
MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	141381/FH/2024
Date registered valid:	25 October 2024
Proposal:	Erection of single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation
Address:	68 Selstead Road, Manchester, M22 1TR
Ward(s):	Woodhouse Park Ward
Applicant:	Mrs Wilding
Agent (if any):	Mr Ian Grainger Blu Room Architecture
Case officer:	Tracie Simpson Tel: 0161 234 4537 Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	**18th December2024**



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: 31 October 2024 Expired: 21 November 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 relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Woodhouse Park ward area of Manchester. A detached garage is located on the side in line with the host dwelling. The property sits on a plot of triangular land with gardens to the front, access along the side and hardstanding to the rear. Boundary treatment comprises decorative railings to the front, hedging along the shared boundaries and timber fencing to the rear




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

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in character

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation



Ground Floor Plan



Rear Elevation



Side Elevation



Front Elevation

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. There have been no comments received in respect of this application.

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o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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.
o 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 EN 19 - Waste Management
o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

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. 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. 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

No previous planning history relating to this property.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.

The proposed extension would be sited at the side of the property, in line with the principal elevation measuring a width of 4.0m extending the length of the property. A window would be positioned on the front elevation with double doors along the side elevation; no windows are along

the rear elevation. The total height would measure 3.8m approximately and would have a mono pitch sloping roof.

It is not anticipated that the introduction of a single storey extension in this location would provide any undue harm on the occupiers of the surrounding properties especially as the precedent of a structure to the side is already established within this area of the site.

The extension complies with DC1 of the UDP and is considered that given the orientation of the property together with the fact that the proposal is single storey, there would be no overshadowing or loss of light as a result of the proposal

Although the extension would be barely visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene, the character of the area has been retained, the appearance is considered to be acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

In this instance the proposal is considered acceptable and therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 and DC1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house, is not excessively large or bulky and are therefore considered to accord with the principles set out in saved UDP policies DC1 (in particular policy DC1.5).and accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The proposal is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials as specified in the application form. It is believed that the proposed works would not detract from the character and appearance of the property and the design of the works would complement host dwelling.

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.

Waste management

The storage of bins is not affected by this proposal as adequate space to the side for the movement of bins for collection is retained. Therefore, the bins would accord with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Current parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal complies with the above policies; it received no objections, and the City Council recognises the importance of adapting homes to suit changing household needs, therefore development may commence in accordance with the following conditions.

For the above reasons, the proposal is unlikely to have any detrimental impact and therefore accords with saved UDP policy DC1 and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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

Positive and proactive working - 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

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 25th October 2024 numbered 03 Proposed Floor Plans

Received on 18th December 2024 numbered 04 Proposed Elevations

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.

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 policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Crown Clinic Limited, Ground Floor, Global House, 16 Bailey Lane, Manchester, M90 4AB
Global House, 16 Bailey Lane, Manchester, M90 4AB
66 Selstead Road, Manchester, M22 1TR

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA