024
Date registered valid:	15 October 2024
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear and side extension
Address:	15 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
Ward(s):	Crumpsall Ward
Applicant:	Cohen
Agent (if any):	Mr Eli Radnor, Radnor Architecture ltd
Case officer:	Katie Raw Tel: 0161 234 4164 Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**20 December 2024**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 3 December 2024

Standard consultations:
No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 10 December 2024 Expired: 17 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

The application site relates to 15 Boardman Road within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The application site relates to a semi-detached, two storey, dark red brick dwellinghouse characterised by gable roof and front canopy across the front elevation. The property benefits from an existing small single storey side extension with a hipped roof, a single storey rear outrigger, and to the rear an outbuilding which does not appear to constitute permitted development given the height of the structure. Amenity space to the front of the property consists of hardstanding and amenity space to the rear consists of a substantial grassed garden.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature, many houses of which are subject to residential extensions.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of single storey rear and side extension.

The single storey rear extension would extend the width of the host property and would, at the largest point, have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.8 x Length: 6 x Width: 6 metres.

The side extension would infill the space to the rear of the existing side extension and extend up to the existing rear outrigger. As such, this proposal would not create a ‘wrap round’ extension and would leave a 2 metre gap from the rear extension beyond the rear outrigger to the shared boundary with no.17 Boardman Road. This element would have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.5 x Length: 6 x Width: 2 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of two windows and a set of doors within the rear elevation, two steps in association with the extension and a large roof light.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been listed by the agent via emails received 12 December and 20 December 2024 as:
Windows and Doors: Existing – Upvc white. Proposed - To match existing.
Roof: Existing - Roof tiles. Proposed - Flat roof single ply membrane.
Walls: Existing - Facing brickwork. Proposed - To match existing.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

Concern was raised with the initial scheme presented for assessment. The initial design shows a wrap round extension with the 6 metre rear extension extending up against the boundary with the non-adjoining neighbour. Concern was raised that due to the orientation of the properties in the streetscene the proposal would result in loss of light and create an overbearing feature. A neighbour objection to this effect was also received. The scheme was amended in a way to reduce harm to the non-adjoining neighbour. A window was proposed against the shared boundary with the non-adjoining neighbour and was considered unacceptable and was subsequently removed from the proposal. The original scheme was a white render structure where the materials were considered out of keeping with the style of development in the immediate area and were considered to exacerbate the overbearing nature to the non-adjoining neighbour. The materials were amended during the course of the application to better reflect the original circumstances of the property and were confirmed by the agent in writing.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and two comments were received during the initial consultation period. One comment was neutral and one raised an objection. The following comments were received:
-Concern the proposal would result in severe impact to daylight for the neighbouring property due to the positioning and length of the extension.
-Questions were raised regarding the formation of the extension including any proposed bathroom, the dimensions of the extension, if foundations would cause damage to the neighbouring property, how builders would access the applicant site and the resultant state of the property after works had finished.

A re-notification was undertaken for neighbouring properties following the revised scheme. No further neighbour comments were received.

Issues

POLICY

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):
a) an economic objective
b) a social objective and
c) an environmental objective.

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:
i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
ii. Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed places.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It 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. Of relevance are Policy DM1 (Development Management), Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles) and Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:
a. The general character of the property;
b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:
a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;

c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.
d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:
a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;
b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;
c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;
d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;
e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABE as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Of relevance are paragraph 2.7, paragraph 2.14 and paragraph 2.16.

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

The following policies are relevant:
i.JP- S1- Sustainable development

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted development application is for the erection of single storey rear and side extension. The scheme is considered acceptable as many people prefer to alter or extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. Whilst the initial proposal presented gave rise to concerns, the revised scheme is on balance considered to overcome issues raised and no further comments have been received from neighbouring properties. 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 extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would result in 6 metres of additional built form to the rear of the property against the common boundary with no.13 Boardman Road. It is acknowledged that this would result in an expansive length of built form along the common boundary. However, given the fall back route of Permitted Development and the Larger Homes Extension route, given no neighbour comments have been received from this neighbour and given the adjoining neighbour would sit due south of the applicant site, the impact to the neighbour is not considered so severe to warrant a refusal for the scheme. Given the lengthy rear amenity spaces of the properties along Boardman Road and given an 18.5 metre distance would remain with no built form against the shared boundary, the proposal would not be considered to harm the adjoining neighbour to a point that would be so overbearing.

The scheme was amended during the course of the application for the extension to be set off the shared boundary with no.17 Boardman Road. This is reflected within the revised plans received for consideration. Neighbour concerns were raised in regard to potential loss of light implications as a result of the proposal. The revised scheme is considered to help negate the adverse impact to no.17. As a result of the revised scheme, the side extension would run along the shared boundary with no.17 and after the rear elevation of the existing outrigger, the rear extension would be then set off the shared boundary by 2 metres. At this point, the neighbour would feel an additional 3.5 metres of built form 2 metres from the common boundary.

It is acknowledged that the neighbour would lose their outlook from the side window within their rear outrigger as a result of the proposal given a blank elevation would be sited up to the shared boundary at that point. However, the existing relationship of windows within side elevations of extensions/outriggers is not a relationship the council would approve due to issues with overlooking. To ensure no further overlooking would take place as a result of the extension, a condition would be attached to any approval granted restricting the further insertion of windows and doors beyond those approved within this consent.

However, given the existing outrigger of the applicant’s which sits directly to the south of the neighbouring property, the level of light received from this window is not considered to be large as existing, given the neighbour’s structure sits immediately south and given the neighbour’s outbuilding with a height of 3 metres would block light. The set in and loss of the wrap round element of the proposal is considered necessary to mitigate some loss of light to the neighbour’s garden. Given the fallback of permitted development and given the structure would be single storey and a flat roof structure, in this instance the harm is not considered so severe to warrant a refusal on the scheme. Further, the loss of the large 3 metre high outbuilding against the shared boundary with no.17 is welcomed to allow additional light to the rear patio area connected to the neighbouring property. On this occasion, the proposal is considered on the cusp of acceptability with consideration given to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategies SP1 and DM1.

No neighbours to the rear of the applicant site would be impacted by the proposal given the single storey nature of the proposal. Given the existing side extension sitting flush with the primary elevation of the host property would not alter as a result of the proposal, there would be no impact to the streetscene.

Design and Appearance

As discussed previously, it is acknowledged the extension is large in length and would result in a decent extension for the applicants use. However, given the Larger Homes Extension route which would allow 6 metre rear extensions against the common boundary and given the side extension could also be erected through permitted development on the basis the outrigger could be classed as 'original', the scheme may be achievable through permitted development. Considering the fallback position of PD, given the spacious rear amenity space, given the existing outrigger at the site and the revised plan to help negate harm to the common boundary with no.17, in this instance, the form and design of the proposal can be accepted on balance.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal have been amended during the course of the application. The use of white render as originally proposed would have related poorly with the surrounding streetscene and would further add to the overbearing nature of the proposal. The change to more traditional materials in keeping with the existing property is welcomed and the agent has supplied a list of materials for review. This includes:
Windows and Doors: Existing – Upvc white. Proposed - To match existing.
Roof: Existing - Roof tiles. Proposed - Flat roof single ply membrane.
Walls: Existing - Facing brickwork. Proposed - To match existing.

The materials proposed across the site are considered acceptable and a materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Car Parking

No change to car parking arrangements would occur as a result of the proposal.

Bin Storage

No change to bin store provision would occur as a result of the proposal.

Conclusion

Overall, on balance given the fallback of permitted development, given the attempts to negate harm to the non-adjoining property and given the proposal is single storey, the proposal can be recommended for approval. This approval is on the basis the materials are conditioned as outlined by the agent to be in keeping with the existing property and a condition restricting the insertion of windows and doors are added to the decision notice of any approval granted.

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

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, a revised scheme has been received which is considered to satisfy concerns raised and appropriate conditions have been attached to any approval granted.

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:
-Drawing- Proposed- Plans and Elevations, numbered 003, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 8 December 2024.
-Drawing- Site Plan- Site Plan/Location Plan, numbered 001, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 9 December 2024.
-Supporting Information- Confirmation of Proposed Materials, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 20 December 2024.

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

3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no openings, including windows and doors, shall be inserted within the elevations of the extension, other than those shown on the approved drawings, unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellinghouse, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) The materials to be used throughout the proposal hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details as set out in ‘Supporting Information- Confirmation of Proposed Materials’, specified in Condition 2 of this approval.

Reason- In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

14 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
8 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
14 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS
1 Moorland Avenue, Manchester, M8 4WT
21 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
12 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
10 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
9 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
19 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
17 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
13 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
11 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
8 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS
12 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS
10 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS
16 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA