

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 140623/FO/2024

Date registered valid: 1 August 2024

Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extensions and rear roof dormers following hip to gable conversions to both properties.

Address: 5 & 7 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT

Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Mr Wakas Hussain

Agent (if any): Mr Subhan Saleem Saleem Architects

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 26 September 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

Date of site visit: 28 August 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 6 August 2024 Expired: 28 August 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 5 & 7 Boardman Road within the north Manchester ward of Crumpsall. The application site relates to a pair of two storey semi-detached properties, built in a red brick construction with white render elements to the front elevation and a hipped roof. The properties both benefit from front porches and single storey rear outriggers. During the site visit, It appeared as though the site was being used by the same family/ extended family as the rear amenity space was communal with no boundary treatment separating the rear amenity spaces of the two respective properties. However, the properties still operated as two separate family houses (no internal connection between the two properties). The amenity space surrounding the applicant site is paved with off street parking provision and a grassed area to the rear of the property. Similar outbuildings were sited within the rear amenity space.

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in nature, with a range of property types and roof formations.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of single storey side and rear extensions and rear roof dormers following hip to gable conversions to both properties.

The two storey side extensions would be of different measurements depending on the constraints of the respective boundary treatments. For no.5 Boardman Road, the side extension would sit flush with the primary elevation of the host property and extend up to the shared boundary with no.3 Boardman Road. No.7's side extension would be set back from the primary elevation by 2.4 metres and at the closest point be set 0.8 metres from the shared boundary.

The rear extensions at both the properties would be of the same dimensions- at the point closest to the respective shared boundaries wrapping into the proposed side extensions the extensions would have a projection of approx. 2.5 metres. The projection of the rear extensions would increase to an approx. 4.5 metre projection at the point closest to the shared boundary.

Rear roof dormers would be sited within the resulting roof space following the hip to gable conversion of the existing properties. This would involve the insertion of two rooflights within the primary elevation of the properties. Two dormers would be inserted in the roof form of the properties and would each have approximate dimensions of Height: 1.8 x Length: 6.5 x Width: 4.4 metres.

The proposal would involve the insertion of two windows within the front elevation, 7 windows and three doors within the rear elevation and one door within the side elevation.

Due to the proposal, some windows within the side elevations of the applicant site would be re-positioned. They are identified on the plan as being obtained through the route of Permitted Development and so not assessed within this application.

Materials to be used throughout the proposal would include:

- brickwork to match existing,
- roof tiles to match existing,
- PVC windows to match existing,
- roof light,
- glazed French door
- flat roof cold deck system.

Negotiations during the Course of the Application

The initial plans submitted for assessment were not considered acceptable to the LPA. A revised scheme was subsequently provided which was considered to overcome issues raised. The original scheme gave rise to the following concerns:

- Rear extension- the rear extension with gable roof element in cumulation with the number of extensions at the site results in an overly large proposal, contrary to Policy DC1.2 of the UDP.
- The insertion of one continuous rear roof dormer creates an overly large and bulky structure, contrary to Policy DC1.2 of the UDP.
- The increase in roof height as a result of the proposal is unacceptable. This is not a feature of the surrounding streetscene and would largely exaggerate the proportions of the property. As such, this element would create an overly large and bulky structure, contrary to Policy DC1.2 of the UDP.

Further information was supplied in relation to materials to be used.

Clarification was sought to the outbuildings evident on site.

A missing first floor plan was provided for clarity.

The description of development was amended accordingly to reflect the revised scheme.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and no responses were received.

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).

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 single storey side and rear extensions and rear roof dormers following hip to gable conversions to both properties. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and extend homes, rather than move, to meet the changing residential needs of families. The revised scheme presented is considered to overcome the issues initially raised to the agent. Both properties have applied for the application together to reduce the amenity impact to one another and the two properties appear to be used in connection with one another. 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 as family dwellinghouses it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

Potential impact to no.3 Boardman Road:

No.3 Boardman Road would be impacted by the proposal at both ground floor and proposed 2nd floor level. The side extension would extend the length of the shared boundary and extend beyond the existing rear building line of the applicant site by 2.5 metres. At the time of the site visit, there was no boundary treatment separating the two properties. The neighbour benefits from a side extension however it does not extend the length of the neighbour's property. A door and window would look onto the side extension and may be impacted by loss of light. However, given the proposal is single storey, any adverse loss of light implications are not considered to be so severe. Further, the proposal would increase the sense of privacy for both the properties and no neighbour objections have been received during the course of the application. No windows would be inserted facing the direction of no.3 Boardman Road. A condition would be placed on any approval granted restricting the further insertion of windows and doors beyond those approved by this consent.

The rear extension with a central element with an increased projection is considered to be designed in such a way to reduce the impact to the neighbour and the increase in projection is not considered to give rise to any adverse amenity implications.

This neighbour would also be impacted by the hip to gable conversion and insertion of rear roof dormer. The hip to gable roof conversion would result in additional built form closer to the neighbouring property, than is currently the case. However, given the built form would be at roof level and a gap would remain between the proposal and the neighbour's side elevation, and given the existing relationship between the two neighbours, it is not considered to cause an overbearing impact nor give rise to significant loss of light implications.

Given the dormer would face the direction of the applicant's rear amenity space, any overlooking opportunities from the proposed clear window within the dormer are not considered to have an overly different view than that achieved by the existing first floor rear windows within the existing property. To protect the privacy of the applicant, a condition would be placed on any approval granted for the bath window within the rear roof dormer to be obscure glazed.

Potential impact to no.9 Boardman Road:

No.9 Boardman Road would be impacted by the proposal at both ground floor and proposed 2nd floor level. No.7's side extension would be set back from the primary elevation by 2.4 metres

and at the closest point be set 0.8 metres from the shared boundary. As such, the side extension would not cause an overbearing feature for the neighbour given it would be single storey and given the neighbour's existing two storey rear extension. No adverse privacy implications nor loss of light implications would occur for the neighbour.

A similar impact from the hip to gable roof conversion and roof dormer would be experienced to no.9 as is the case for no.3. Similarly, to protect the privacy of the applicant, a condition would be placed on any approval granted for the bath window to be obscure glazed.

Potential impact to streetscene:

A wet room is proposed within the side extension to no.7 Boardman Road. To protect the privacy of the applicant, a condition would be placed on any approval granted for the bath window to be obscure glazed.

The two side extensions would create a small addition to the front of the properties and are not considered to give rise to an overbearing feature to the detriment of visual amenity.

Although the hip to gable roof conversion would amend the appearance of the property and proportions of the roof, given it would not alter the overall height of the roof, it is not considered to give rise to an overbearing feature.

Potential impact to the other adjoining semi:

The impact of the proposal has been mitigated to the adjoining semi by applying for the works at the same time. If only one of the properties implemented the work causing harm to the neighbouring property, the development would not be considered to be undertaken in accordance with the conditions within the decision notice and as such enforcement action would be taken. This would ensure harm to the adjoining semi would be mitigated.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would have any significant impact upon residential or visual amenity, and the proposal has been re-designed to reduce harm to the surrounding properties. As such, the proposal would be considered pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and JP-S1 of Places for Everyone.

Design and Appearance

Side extensions:

The side extensions would be single storey and would have hipped roofs and would be designed in a way to respect the boundaries with the surrounding properties. As such, this element of the proposal is not considered excessively large or bulky, pursuant with Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Rear extensions:

The two side extensions would wrap into the two rear extensions. Whilst it is acknowledged the central element does not comply with the prescribed maximum projection under policy DC1.3 of the UDP, the element closest to the shared boundaries do comply with the aforementioned policy. As such, given the way the rear extension has been designed with the hipped central element and the largest amount of built form would be sited away from the boundaries to minimise impact, the form is considered acceptable, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Hip to gable conversion and rear roof dormers:

In this instance, the creation of additional roof space and further extensions to the property are not considered to result in overly large or bulky structures and is considered acceptable in scale and massing, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP and Core Strategy policies SP1 and DM1.

The dormers are set above eaves level and set below the ridge height of the host property. As such, the form of the dormers are acceptable. The form of the hip to gable roof conversions are also considered acceptable and examples of hip to gable roof alterations and/ or rear roof dormers are evident within the immediate area. As such, this element of the proposal is considered acceptable in size and form, pursuant to Policy DC1 of the UDP.

Materials to be used have been listed within the report previously and are considered acceptable and would in most instances match the materials used within the existing property. a materials condition to this effect would be attached to any approval granted.

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.

Outbuildings

During the course of the application, the agent was asked to confirm that the outbuildings evident during the site visit were obtained through the route of Permitted Development. The agent confirmed all the outbuildings were achieved through the route of Permitted Development, except for a gazebo like structure to the rear of the site. An informative advising the agent that all the outbuildings must benefit from either permitted development or an application would be attached to the decision notice of any approval granted.

Car Parking

Car parking would not be affected as a result of the proposal.

Bin Storage

Adequate space would be retained to the side and rear of the site for bins to be stored. This is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed development does not create any significant impact in terms of visual or residential amenity. The design and appearance is in keeping with the character of the property and local area and the amended design is considered to overcome issues raised.

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, and a revised scheme considered to overcome concerns has been received and accepted. Appropriate conditions have been attached to the 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:

- Drawing- Existing & Proposed- Roof Plans, numbered Sheet 3, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 19 September 2024.
- Drawing- Site Plan- Existing & Proposed- Site Plans, numbered Sheet 10, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 19 September 2024.
- Drawing- Proposed- Plans and Elevations, numbered Sheet 5-9, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 23 September 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 two bath windows within the proposed rear roof dormers as shown on the approved 'Drawing- Proposed- Plans and Elevations, numbered Sheet 5-9', 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.

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- Site Plan- Existing & Proposed- Site Plans, numbered Sheet 10' and 'Drawing- Proposed- Plans and Elevations, numbered Sheet 5-9', 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.

Informatives

- 1) This decision notice does not give planning consent to outbuildings within the curtilage of the site which may be unlawful. This element of development should be reviewed and if planning consent is required, applied for separately.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

8 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
3 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
4 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4WJ
9 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
7 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
11 Boardman Road, Manchester, M8 4NT
8 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS
4 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS
6 Belhaven Road, Manchester, M8 4NS

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