

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 140915/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 17 October 2024

Proposal: Erection of two storey side, single storey side and rear, and first floor front extensions together with the installation of rear dormer

Address: 32 Highclere Road, Manchester, M8 4FG

Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Mrs San Rais

Agent (if any): Mr Subhan Saleem

Case officer: Ellie Knowles
Tel: 0161 219 6633
Email: ellie.knowles@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 12 December 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 15 November 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 18 October 2024 Expired: 8 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

32 Highclere Road is a two-storey semi-detached brick-built property in Crumpsall ward. The application property is situated on a triangular corner plot, with a single driveway and modest grassed amenity spaces to the front, side and rear. Boundary treatment around the site comprises low brick walling and hedging behind along the highway boundary and a combination of retaining walling, a detached outbuilding, timber and concrete fence panels around the rear garden.

The application property affords a double bay window to the principal elevation and was originally designed with a stepped arrangement, featuring a recessed front/side element, which is a characterful feature of the area. It is noted that this original recess has been infilled at either ground floor or both floor levels on a number of properties in the locality.

The original property has been previously extended through loft conversion with rooflights, single storey front and side extensions, in addition to a detached outbuilding constructed within the rear garden (not shown on plans and current use unknown).



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising semi-detached brick-built dwellings of a similar character and form. Facing the junction of Highclere Road and Boardman Road are 4 semi-detached pairs arranged in a uniform design and layout, including the application property. There are however examples of historic extensions in the streetscene, notably the front infill extensions and single storey side/rear extensions.

Description of development

The applicant seeks permission for a two-storey side, single storey side and rear, and first floor front extensions together with the installation of rear dormer. The proposed extensions would be constructed with brickwork and rooftiles to match the existing dwelling.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local responses

None

Consultee responses

None

Relevant Planning History

At the application site –

094468/FH/2010/N1 – Erection of part single, part two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension. Approved 25.03.2011. *Not implemented.*

092927/FH/2010/N1 – Erection of part single, part two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension. Withdrawn 07.06.2010.

History of negotiations

No negotiations were entered into with the agent, given that the proposal was considered unacceptable in principle, even in the event of significant revisions. The applicant was given the opportunity to withdraw the scheme or proceed with the recommended determination, the applicant chose to proceed with the determination option.

Local Planning Policies

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

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012-2027) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11 July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan. Parts of the policies have been superseded by the Places for Everyone Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant **Places for Everyone** policies for this application are as follows:

JP-S1 – Sustainable Development

The relevant **Core Strategy** policies for this application are as follows:

DM 1 – Development Management

SP 1 – Spatial Principles (partially superseded by PfE)

EN 1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas

EN 19 – Waste

The relevant saved **UDP** policies for this application are:

DC1– Residential Extensions

The relevant supplementary planning guidance documents for this application are:

- The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF (December 2024) sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt. Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors. The Local Planning Authority consider the following sections relevant to this proposal.

- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Issues

Principle of development:

The principle of extending one's home is generally acceptable in circumstances where there is no overriding unduly harmful impact upon either the character of the property, or upon the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

In this instance however, the principle of the proposal is considered unacceptable by virtue of the proposed scale, design and overbearing massing impact, subservience not having been sufficiently demonstrated, overdevelopment of the application site, coupled with the potential for loss of outlook, overdominance concerns and adverse impact to privacy upon the occupants of the neighbouring property no.30 Highclere Road.

It is therefore believed that there are factors of sufficient weight that would warrant the refusal of this application.

Impact on visual and residential amenity:

Having assessed the proposal, and on balance, the proposal is deemed to conflict with saved policy DC1 of the UDP, and policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy as well as the general guidance set out in chapter 12 of the NPPF.

As previously stated, the application site comprises a corner plot facing the highway junction, it is therefore sited at a splayed angle from the adjacent semi-detached pair nos. 28-30 Highclere Road due directly west. In light of the pre-existing housing layout arrangement of these houses, the existing separation distance from no.30 Highclere Road is approximately 7.5 metres (between the outermost rear corner of the application property and nearest side elevation of no.30 with windows), and therefore the proposed two storey side extension with rear dormer and unobstructed fenestration at ground, first and second floor levels, projecting a further 4m westwards in close proximity to the common boundary, would create a resultant separation distance of approx. 4.8m (as shown on plan ref sheet 8) with windows directly facing the eastern side elevation of this neighbouring property. Which resultant spatial relationship is considered to unduly impact on the privacy of these neighbouring occupiers and effect the existing outlook afforded from windows within the side elevation of no.30, which is contrary to saved UDP policy DC1.2 b) and policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Given the orientation of the application property due east of no.30 Highclere Road and 4.8m distance retained between nearest elevations, concern is raised with regards to the resultant overbearing massing impact of the proposal along the shared boundary with this neighbouring property and potential for due overshadowing during most morning hours, if the proposed extension were to be allowed, which is contrary to saved UDP policy DC1.2 b) and policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

It is considered that the submitted plan does not sufficiently demonstrate subservient extensions to the host dwelling. The proposed rear dormer would span the full width of the extended dwelling and dominate the entire rear roof plane, with minimal distance retained to the edges. This is further exacerbated by the design of the proposed two storey side extension roof ridge, which would appear as one seamless dwellinghouse, thereby creating a built form that would be excessively large in relation to the character of the semi-detached pair (no.25 Boardman Road) immediate area. The proposed cumulative impact of the extensions on this property, to the front, side and rear, are considered to significantly subsume the original dwelling and create over dominant additions in relation to the host property, which is considered to introduce a visually intrusive and alien feature within the immediate street scene.

Moreover, given the significant scale of extensions proposed and absence of the existing rear outbuilding shown on plan, the proposal is considered to constitute as overdevelopment of the application site, which would create a 5-bedroom property with limited amenity space for current and future occupiers.

As such, the proposal is considered contrary to saved UDP policy DC1.1 d), DC1.2 a); policy DM1, SP1, and EN1 of the Core Strategy; and the guidance set out in the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document.

In addition, the existing external access would be lost to accommodate the proposed side extension element built up to the highway boundary to the site frontage. Therefore, refuse management of wheeled bins would need to be accommodated within the front garden. However, this arrangement has not been sufficiently demonstrated on plan, and therefore, it is considered that the proposed development does not respond positively policies DM1 and EN19 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

Notwithstanding the amenity concerns raised above, the proposed ground floor rearward projection at approximately 1665mm is considered compliant with guidance set out in saved UDP policy DC1.3 a) regarding rearward extensions. In addition, the proposed single storey side extension and first floor front infill extension raise no amenity concerns, given the prevalence of extensions of this nature in the immediate area, alongside the subservient form and designs proposed, therefore these three elements are considered acceptable in isolation.

Impact on Highway Safety:

The proposed development would not interfere with the existing number of parking spaces on site, one off-street space would be retained albeit relocated within the site frontage, as such is considered acceptable in this regard. Notwithstanding this, no new hard landscaping details or amended vehicular access information (if necessary) has been submitted during the course of this application, as such concerns remain on the basis of this outstanding information.

Waste:

The proposed scale and siting of development would remove external access to the side and rear of the application site, as such domestic refuse management arrangement would have to be stored within the front garden. No details of a required bin store have been submitted during the course of this application to comply with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy; notwithstanding these further details could be secured by pre-occupation condition.

Conclusion:

In this instance, it is considered the proposal does not sufficiently accord with the principles of the policy documents outlined above. Although the proposed development would allow the adaptation of the existing house to meet changing residential needs, on balance, it is considered unacceptable by virtue of the proposed scale, design and overbearing massing impact, subservience not having been sufficiently demonstrated, overdevelopment of the application site, coupled with the potential for loss of outlook, overdominance concerns and adverse impact to privacy upon the occupants of the neighbouring property no.30 Highclere Road, it is therefore considered that the proposed development does not respond positively to The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) chapter 12; policies DM1, SP1, EN1, EN19 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and chapter 2 of the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007). The proposal, therefore, cannot be supported by the Local Planning Authority.

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application, but these concerns cannot be overcome by the submission of a revised proposal. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and therefore refused in a timely manner.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. The proposed development, considered cumulatively, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area. In particular, the scale, design, massing and siting of proposed extensions would subsume the original dwelling and appear as over dominant additions in relation to the host property, which would further be considered overdevelopment of the application site. As such, the proposal would create a visually intrusive feature in the street scene and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the adjoining property 25 Boardman Road and would in consequence be out of character with the area generally. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to The National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024) chapter 12; policy DM1, SP1 and EN1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and chapter 2 of the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007).
2. The proposal by reason of the resultant overall mass and cumulative impact of built form in close proximity to the common shared boundary with no.30 Highclere Road, in the form of the proposed two storey side extension with large dormer window, designed with fenestration at all floor levels to the rear elevation, projecting 4000mm to the side (westwards), would unduly impact the outlook, create an overbearing impact and result in direct privacy loss for those occupiers and future occupiers of no. 30 Highclere Road, which is contrary to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) for Residential Extensions and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

30 Highclere Road, Manchester, M8 4FG
25 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
31 Highclere Road, Manchester, M8 4WH
23 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT

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) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA