

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 140424/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 3 July 2024

Proposal: Erection of a first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 11 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS

Ward(s): Whalley Range Ward

Applicant: Mr Tariq Julani

Agent (if any): Mr Sakib Ahmed CGI Works

Case officer: Janet Lawless
Tel: 0161 234 4535
Email: janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 28 August 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 14th August 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 15 July 2024 Expired: 5 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 property that is the subject of this householder application is a red brick semi-detached dwellinghouse that is located on a wider estate development. There is garden area to the front and rear, and a single storey side extension. There is an existing small conservatory on the rear of the property. There is off road parking provision to the front of the property.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is residential in character with predominantly single-family dwelling houses of mixed types such as bungalows, detached two-storey houses and semi-detached houses. The house is a moderate distance to the shops and businesses in Chorlton District Centre, together with a number of local schools (William Hulme Grammar School and Whalley Range High School) and the St Werburgh's tram stop.

Description of development

The proposal is for the erection of a first-floor side extension which would provide accommodation in the form of enlarging bedroom number two to enable additional space and adaptation for a disabled member of the family together with an en-suite bathroom.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were informed- no representations have been received.

Issues

Policy and Issues

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan. Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.

Policy DM 1 - Development Management

Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for everyone GM Spatial Plan

The Inspectors' Report on the examination of the Places for Everyone plan was published on 15 February 2024. The Inspectors' Report sets out and justifies their recommendations in relation to the plan, and they have concluded that all legal requirements have been met and that with the recommended main modifications set out in the appendix to their report, the Places for Everyone plan is 'sound'.

The nine constituent local authorities have now adopted the Plan following consideration of the Inspectors' Report. There will be a period of six-week post adoption (i.e. from 21 March) when a judicial review challenge may be made. This will trigger a process of consideration by the Courts as to whether a JR is sufficient grounds to be heard (there is a one-step oral hearing appeal process if a Judge decides to reject the ground for a JR from the outset).

Given the stage the Plan has reached, the Plan and its policies is now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given significant weight in the planning balance.

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle - The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is proposing the erection of a first- floor side extension which would be in line with the front and rear wall of the house, it would sit above the existing footprint of the previously constructed ground floor side extension. The property site sits far forward of the neighbouring property at number 9 Broadmeadow Avenue. Given that the existing ground floor extension is up to the common boundary with number 9 Broadmeadow Avenue, the first- floor extension is set down from the existing ridge of the host property, as this ensures that the proposed

development would not result in a terracing effect should number 9 choose to extend off the side of their property in the future. The proposed roof would be gabled to reflect the existing design of roof on the property. Windows are proposed on the front and rear elevations only. The submission originally proposed a window on the side of the property, however following a reconfiguration of the space to the first floor, this has been removed from the proposal as has the additional bedroom, with the client electing to improve the standard of accommodation of the second bedroom for a disabled family member. This is considered to be acceptable. It is not considered that the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Visual Amenity

It is considered that the introduction of an extension in this location is acceptable especially given the staggered relationship with number 9 Broadmeadow Avenue. The proposal retains subservience when viewed in the context of the host property.

The extension would feature within the street scene, however, many properties on the estate have been altered at some time since their original build with enlargements to side and rear which are particularly popular. Notwithstanding the changes, it is considered that the character of the area has been retained. It is therefore considered that the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered to be comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be accommodated as an addition to the property.

The proposal complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Siting - The proposed side extension would be sited on the western elevation along the common boundary with number 9 Broadmeadow Avenue. The two properties have a staggered relationship, with number 11 sitting far forward of the building line of number 9. Locating the extension along this elevation would have less of an impact on the neighbouring properties as opposed to projection from the rear. It is considered that the siting of the extension at this location is considered acceptable.

Scale and massing - Whilst the proposed extension would not be set back from the front of the property due to the juxtaposition of numbers 11 and 9 Broadmeadow Avenue, it is set down from the existing ridge which reduces the bulk and massing along that common boundary whilst at the same time resulting in an extension which is of a sympathetic scale, to the existing property and reflective of other previous developments within the immediate area.

It is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP Policy DC1 and Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Design and Appearance - The applicant is seeking to match existing materials and the design mirrors that of the existing dwelling house. It is considered that the extension would be in keeping with the character of the original dwelling house and the surrounding properties.

Parking - There is adequate off- street parking provided by the driveway to the front of the property.

Refuse bin storage - The storage of refuse bins is not affected by this proposal as there is an existing purpose built bin store to the front of the property, as the previously constructed single storey side extension removed the passage of bins from the rear to the front on collection day.

Conclusion - The proposal is considered acceptable in this location, in terms of design, scale and massing and it is not considered that the proposal would create any undue loss of amenity to existing or proposed neighbours or occupants of the property. There is sufficient external amenity space retained post development. The proposal therefore complies with Policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

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

Officers have worked with the Applicant / Agent in a positive and proactive manner in order to guide the Application through all stages of the Planning process, in this instance no issues have arisen and the application has been determined in accordance with both national and local policies, and in a timely manner.

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:

Location Plan received 3rd July 2024

280624/24.04-01 Proposed floor plans and elevations received by email 28th August 2024.

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.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, including patching in and mortar, shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) 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 windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interest of residential amenity, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and policy DM1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

5) Before first occupation, the window in the first floor northern (rear) elevation 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 residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

1 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
4 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
40 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
8 Stoneyfield Close, Manchester, M16 8GT
2 Stoneyfield Close, Manchester, M16 8GT
10 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
15 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
9 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
2 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
8 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
4 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
5 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
3 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
2 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
6 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
36 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
12 Stoneyfield Close, Manchester, M16 8GT
10 Stoneyfield Close, Manchester, M16 8GT
6 Stoneyfield Close, Manchester, M16 8GT
4 Stoneyfield Close, Manchester, M16 8GT
14 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
12 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
38 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester, M16 8GR
6 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
17 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
13 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS
7 Broadmeadow Avenue, Manchester, M16 8GS

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) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA