

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 136387/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 2 March 2023

Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension to side and rear and installation of dormer to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 12 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DF

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Bithell

Agent (if any): Mr David Lambert ARCD Architects

Case officer: Janine Renshaw-Livesey
Tel: 0161 234 4555
Email: janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 22 May 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 4 April 2023

Standard consultations:

Printed: 2 May 2023 Expired: 12 May 2023

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 2 May 2023 Expired: 12 May 2023

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

Description of site/building

The site relates to a two-storey property located along High Lane in the Chorlton Park area of Manchester. Access to the property is taken from the side. Gardens lie to the front and rear with off road car parking along the side. The property benefits from living space within the basement.

Description of area

This is primarily a residential area in character.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for an extension for the erection of a single storey extension to side and rear and installation of dormer to provide additional living accommodation.

Negotiations

The proposal has been modified by removing the canopy and replacing the render capping of the single storey rear extension with vertical timber cladding.

Consultations & Notification Responses

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted, and one letter was received raising issues in relation to the extension and the impact it may have on light and shadowing. Concerns were also raised in relation to retaining the boundary wall running along the boundary beyond the proposed extension and the bricks to be used on the extension should match the existing bricks. The applicant modified the scheme by removing the canopy reducing the built form along the common boundary and provided clarification for the retention of the wall by annotating the drawings.

The applicant submitted the revised scheme, and the occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted, and no representation was received.

Issues

Principle - The principle of a family extending their dwellinghouse to create more living space is acceptable. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's siting, scale and massing and design as well as the impact upon the surrounding occupiers' residential amenity.

Siting, scale and massing - The rear extension would be sited at the two storey original outrigger and span the entire width of the rear elevation of the south-west facing terraced property and would project approximately 4 metres. The side extension would project 2 metres from the side elevation of the dwelling house the side extension matches the length of the neighbour's side. The extension has a projection of 4 metres and increases the length of the outrigger extension with a flat roof and measures 3 metres in height. Although saved UDP policy DC1 of the Core Strategy only allows extensions up to 3.65m, the majority of this proposal could be done under a PDE application, as the General Permitted Development Order (2015) allows rear extensions up to 6m. As the extension does not exceed these permitted dimensions it is considered acceptable.

Design and appearance - The proposal would be built of bricks to match existing, along the boundary with No 14, along the top of part of the extension would have a glass lantern type roof and be capped with vertical timber cladding and large glazed windows facing the garden. To facilitate the change from a high inside floor level to the lower outside ground level.

The original scheme included a rear canopy. Both the canopy and the rear extension were capped with render. However, the revised scheme removed the canopy, and the render was replaced with vertical timber cladding. The materials and design of the extension and light well are acceptable in accordance with DM1, DC1 and SP1 and point 127 of the NPPF, therefore the appearance is deemed acceptable.

Residential amenity - Although the proposed extension would bring the boundary wall, close to the neighbouring extension the potential for overshadowing and loss of light is lessened by the orientation being south-east of the application site). It is anticipated that some shadowing would occur as a result of the rear extension. However, given the size of the neighbouring garden and a rear extension from this wall could be under PD regulations the scale of the proposal is considered acceptable. There would be little overlooking associated with this development as the only windows/doors to the rear doors facing the garden and one wrap round high level window. After the scheme was modified no objections were received from local residents and the proposal is considered to accord with policies DM1, DC1 and SP1.

The window inserted next to the solar panels on the front roof elevation is considered to be acceptable as these interventions do not detract from within the street scene and are not readily visible due to the pitch of the roof and are not considered to detract from the architecture of the host building and therefore, accords with policies DM1, DC1 and SP1 of the core strategy for Manchester.

Dormer

Residential Amenity

The applicant proposes the installation of a rear dormer extension which would extend across the roof set down slightly from the ridge line of the original roof height and in from the side walls of the house. Two windows are proposed which overlook the rear garden. Given the distance to rear boundaries it is not anticipated that there would be any further overlooking afforded by these windows than already exist from the rear windows at first floor.

The City Council considers the change to the roof design as acceptable especially given that the ridge height is no higher than the existing and the dormer is set back from the eaves. This is considered to be an acceptable addition to the roof of the property and is therefore considered would not provide a detrimental outlook on the adjoining properties or the surrounding area and is considered acceptable in this location and is not believed to impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

The location of the dormer is on the rear and would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene. However, the character of the area would be retained and therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the rear dormer is considered can be acceptably accommodated at the application 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, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed dormer is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed dormer is satisfactory and is considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposal would provide a modern addition to the property. In terms of the materials, the dormer is clad in grey zinc and with wraparound glazing. They are considered to be an acceptable choice given the design of the dormer. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

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.

Conclusion - The proposal is not considered to be either large or bulky, the materials are appropriate and it does not cause any significant harm to the visual or residential amenity of the area or surrounding occupiers. It accords with the policies contained within the development plan and no objections were received, therefore the City Council considers the development acceptable, in accordance with the following conditions.

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

Positive and proactive working - Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application.

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:

The Location and Site Plan,

L(-2) 001

L(-2) 031

L(-4) 012

L(-2) 011

L(-2) 021

L(-2) 040

L(-4) 011

L(-4) 013

L(-4) 014, stamped as received on the 2 May 2023.

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 hereby permitted shall match those as specified on drawing numbers:

L(-2) 001

L(-2) 031

L(-4) 012

L(-2) 011

L(-2) 021

L(-2) 040

L(-4) 011

L(-4) 013

L(-4) 014, stamped as received on the 2 May 2023.

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 structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Arrowfield Estate Residents Association
Arrowfield Estate Residents Association

531 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
14 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DF
The Manchester Centre For Buddhist Meditation, 21 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DJ
Flat 9, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
10 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DF
Flat 8, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 5, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 2, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 1, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
529 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 10, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
16 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DF
17 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9DJ
Flat 7, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 6, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 4, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
Flat 3, Ventry Court, 523 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ
533 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AQ

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA