

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 140698/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 5 August 2024

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

Address: 12 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU

Ward(s): Gorton & Abbey Hey Ward

Applicant: Mr. M. Abdullah Bajwa

Agent (if any): Mr. Niamat Ali, NA Design

Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 16 October 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 5 September 2024

Standard consultations:

Printed: 2 September 2024

Expired: 23 September 2024

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 30 September 2024

Expired: 10 October 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 12 Hinstock Crescent within the north Manchester ward of Gorton & Abbey Hey. The application site relates to an end terraced dwellinghouse within a short row of four houses which are slightly elevated and sited along the head of a turning circle within a short cul-de-sac of houses of similar type. The property is a two storey, brick dwellinghouse painted in a red colouration with a hipped roof. The property is characterised by front bay windows and a front porch with gable roof element (recently constructed). At the time of the site visit, works had been implemented in the form of a part single, part two storey side and rear extension. However, the applicant was informed to cease works by colleagues in Planning Enforcement by the time the site visit for this application was undertaken. Amenity space for the property consists of an off street driveway, open with the neighbouring land no.14 Hinstock Crescent. Amenity space surrounding the property consists of area to the side and rear of the property, which at the time of the site visit had been cleared, except for a blue outbuilding sited within the northern corner of the site.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in context. Properties to the rear include those properties along Chapman Street. Hinstock Crescent consists of other householder extensions in the form of no.14 Hinstock Crescent (planning ref: 138630/FH/2023) and no.13 Hinstock Crescent (see planning ref: 134392/FH/2022).

Description of development

The application has been submitted given the building works constructed on site has discrepancies from the previously approved and implemented scheme of 139832/FH/2024. The discrepancies have taken the form of:

- Windows in the front elevation of the side extension on plan did not match the situation on site.
- Removal of two windows in the rear elevation of the proposal and changes to door arrangement.
- Changes to the angle of the splay of the proposed two storey side extension.
- Measurements on site of the extension did not match the measurements shown on plan.

As such, the current application seeks consent for the erection of part single part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

The part single storey side extension, at the largest point, would have approximate dimensions of Height: 3.6 x Length: 6.1 x Width: 3.9 metres. The part two storey side extension would have approximate dimensions of Height: 6.9 x Length: 4.6 x Width: 3.9 metres.

The proposed side extension would wrap into the proposed rear extension. The part single storey rear extension, at the largest point, would have approximate dimensions of Height: 4 x Length: 4 x Width: 9.6 metres. The part two storey rear extension would be sited away from the boundary with the adjoining neighbour by 3 metres and have approximate dimensions of Height: 6.9 x Length: 3.2 x Width: 6.8 metres.

The proposal would create additional residential accommodation for the family, including two sensory rooms for disabled needs.

The proposal would involve the insertion of two windows within the front elevation, three windows within the side elevation, a set of sliding doors and a further door and one window within the rear elevation and a roof light within the part single storey rear extension.

For completeness, the agent has listed the materials for the proposal. These include:

- Front: red smooth bricks
- Side and rear: common bricks weathered
- Windows: grey uPVC double glazed
- Kitchen door: grey uPVC double glazed
- Patio door: grey aluminum double glazed
- Fascia/ soffit: grey PVC
- Gutters/ down pipe: grey PVC
- Roof tiles: Sandtoft clay new Cassius tile Antique slate.

Negotiations during the course of the Application

Discussions took place between the agent and the LPA to ensure the plans reflected (scale and any fenestration discrepancies) the situation on site.

The agent amended the site plan for the purpose of clarity.

The agent confirmed the materials to be used in the proposal for the avoidance of doubt.

The description of development was also amended to more accurately reflect the development proposed. This was agreed in writing by the agent.

Planning History

CDN/24/0558-Discharge of Condition 4 (Gas Membrane) and 5 (Contaminated Land) attached to planning permission 139832/FH/2024.

Approved 13.08.2024

139832/FH/2024-Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Approved 13.06.2024

137980/FH/2023-Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Approved 30.10.2023

136894/FH/2023-Erection of part single, part two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Refused 11.07.2023

135656/FH/2022-Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Refused 24.02.2023

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and three responses were received (one from the initial consultation and two from the re-notification).

The following concerns were raised during the initial consultation:

- Concern the plans do not reflect the building works on site, and concerns conditions placed on previous approvals have not been implemented correctly.

- Ongoing situation with applicant site and building work given rise to mental and physical health struggles to neighbours.

- Loss of privacy from the proposed side extension causing overlooking to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposal. This is exaggerated by the proposed front elevation and placement of windows which do not match the plans. The 45 degree rule is not being adhered to.

- Loss of light to the detriment of the neighbouring property due to mass and increase roof height of the proposal- this would lead to loss of light to the neighbour's windows and onto the neighbour's land.

- The materials used for the partly constructed extension does not match the existing property and is so in breach of planning consent.

- Concern that the property as a result of the proposal could be used as an HMO, or other uses beyond a family dwellinghouse.

- Concern the height of the roof does not match the plans.

- Issues with civil matters including disputed land. A neighbour seeks assurance that the proposal will not be built on the neighbour's land.

- A neighbour requested the application be dealt with by the Planning and Highways committee.

- Several photos were supplied for consideration.

During the re-notification period the same concerns were expressed. A neighbour requested measurements be shown on the plans to understand distances of the extension to the shared boundary.

Another neighbour commented during the re-notification period raising concerns the building work has created an eyesore. Concerns were raised the building work has adversely impacted local wildlife. Concern construction works have not been built to a professional standard. Concern was raised in regard to lack of privacy from the scheme.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health were consulted and requested the following be attached to any approval granted:

CLAND* (Watching brief condition)

In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas are encountered on the site at any time before the development is occupied during the watching brief, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until a report detailing what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Remediation Strategy), is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed Remediation Strategy and validated. If no contamination is found, then a post-completion report shall be submitted to evidence this prior to occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to policy EN18 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Issues

POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

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 and beautiful 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).

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow

gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

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.

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 CABI 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 part single part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation. The revised scheme is considered to overcome the issues raised during the course of the application. 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. 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

No.14 Hinstock Crescent is the non-adjointing neighbour to the applicant site. This neighbour would be primarily impacted by the proposed side extension. It is noted that this application relates to differences with the placement of windows within the extension and differences to the splay of the side extension due to the boundary constraints, than the previously approved scheme of 139832/FH/2024. It is also noted the neighbour has a similar two storey side extension.

At ground floor level the extension would be sited approximately 0.8 metres from the shared boundary and at first floor level, the extension has a 1.5 metre set back. Given the neighbour's side extension would be sited close to the proposal, the extension is not considered to create an overbearing feature to the enjoyment of the neighbour's front amenity space. Due to the existing orientation of the properties in the streetscene, any loss of light to the neighbour is not considered significant and the set back at 1.5 metres at first floor level helps to retain a sense of openness at the site.

Two windows would be inserted in the front elevation of the side extension and it is noted that the ground floor and first floor window would not have vertical alignment. This is informed by the built form and constraints of the splay at the site. Whilst uncommon, it is not considered to cause such visual harm to warrant a refusal on the scheme. A condition would be attached to any approval granted restricting the further insertion of windows and doors beyond those approved within this consent.

Concern was raised during the course of the application that the windows would give rise to overlooking to no.14 Hinstock Crescent. Given the ground floor window would look out onto the applicant's drive, the increased height fence and the side window of the neighbour's front porch which does not relate to a habitable room, any overlooking implications are not considered to be severe. In regard to potential overlooking from the proposed first floor window, supporting photos were supplied from the neighbour showing how direct overlooking into the two properties would be possible. However given the oblique angle of the two windows, overlooking would not be easily possible which is mitigated by the 1.5 metre set back at first floor level.

Three windows would be inserted in the side elevation of the proposal. One of the ground floor windows would be a wet room and to protect the privacy of the applicant would be conditioned to be obscure glazed. The other ground floor window would relate to the kitchen. Given this is at ground floor level and given there would be an 8 metre gap from the window to the closest point of the shared boundary with no.14 Hinstock Crescent, no overlooking implications for the neighbouring or applicant property would occur, especially given the high boundary fence separating the two properties. A window would be inserted in the side elevation of the proposal relating to a master bedroom. Although the window would be at first floor level, given the 8 metre gap to the boundary again any implications would not be severe.

Given the remaining amenity space of the applicant site to the shared boundary with no.14, the proposal is not considered to create an overbearing feature. Whilst supporting photos provided from the agent show the built form can be seen from the neighbour's garden, it is considered adequate distance away to not cause an overbearing impact or give rise to loss of light implications.

The adjoining neighbour no.10 Hinstock Crescent would feel 4 metres of built form against the boundary at ground floor level and 3.2 metres at first floor level, but this would be set away from the boundary by approximately 3 metres. At ground floor level, the neighbour benefits from an approximate 3.5 metre conservatory and as such, this neighbour would only experience a 0.5 metre projection of built form at ground floor. Given the existing circumstances, this is not

considered so severe to give rise to significant overbearing implications. At first floor level, the projection would reduce to 3.2 metres and be set in 3 metres from the boundary. Given the set in, the proposal is not considered to create a tunnelling impact to the neighbour's first floor rear windows, nor create an overbearing feature. The neighbour sits due south of the applicant site and so any impacts in terms of loss of light/ overshadowing are not considered to be severe.

At ground floor level the proposal would be sited 3 metres from the rear boundary of the site and at first floor level 4.2 metres from the rear boundary of the site. The rear of the applicant site looks onto properties on Chapman Street. Two doors would be inserted at ground floor level facing the rear boundary line. However, given the boundary treatment separating the rear of the site to properties along Chapman Street, it would not give rise to any adverse privacy implications. 1 no. window would be inserted in the rear elevation facing properties on Chapman Street. However, as this window would be conditioned as being obscure glazed, no adverse privacy implications would occur for neighbours to the rear. It is acknowledged that a limited gap would remain from the proposal to the rear building line of the applicant site. However, the set back at first floor level ensures the proposal does not create an overbearing feature for the properties to the rear. Additional amenity space would still be retained to the side of the proposed extension.

During the course of the application, concern was raised from a neighbour that the property could be later used as an HMO or sub-divided. To ensure the property remains a family C3(a) dwellinghouse, a condition to such effect would be attached to any approval granted.

The application under consideration has been submitted with a view to meeting the needs of a disabled occupier. Saved UDP policy advises that the Council will consider on their merits exemptions to policies DC1.1-1.4 in the cases of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

For these reasons set out above, and on balance, and subject to planning conditions, it is considered that the proposal could be accommodated in this location on the basis that there are no undue overbearing adverse impacts from massing, nor would the proposal result in undue overlooking or loss of privacy, or unduly impact on the character and appearance of the Hinstock Crescent street scene. Moreover, it is considered that the proposed development responds positively to saved policy DC1 and policies SP1 and DM1, in that it would improve the living environment for the resident and thereby their well-being and continued occupation of the house, subject to conditions. It is however recommended that additional conditions are attached in the interest of privacy.

Design and Appearance

Part single, part two storey side extension:

Policy DC1.4 of the UDP considers the relationship of new two storey side extensions to ensure a sense of subserviency at the site. At the closest point, the side extension would be sited 0.8 metres from the shared boundary with no.14 Hinstock Crescent. As such, at first floor the side extension is set back by 1.5 metres. If the extension were to be sited against the boundary a 2 metre set back at first floor level would be considered subservient to policy DC1.4 of the UDP. As such, given the set away from the boundary and the set back at first floor level, the extension is considered pursuant to Policy DC1.4 of the UDP. Further the roof of the extension would be lowered than that of the applicant site to ensure the proposal would create a subservient feature. A hipped roof would be introduced which would match the existing roof form of the host property, to ensure a sympathetic addition. It is noted that due to the location of the property sitting at the head of the cul-de-sac and the irregular shape of the boundary, no terracing implication would occur.

Part single, part two storey rear extension:

The projection of the rear extension at ground floor level would be 4 metres and at first floor this is reduced to 3.2 metres. It is noted that at ground floor level the extension would exceed the maximum rearward projection within Policy DC1.3 of the UDP. However, given any harm to the adjoining neighbour would be minimised by the neighbour's existing conservatory, and given the external amenity space to be retained for the family's use to the side of the property, it is considered the 4 metre projection can be accommodated without creating an overly large or bulky structure. At first floor level, the extension has been designed in a way to reduce the harm to the adjoining property by pulling the built form significantly off the boundary, have a reduced projection and have a hipped roof formation to lessen the bulk of the extension. Given this and given the projection of the first floor element is pursuant to Policy DC1.3 of the UDP, the first floor rear element is considered to create a sympathetic addition to the property with the reduced projection.

Materials:

During the course of the application, materials to be used in the proposal were listed as:

- Front: red smooth bricks
- Side and rear: common bricks weathered
- Windows: grey uPVC double glazed
- Kitchen door: grey uPVC double glazed
- Patio door: grey aluminum double glazed
- Fascia/ soffit: grey PVC
- Gutters/ down pipe: grey PVC
- Roof tiles: Sandtoft clay new Cassius tile Antique slate.

Neighbour objections raised concerns to the proposed materials being out of character with the materials used for the existing house. It is noted the applicant site is brick constructed with a red colour paint applied on top of the existing walls. As such, it is difficult to match the colouration of the host property with bricks. In this instance, the materials erected on site and listed above are considered acceptable. It is noted other extensions on the street have variances in terms of materials. Given the painting of the extension to the same colour is not considered to create a high quality design, the bricks chosen in this instance can be considered acceptable. A materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

Via email on 16 October 2024, the agent confirmed the existing fenestration is to be replaced with a grey colouration. As such, the proposed colouration of grey fenestration is considered acceptable.

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.

Neighbour Objections

Neighbour objections raise concerns that the building works on site do not reflect previous consents. The purpose for the current application is to seek to ensure building works match the plans approved. The agent has confirmed the measurements on the plan accurately reflect the situation on site. The revised plans submitted as part of this application ensure any discrepancies from the building works are rectified and regularised.

In terms of planning comments raised by the neighbour objections, these have been duly considered in the issues section above. Comments relating to civil matters, trespassing, shared

ownership matters, boundary disputes, party wall issues and issues regulated by building control legislation would fall outside of planning legislation and therefore cannot be considered as part of this planning application.

Environmental Considerations

Environmental Health were consulted and requested a CLAND (Watching brief condition) be attached to any approval granted. Although the watching brief condition was approved through condition 5 (Contaminated Land)- CDN/24/0558, the watching brief is in place up until the date of occupation. As such, the condition would be placed on any approval granted.

Car Parking

No changes to car park arrangements would occur as a result of the proposal. This is considered acceptable.

Bin Storage

A 0.8 metre gap would be retained between the side extension and the shared boundary with no.14 Hinstock Crescent. This is considered sufficient room for the bins to be stored within the side private amenity space and brought forwards to the street on the day of collection. This is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed development does not create any significant impact in terms of visual or residential amenity, with the appropriate use of conditions attached to any approval granted. The design and appearance of the extension is considered acceptable and the revised scheme presented ensures the plans accurately reflect the works on site and shall be adhered to with the further construction of the extension. As such, the proposal is considered pursuant to The National Planning Policy Framework (2023); policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and provisions within Places for Everyone.

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

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 plan has been received which is considered to overcome 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:

-Application Form, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 5 August 2024.

-Drawing- Proposed- Elevation, numbered NA-P03, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 September 2024.

-Drawing- Proposed- Floor Plan, numbered NA-P02, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 26 September 2024.

-Correspondence- Agent confirming Changes to Existing Fenestration, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 16 October 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) Before first occupation, the ground floor wet room window and first floor en-suite window as shown on the approved 'Drawing- Proposed- Elevation, numbered NA-P03', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 September 2024, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

The windows shall be top opening only and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) The materials to be used throughout the proposal hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details as set out in the 'Drawing- Proposed- Floor Plan, numbered NA-P02' and 'Correspondence- Agent confirming Changes to Existing Fenestration', 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.

6) In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas are encountered on the site at any time before the development is occupied during the watching brief, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until a report detailing what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Remediation Strategy), is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed Remediation Strategy and validated. If no contamination is found, then a post-completion report shall be submitted to evidence this prior to occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to policy EN18 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

7) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no part of the development shall be used for any purpose other than the purpose(s) of Class C3(a) of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason - In the exceptional circumstances of a proliferation of HMO's restricting housing choice and adversely affecting sustainability and in the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard

the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to policy 7.4 of the Guide to Development in Manchester: Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health

9 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
97 Chapman Street, Manchester, M18 8UA
95 Chapman Street, Manchester, M18 8UA
14 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
13 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
10 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
8 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
16 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
15 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
7 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
6 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
5 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
11 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA