

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 140496/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 11 July 2024

Proposal: Retention of entrance porch and canopy to front elevation and single storey rear extension

Address: 6 Greystone Avenue, Manchester, M21 7RP

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: R Ali

Agent (if any): Philip Holmes PHA Architects Ltd

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 30 August 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 7 August 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 26 July 2024 Expired: 16 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

The application property is a 1930s red brick built semi-detached dwelling with double storey bay window on the front façade. The property benefits from a private garden to the rear bound by timber fencing, and a fully hard surfaced parking area to the front which abuts the pavement with no boundary treatment.



The property has been previously extended via part single, part two-storey side and rear extensions, built in accordance with planning permission 117015/FH/2017. Albeit with a variation in roof form to the proposed single storey rear element, as noted in the enforcement case ENF/14480/19.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential in character, with Whalley Range High School sited due north. The dwelling is situated within in a short cul-de-sac (Greystone Avenue) off Mauldeth Road West within Chorlton Park ward. Properties on Greystone Avenue are predominantly uniform in character, materials and form. Side and rear extensions are evident within the streetscene.

At the time of the initial site visit, (01/03/2024), unauthorised works to the host property were documented including, the erection of a front canopy with four supporting columns and additional single storey rear extension, rendering of the ground floor front elevation and complete resurfacing of the site frontage in concrete.

At the time of the second site visit, (07/08/2024), the unauthorised works evidenced in March were still in situ. An aco drain had been installed into the hardstanding across the site frontage.

Description of development

Retrospective consent is sought to retain the front canopy with associated columns and single storey rear extension, as well as material alterations to the property.

The proposed front canopy to be retained would consist of a tiled lean-to form with small gable feature, which would measure 9.2m width x 1.35m depth x 3.3-3.7m height. The canopy would extend along the full width of the existing extended dwelling, from the common boundaries with nos.4 and 8 Greystone Avenue, supported by 4 white columns.

The proposed single storey rear extension to be retained would extend the full width of the existing extended dwelling, comprising a stepped arrangement inset from both the side boundaries by 1m. The additional rear extension would project 3.5m in total, creating an overall rearward projection of 7.2m from the original building line of the property, when read cumulatively with existing rear extensions on site. The extension would accommodate a parapet roof with lantern rooflight, measuring 3.3m in maximum height.

The ground floor front elevation of the extended dwelling has been rendered bright white.

None of these elements can be constructed under permitted development, therefore require planning permission.

The entirety of the site frontage has been resurfaced in non-permeable concrete with drainage facilities incorporated, in order to create an extended driveway. Given the location of the drain and the fall of the driveway it is not considered that the installed drainage serves the area of hardstanding and planning permission is also required for this element.



Site photo of front of property when illuminated

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents

None

Consultation responses

None

Relevant Planning History

At the application site –

139262/FH/2024 – Retrospective application for erection of canopy to front, render to ground floor front elevation, hardsurfacing to front and single storey rear extension. Withdrawn 09.04.2024.

117015/FH/2017 – Erection of part single, part two-storey side and rear extensions to form additional living accommodation. Approved 21.09.2017 – Now implemented. **PD rights removed for Classes A, B and E.**

Enforcement cases –

ENF/15706/23 – Erection of a front porch and canopy with pillars. Case ongoing.

ENF/14480/19 – Extension not built in accordance with approved plans. Case closed 23.09.2020.

History of negotiations

139262/FH/2024 – original application

The planning officer notified the agent via phone call and emails (29/2/24) that additional unauthorised works have been implemented on site including; a single storey rear extension, white render to the front elevation at ground floor and hardsurfacing of the site frontage in concrete. As such, revised plans were requested showing all these developments for completeness.

The agent requested via phone call (9/4/24) whether the LPA would accept the submission of revised plans showing all unauthorised works to be removed and queried the imposition of a planning condition controlling this removal. The planning officer stated that this was not within the remit of this application, given the description of development and principle that the suggested 'removal' condition was not considered enforceable. As such, the officer advised that a new permission should be applied for, if the client wishes to formalise the removal of these unauthorised works to the property.

Current application

The second application on this site sought to formalise the retention of all unauthorised development on site.

The planning officer requested via email (dated 29/7/24) that the submitted plans were revised to show and annotate the removal of the unauthorised front porch and white render to the GF principal elevation. These elements were considered unacceptable in principle.

In addition, in order to support the retention of the unauthorised single storey rear extension, plans showing the proposed removal of the ground floor windows to the side were requested.

No revised plans have been received from the agent, therefore the application was determined as a refusal.

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

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

DC1– Residential Extensions

A relevant material consideration is also:

- Manchester Residential Quality Guidance March 2017 (Manchester's Emerging Space Standards)

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF (2023) 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

Impact on visual amenity and the streetscene:

Greystone Avenue is characterised by relatively uniform 1930s residential properties which feature matching red brickwork, double bay windows hung in decorative tiles topped with a gable feature. Front boundary treatments consist predominantly of original low brick walling enclosing block paving and soft landscaping (lawns, hedging, trees etc).

The retrospective single storey extension is sited to the rear and would accommodate a parapet room form. Given this scale and siting, this element would not be visible from public vantage points, therefore is considered to pose limited impact upon the character of the host property.

The retrospective canopy and associated columns located on the front façade of the dwellinghouse have not been designed to be in keeping with the original design and character of the existing house and are considered to adversely affect the appearance of the existing house. The canopy reads as a continuation of the existing lean-to roof form of the formerly approved part single, part two-storey side extension. In addition, the finished white render at ground floor level to the front elevation is considered a stark and alien material, that does not respect the character of the host property and immediate streetscene.

The retrospective hardsurfacing to the site frontage also raises significant visual amenity concerns, relating to the introduction of an incongruous material, as well as the loss of the partial front garden and characterful original low brick walling across the site frontage. Notwithstanding this, this element now features an arco-drain facility albeit this is located to the

front of porch canopy and given the fall of the driveway away from the property this drain is not considered to serve the installed hardstanding.

Furthermore, the canopy and associated columns and render create visually dominant and incongruous features within the relatively uniform streetscene, and are considered to create adverse impact on the visual amenity of the occupiers of the Avenue. It is therefore considered that in the event that these structures and alterations were to be retained, it would create an unsatisfactory visual relationship between the neighbouring properties, particularly those at nos 4 and 8 Greystone Avenue. As such, the overall character of the host property and street scene would be adversely affected and therefore the retrospective development is not suitably related to the existing building and its context.

It is therefore considered that the retention of the retrospective canopy and associated columns and render would detract from the character and appearance of the host property, due to the context, design and siting, which is contrary to the advice contained in Chapter 12 of the NPPF which requires good design, and policy DM 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012.

Impact on residential amenity:

The retrospective works to the front of the host property, including the front canopy and columns and render are not considered to give rise to undue impacts on overshadowing, overlooking or overdominance, given their nature and scale in relation to neighbouring properties.

Notwithstanding this, concern is raised in relation to the unauthorised single storey rear extension, with regards to overlooking impacts as a result of a single window inserted in the side elevations. The overall scale of the additional rear extension is considered acceptable on balance, given that this element has been inset from the side boundaries by 1m and would only project 3.4m from the existing building lines of no.4 and 8, the previously extended neighbouring adjacent dwellings. Furthermore, it is considered that the detached outbuilding present within the rear garden of no.4, sited along the shared boundary with the application site offers adequate screening of the development.

As such, the existing side windows raise overlooking concerns upon adjacent neighbouring properties no.4 and 8.

Highways:

The extended driveway to the front would provide sufficient off-street parking for approx. 3 cars, this is considered acceptable.

Conclusion:

In assessing this proposal, it has also been recognised that although the application relates to an unlisted building, not within, or; near an area of designated special interest or importance, the property has architectural features which are present in the dwellinghouses in Greystone Avenue which contribute to the character of the local area. The retention of the unauthorised structures and alterations would create an unsatisfactory visual relationship between the neighbouring properties, particularly those at nos. 4 and 8 Greystone Avenue and the overall character of the property and streetscene would be harmed and therefore the development is not suitably related to the existing building and its context. On balance, taking these factors into consideration and for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the retention of the unauthorised front canopy and associated columns and render would not respond positively to the National Planning Policy Framework, (December 2023); policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC1.

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

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. The application has been submitted retrospectively of works taking place and these are considered to be contrary to the development plan.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. Visual amenity

The retention of the front canopy extension, associated columns and white render at ground floor to the principal elevation at 6 Greystone Avenue, by virtue of their scale, siting, design and materials used forms an over dominant and intrusive feature to the detriment of visual amenity and the character of the area. The resulting effect would be unduly harmful on the character of the application property and the local street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC1 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Residential amenity

The retention of the single storey rear extension by reason of the fenestration in the side elevations facing the common boundaries with no. 4 and no.8 Greystone Avenue, would unduly impact upon the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring property, resulting in loss of amenity of the current and future occupants; contrary to policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), and policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy (2012).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Apartment 18, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 19, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 20, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 21, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 22, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 23, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 24, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 25, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 26, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 27, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 28, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 29, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 30, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 31, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 12, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 32, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 33, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 34, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 35, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 36, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 37, Tudor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 10, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 5, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 9, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 8, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 7, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 6, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 4, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 3, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 2, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 1, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
Apartment 11, Windsor House, Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7TH
8 Greystone Avenue, Manchester, M21 7RP
4 Greystone Avenue, Manchester, M21 7RP
3 Greystone Avenue, Manchester, M21 7RP
1 Greystone Avenue, Manchester, M21 7RP

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

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