

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 141321/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 21 October 2024

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two-storey side extensions, single-storey rear extension and rear dormer to form additional living accommodation

Address: 7 Freshpool Way, Manchester, M22 4UB

Ward(s): Sharston Ward

Applicant: Mr Deaa Rajeh

Agent (if any): Dr Taki Sonbli

Case officer: Robert Tyrer
Tel: 0161 234 4068
Email: robert.tyrer@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 13 December 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 11 December 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 1 November 2024 Expired: 22 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

Application site relates to a modern two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse with gardens to the front and rear and a driveway to the side.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is residential in nature comprising of a mixture of different residential properties that are modern in appearance.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission to erect a part single, part two-storey side extensions, single-storey rear extension and rear dormer to form additional living accommodation

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity – Notification letters were sent to nearby residential properties (see appendix 1 for the list of properties).

Local residents/public opinion -

Issues

Planning History

Application Reference: 131209/FH/2021

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two-storey side extensions and single-storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Decision: Approved 07.10.2021

Local Policy

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development 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 Core Strategy policies for this application are as follows:

Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

DM1 – Development Management 1

The relevant UDP policies for this application are:

DC 1.1 – 1.6 – Residential Extensions

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039

On the 21st March 2024, nine of the ten Greater Manchester Councils voted to adopt the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan – 2022 to 2039 (PfEJDP); Manchester City Council is one of the Council's that has voted to adopt the plan. The PfEJDP has superseded parts of some of the policies contained within the Council's Core Strategy.

The relevant PfEJDP policy is as follows:

Policy JP-Strat1: Core Growth Area

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - The NPPF 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.

Principle – The principle of a part single, part two-storey side extensions and single-storey rear extension has already been established by planning permission 131209/FH/2021 which has partially been implemented at the time the applicant submitted the current application.

This application will focus on the differences between the previous application and the current notably the addition of rear dormer and changes to the side extension roof.

As with the previous applications matters that will require consideration, in order to assess the acceptability of the proposal are siting, scale and massing, design and appearance.

Further consideration will be given as to whether the proposal has any impact on surrounding residential amenity in particular the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Siting, Scale and Massing –



Image 1 Comparison between the approved drawings (top) and the proposed (below).

The changes to the roof of the side extension are relatively minor, although it has resulted in a higher eaves height than that of the original dwellinghouse, whilst this is an unfortunate consequence of the changes, the designs of the housing within the street could not be described as consistent in height or appearance. There are numerous examples where there is a marked change in height and/or design of nearby properties, therefore such a raise of eaves will be less noticeable in the streetscene.

The dormer is situated at the rear of the property, lower than the original roof height and is set back by at least 20 centimetres from the eaves this is a common location for dormers and the siting and size of the dormer is one that would normally be permitted under general permitted development. Therefore, in terms siting, scale and massing of the dormer it is considered to be acceptable.

The materials for the dormers will match that with the colour of the roof tile and the visual impact similar to the original roof in this regard.

Overall, it is considered that the extension and dormer have been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwellinghouse, is not excessively large or bulky and are therefore considered to accord with the principles set out in saved UDP policies DC1 and accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity – Overlooking in terms of either actual or the perception of and its impact on residential amenity is considered to be a material planning consideration, both policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP required consideration be given to privacy, although there are no set privacy distances.

The representations were received objecting to the proposal stating concerns regarding privacy and overlooking from the development, however views from a dormer window are generally no different to that of a first-floor window which also provides some views over rear gardens.

The proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenity of current and future occupiers of the application property nor neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Car Parking and Refuse Storage – The driveway can still accommodate at least one vehicle and bins are shown to be stored within a bin store at the front of the property.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with DM1 and saved policy DC1 in respect of car parking and adequate refuse storage.

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:

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively and positively to issue the decision without delay. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the NPPF.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Drawing Titled "Existing and Proposed elevations" and "Existing and Proposed black plans/side elevation"

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.

2) The external materials of each elevation of the extension and the rear dormer, shall match the appearance of those used in the construction of the original dwellinghouse.

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 and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

11 Freshpool Way, Manchester, M22 4UB
9 Freshpool Way, Manchester, M22 4UB
18 Northumberland Way, Manchester, M22 4UG
20 Northumberland Way, Manchester, M22 4UG
6 Freshpool Way, Manchester, M22 4UB
5 Freshpool Way, Manchester, M22 4UB

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