

## Planning

## Growth & Development

### Delegated officer report for planning application

**Application no.** 141455/FH/2024  
**Date registered valid:** 12 November 2024  
**Proposal:** Installation of external door in existing window opening and new external stairs to garden area.  
**Address:** 24 Claremont Grove, Manchester, M20 2GL  
**Ward(s):** Didsbury West Ward  
  
**Applicant:** Qasam  
**Agent (if any):** Beth Egerton Egeshaw Architecture  
**Case officer:** Tracie Simpson  
Tel: 0161 234 4537  
Email: [tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk)  
  
**Recommendation:** Approve  
**Date of recommendation:** 7<sup>th</sup> January 2025



## 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: 14 November 2024

Expired: 5 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

The site/building relates to a 3 storey semi detached dwelling house with basement in the Didsbury West ward area of Manchester. The property is of orange brick with brick bays to the front and gable window at second floor featuring decorative brick eaves. There is a garden to the front with access along the side and garden to the rear. Off road car parking is available at the front.



**Listed building:** Not applicable  
**Conservation area:** Not applicable  
**Tree Preservation Order:** Not applicable

### **Description of area**

This is primarily a residential area in nature

### **Description of development**

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the Installation of external door in existing window opening and new external stairs to garden area.



### **Consultations & Notification Responses**

Local residents – No comments or representations received as a result of this proposal.

The proposed stairs would lead off the proposed rear entrance down to the rear garden area.

### **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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- 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 EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

## 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 relating to 24 Claremont Grove**

140693/LP/2024 -Recv: 15.08.2024 - Application Refused - 11.10.2024 24 Claremont Grove, Manchester, M20 2GL, Creation of new external access into garden together with the installation of a external door

066750/FH/SOUTH2/02 - Recv: 03.12.2002 - Application Approved - 08.01.2003 24, Claremont Grove,, Didsbury, formation of lightwells to front, side and rear with associated erection of balustrading

### Residential amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the Installation of external door in existing window opening and new external stairs to garden area. The site sits within a triangular plot located west on Claremont Grove with gardens to the front and rear.

To the rear features a brick bay at ground and basement level with a sunken terrace area which encases the bay at basement level. The applicant proposes to change the ground floor window

within the brick bay to a door including installing external stairs which would lead down into the rear garden. These would be positioned over the existing sunken terrace.

It is not considered that the introduction of an external staircase in this location would provide any visual harm to the adjacent or surrounding properties including loss of privacy, light or overshadowing.

Overall, the footprint of the proposal is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property. The proposal would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area is retained although over time the houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended. Therefore, the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible

On balance, the proposal is considered can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area.

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

#### Siting, scale and massing

In context to the application site, the addition is acceptable and is considered would not cause undue harm to the current levels of amenity being enjoyed by the occupiers of surrounding properties. The proposal would not present an unusual feature in the immediate area and due to the existence of other similar external stairs to the rear of properties, is considered acceptable within the surrounding environmental context and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties.

It is therefore considered that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is 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. In terms of the proposed materials, it is intended to use steel metal staircase with balustrading as specified in the application form. The design of the proposal has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the rear and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure.

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 Bins

Refuse bins are unaffected by this proposal.

#### Parking

Current car parking arrangements are unaffected by the proposal.

#### Conclusion

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house and the proposal 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**

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. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and therefore determined within a timely manner.

#### **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 12th November 2024 numbered 59\_24M20-EGE-XX-DR-A-2101 Rev P3

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone.

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 policies DM 1, SP 1 and EN 1 of the Core Strategy and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone.

### **Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified**

Flat 2, 17 Hesketh Avenue, Manchester, M20 2QN  
17 Hesketh Avenue, Manchester, M20 2QN  
Flat 3, 17 Hesketh Avenue, Manchester, M20 2QN  
Flat 1, 17 Hesketh Avenue, Manchester, M20 2QN  
22 Claremont Grove, Manchester, M20 2GL  
26 Claremont Grove, Manchester, M20 2GL  
15 Hesketh Avenue, Manchester, M20 2QN

### **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