

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 139846/FO/2024

Date registered valid: 22 April 2024

Proposal: Erection of a rear dormer extensions together with single-storey rear extensions and the installation of two rooflights to the front of each property

Address: Numbers 2, 4, 6, 8,10,12 & 14 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF

Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Messrs Spaenjaers and Van Paesschen, VSHF Manchester Ltd

Agent (if any): Mr Darren Ridley, The Planning Station

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 17 June 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

Date of site visit: 8 May 2024

Standard consultations:

Printed: 29 April 2024 Expired: 21 May 2024

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 29 April 2024 Expired: 21 May 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/area

The application site relates to a complete row of seven two storey terraced properties, with parking to the front of the block and open communal garden areas to the rear. The block of 7 houses are Class C4 Houses of Multiple Occupations for student accommodation. The partial rear elevation of the terrace is visible from Egerton Road.

The remainder of the area is predominantly residential in nature, with a mix of Victorian terraced houses and more modern infill sites such as the application site under consideration.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of development

The application seeks planning permission for 7 terraced properties to each be extended through the following (see figure 1):

- Single storey rear infill extension
- Large box rear dormer
- Hip to gable conversion at numbers 2 and 14 only

The seven proposed single storey rear extensions would involve extending the kitchen/dining room area and become flush with the original two storey outriggers. A hipped or pitched roof would be implemented to each extension and feature a rear elevation door.

The seven dormer windows would be designed as a large second floor extension, the dormers would be flush in appearance and be designed with a single window in the rear elevation overlooking the communal rear yard and be finished in tiles to match existing.

The proposal would facilitate the creation of an additional two bedrooms at second floor and an extended kitchen/dining room area at ground floor, at each property.



Figure 1 – Proposed rear elevation

This revised proposal follows the refusal of 135793/FO/2022 at no.2 and 135794/FO/2022 at no.14. Now proceeding with the total redevelopment of the seven terraced properties.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local responses

Two letters of representation were received from local residents raising the following concerns, which will be addressed in the appraisal.

- The properties are in a flood zone. The development will increase the risk of flooding.
- Increased loss of environmental and visual amenity for residents living opposite 2-14 Exbury Street
- Intensification of Use of the 7 properties for HMO living is contrary to MCC Housing Policies in the Local Development Framework especially Policy H11.
- High levels of littering in area & poor waste management due to high student density

Consultee responses

Highway Services –

The application seeks consent for the erection of a rear dormer extensions together with single-storey rear extensions and the installation of two rooflights to the front of each property at Numbers 2,4,6,8,10,12, and 14 Exbury Street, Manchester M14 6RF.

The terrace property is located adjacent to the adopted 20mph Exbury Street with adoption extending to the back of the footways.

HIGHWAYS RESPONSE:

The proposed development extends only within the red-line boundary of the site and as such, does not impinge upon the adopted highway.

As noted in the Design & Access document, the development will facilitate an increase in occupancy of each HMO from 3 to 5. In total, there will be an additional 14 residents on the terrace.

PARKING AND ACCESS:

There are currently 7no. of on-site parking spaces within the curtilage of the terrace. The residences each have one in curtilage car parking space.

With the increase of residents at each property, vehicular demands associated with the terrace may contribute to the level of vehicles parked on-street. Highways has concerns on the impact this will have in the immediate area.

Vehicular access to the site is gained from Exbury Street. It is noted that an existing vehicular crossover is present in this location in order to facilitate this access.

CYCLE PARKING:

In line with MCC recommendations, secure and sheltered cycle parking provision should be made, within the curtilage of the site, for the accommodation of resident's cycles. Further information is required from the applicant on the current level of cycle parking spaces provided at the terrace.

It is requested that a minimum of five cycle parking spaces are provided per property at the terrace.

REFUSE AND SERVICING:

Waste bins will continue to be stored at the front of the property between the porches. However, it is noted from the Design & Access document that the waste bins will be stored in bin stores. Can the applicant provide further information regarding the proposed bin stores?

Flood Risk Management – Flood Risk Assessment required by condition.

Environmental Health – Waste management strategy and proprietary Gas membrane required by condition.

Fallowfield & Withington Community Gardens / SE Fallowfield Residents Group –

We wish to voice our strong objections to planning application 139846/FO/2024 for the row of houses 2-14 Exbury Street, M14 6RF at the eastern end of Derby Road. Our representation is being submitted on behalf of Community Guardians and SE Fallowfield Residents Group. This

planning application seeks to erect rear dormer extensions and single-storey rear extensions with two rooflights to a whole row of seven properties.

We consider this to be wholly inappropriate due to the extra number of persons that will be accommodated if this expansion and intensification is allowed. Each property will increase from 3 to 5 beds resulting in an increase from 21 bedrooms to 35 bedrooms. The problems of intensification arise recurrently at SEFRG and CG meetings and have done so for years. Members of both residents groups do not support intensification of use.

Many members of our groups live in this part of southeast Fallowfield. Numerous incidents of noise and anti-social behaviour from transient residents and students in close proximity to these properties have occurred over the years.

Refuse disposal issues, bins on pavements, rats and drug issues are also regularly raised at our meetings and on our neighbourhood WhatsApp chat close to these properties.

Residents in our groups have specifically asked for a strong objection to this to be written on their behalf because they are weary from lack of sleep and weary of the problems caused by living in a neighbourhood with such a high demography of students and transient residents. We are also aware that there are other permanent residents on Exbury Street and adjoining streets who are not part of our residents groups. Recent door knocking exercises by members of our groups highlighted problems from the HMO houses 2-14 Exbury Street.

We feel that further intensification of these properties would be unbearable and will cause more bin refuse issues, more noise from comings and goings and more parking problems.

We urge you to uphold your planning policies to protect residential amenity and promote sustainable communities by refusing this application in full.

Withington Civic Society –

The proposed extension involves major additions to a row of seven houses which are used as HMOs. The area is of course the subject of an Article 4 Direction, and contains a large number of HMOs as well as flats with all the problems associated with such accommodation.

We can do little better than quote the Inspector in Planning Appeal APP/B4215/W17/3189101:

“Areas that have a high concentration of HMOs, including student accommodation, often experience a conflict between the lifestyles of students and local residents. The generally transient nature of the occupants of HMOs results in them often failing to integrate into the local community and makes it difficult to provide community services and facilities. This is exacerbated by the often seasonal nature of student occupation, with fluctuations in service needs as a result of students often vacating the properties outside term times. As a result, an over concentration of HMOs creates an imbalance in the housing provision in the local community which can have a harmful effect on the sustainability of the community.”

As the Inspector commented in Planning Appeal Ref APP/B4215/A/10/2139091 at paragraph 12:

“In the Withington ward in which the appeal is located, the number of HMO’s in the area has now reached the tipping point beyond which maintaining a sustainable community attractive to permanent residents would be difficult.”

According to the Office for National Statistics Official Census Map 2021, the relevant property falls within area E00026867 of the map where it is stated that the number of full-time students is

56.2%. A small percentage may be school students still living at home, but the vast majority are students living in the community. Adjacent areas have an even greater density of students. This all creates a serious imbalance and is seriously damaging to the well-being of the permanent (but diminishing) community.

This proposal, in combination with other HMOs in the area, would significantly harm the mix and balance of housing provision in the area. As such, it is contrary to Core Strategy Policy H11 which states that *“In areas of high concentration, extensions to HMOs (as defined in the Housing Act 2004) would not be permitted where this could reasonably be expected to lead to an increase in the level of occupation”*. It also fails to accord with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that local planning authorities should provide a wide choice of high quality homes.

The Manchester City Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document at paragraph 9.46 is highly relevant and states:

“The Student Strategy found that the problems caused by shared houses appear to be more noticeable (and raise more concerns) to residents where they occur in previously relatively stable neighbourhoods, and identifies these areas as those with between 20-40% student households. The strategy examines whether a ‘tipping point’ can be identified for the point where the proportion of shared houses (in this case student households) becomes damaging to a street or neighbourhood and concludes that once a 20% threshold is reached problems become harder to manage, but considers that a tipping point would be difficult to set universally across Manchester due to varying capacities of neighbourhoods to accommodate this type of housing, based on house type and demography. During the preparation of the Core Strategy, and particularly through consultation with local stakeholders, the Council concluded that a 10% threshold would be more appropriate.....”

It is noteworthy that the applicant makes no substantive proposals for waste disposal. Yet the whole area suffers from a serious and appalling litter and waste problem.

The increase in occupation by another 14 persons from 21 to 35, will inevitably lead to increasing problems of littering, and it is noted that bins are stored at the front of the properties.

Likewise, there would be no additional parking provision despite the already existing parking issues in the road.

Unfortunately, one only has to walk down some of the roads in the area to see what an awful state the area is in.

To our knowledge permanent residents and families have been leaving the area as it becomes increasingly hostile to families. Residents who complain about street noise are on occasion met with the refrain that they “should not live in a student area”. This is unacceptable. The application, if granted, will only make matters worse.

Accordingly, Withington Civic Society strongly opposes the application.

Relevant Planning History

At 2 Exbury Street –

135793/FO/2022 – Erection of a single storey rear extension, hip-to-gable conversion and installation of rear dormer. Refused 10.02.2023, on the grounds of policy H11 (HMO concentration impacts) and visual amenity.

At 14 Exbury Street –

135794/FO/2022 – Erection of a single storey rear extension, hip-to-gable conversion and installation of rear dormer. Refused 10.02.2023, on the grounds of policy H11 (HMO concentration impacts) and visual amenity.

At 10 Exbury Street –

130188/LE/2021 – Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for use of the property as a House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4). Approved 10.06.2021.

At 8 Exbury Street –

130187/LE/2021 – Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for use of the property as a House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4). Approved 24.06.2021.

At 6 Exbury Street –

130158/LE/2021 – Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for use of the property as a House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4). Approved 16.06.2021.

At Allotment gardens adjacent 96 Derby Road/Exbury Street, Fallowfield –

050873/FO/SOUTH1/96 – Erection of a terrace of 7 two storey dwellings and associated car parking. Approved 16.01.1997. *Implemented.*

History of negotiations

No negotiations were entered into with the agent, given that the proposal was considered unacceptable in principle, even in the event of significant revisions.

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

JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

The relevant **Core Strategy** policies for this application are as follows:

DM 1 – Development Management
SP 1 – Spatial Principles (partially superseded by PfE)
H 6 – South Manchester
H 11 – Houses in Multiple Occupation
EN 1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
EN 19 – Waste

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

DC1– Residential Extensions
DC26 – Development and Noise

The relevant supplementary planning guidance documents for this application are:

- The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

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 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Issues

Principle of development:

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions are to be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The NPPF at paragraphs 2 and 47 reinforces this requirement and at paragraph 12 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making, and that where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted.

In the case of this application, which is a resubmission of the previously refused schemes (ref:135793/FO/2022 & 135794/FO/2022), the principle of the proposal is not considered acceptable and is in conflict with the aforementioned development plan policy and associated guidance.

The seven terraced properties are currently in use as three-bedroom Houses of Multiple Occupation (class C4). The proposed dormer and rear extensions will facilitate the internal remodelling of the seven properties and would create two additional bedrooms in each property in the vacant roof void. Each property would therefore become a five-bedroom HMO. This addition of two bedrooms per property would therefore increase the total occupation of the

seven properties from 21 persons to 35 persons. Whilst one of the ground floor rooms is annotated as an extended kitchen/living area it could equally be used as an additional bedroom.

The increase in floorspace and associated occupancy arising from the proposed rear dormer extensions to each of the seven properties (no.s 2-14) would facilitate as a significant over intensive use of the properties and would lead to problems associated with increased levels of activity formed by people with different lifestyles and patterns of behaviour, increased noise, disturbance, waste storage demands and car parking requirements.

Houses in multiple occupancy also often lead to transient occupancy, whereby occupants have little vested interest in the area and can in part, alter the character of an area as a neighbourhood of choice.

HMOs tend to attract people who will live in the property for a comparatively short period of time and consequently they do not have the same interest in the well-being of an area as those who are less transient such as a family. It is believed that this cyclical change in occupiers can have a negative impact upon both residential amenity, often due to poor or no management and a general lack of civic pride. As such, the cumulative effects of HMOs can have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of an area.

On this basis, the proposal is considered to conflict with policies DM1, SP1 and H11 of the Manchester Core Strategy and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There are no material considerations to indicate otherwise.

Impact on residential amenity:

Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy indicate that consideration should be given to the effects of development upon the amenity, living conditions and the well-being of residents.

Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF also states that planning decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

In this case, the Council has concerns in relation to the over-intensive use of the seven properties, as a result of the increase in occupancy.

Whilst the City Council has no control over who can occupy a property, it can help prevent properties from being over intensively used, by restricting the number of unrelated occupants.

HMO accommodation can often cause problems in residential neighbourhoods, due to the levels of activity associated with unrelated people living together, as opposed to traditional family occupancy, which normally involves the manifestation of different patterns of behaviour and less frequent levels of activity.

A collective group of individuals with different lifestyles and different patterns of behaviour can result in frequent comings and goings, with associated noise and disturbance. This in turn can have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, to the detriment of their amenity.

The principal effects include, noise nuisance, negative impacts upon the physical environment and streetscape due to inadequate management of refuse storage and pressure upon local parking provision.

It is not considered that either of the proposed extensions (dormer windows and rear extensions) would adversely impact on the amenity of residents in terms of either overshadowing, overbearing impact or loss of privacy. However, significant concern is expressed by local resident groups that additional residents and the associated activity and coming and goings that would be associated would add to and further detract from the amenity of residents in the wider area, this view is shared by the local planning authority.

The proposed extensions could result in an 66.67% increase in accommodation within the seven properties. The proposal is sited within an area where a high proportion of properties are let as HMO's predominantly to students and there are issues with anti-social behaviour. To this end the Councils policies seek to prevent the over intensification of HMO's within areas and this includes the enlargement of existing HMO's. The proposal includes an additional 14 bedrooms within this terrace (2 per property) and it is considered that the potential of fourteen additional persons living in these seven properties, would be a substantial increase given the small size of the existing properties and the number of people already resident there. On balance it is considered that the proposed development wholly conflicts with policy H11.

In this case, the lack of sufficient off-road car parking provision for a potential 35 occupants, also forms a particularly harmful factor.

Notwithstanding the relatively accessible location of the property, car ownership by prospective occupants cannot be precluded.

Policy DM1 in particular states, that for all development, regard should be made to parking provision.

The increased occupancy of the properties would undoubtedly lead to increased competition for on and off street parking spaces on adjacent roads in an area that already suffers with on-street parking demand, due to the levels of occupancy in the area and the lack of off street provision.

The proposed use by definition could quite feasibly generate demand for 35 car parking spaces. This in turn would cause competition for on-street parking spaces along Exbury Street and nearby roads. On street parking demand is already at a premium in the immediate area which would be exacerbated by the proposed development. This view is endorsed by Highway Services in their consultation response.

Impact on visual amenity and the streetscene:

Dormer extensions

In terms of its scale the proposed seven dormer windows would occupy the majority of the roof slope of the entire terrace, reading as one solid mass at second floor level, leaving minimal distance to the side, eaves and original ridge line (see figure 1). The design incorporates a small window in the rear elevations only and is a simple box structure, constructed flush across the seven properties. The choice of materials would match the existing. It is deemed that the dormer windows are not well sited and the addition to the terrace's roof profile particularly in relation to the poor design and significant scale is unacceptable and would be a visually incongruous addition, visible from public vantage points, notably Derby Road to the north and Egerton Road to the west. Altogether the proposal is not considered to be appropriately sited or scaled to the host dwelling, contrary to residential properties DM1 and DC1.

Rear extensions

The proposed rear extensions would accommodate either a hipped (no.2) or pitched roof (no.s 4-14) rendering it subservient to the original dwelling. In terms of their scale and design these elements are considered acceptable on balance.

It is considered the proposed rear dormer windows would feature in a prominent position within the local streetscene and therefore contribute to an incongruous development that is out of character for Exbury Street and Derby Road. The poor design of the proposal exacerbates its excessive bulk, hence it is considered to be overly dominant and would form an unattractive and overbearing feature, visible from the surrounding streetscene. On balance it is considered that the proposed development conflicts with policy SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and DC1 of the saved UDP.

Highways:

The proposal will increase occupancy of the seven properties by an additional 14 persons, however no additional vehicle parking can be accommodated on site. With the proposed intensification at each property, vehicular demands associated with the terrace may contribute to the level of vehicles parked on-street. As such, MCC highways has concerns on the impact this will have in the immediate area.

Conclusion:

For the reasons explained above, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable appearance to the detriment of the neighbouring occupiers. Further, the extensions would facilitate an increase in occupancy of these 7 HMOs, the proposed development conflicts with Council policy and is therefore unacceptable.

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

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. Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application, but these concerns have not been overcome. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and therefore refused in a timely manner.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. H11

The proposed increase in occupancy as a result of proposed extensions, would result in an over intensive use of these seven C4 properties. The consequential increase in the levels of activity, noise and disturbance waste generation and demand for parking would have a harmful impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers, which would have a detrimental impact on the sustainability and character of an area in which there is a high concentration of houses in multiple occupation and would therefore be contrary to the provisions of policies SP1, H11 and DM1 of the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework.

2. Visual amenity

The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk, massing, design and relationship to the original terrace; would form an overly dominant and visually obtrusive feature, within the streetscene and would be incongruous with the character of the area in general, to the detriment of visual amenity and as such is contrary to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management

Flat 2, 41 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
Flat 1, 41 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
Flat 3, 87 Egerton Road, Manchester, M14 6RD
Flat 1, 87 Egerton Road, Manchester, M14 6RD
55 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
10 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
4 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
53 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
89 Egerton Road, Manchester, M14 6RD
39 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
33 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
27 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
Flat 2, 87 Egerton Road, Manchester, M14 6RD
63 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
14 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
12 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
8 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
6 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
94 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
51 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
49 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
43 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
41 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
35 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
31 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
59 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
57 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
29 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF
65 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
93 Egerton Road, Manchester, M14 6RD
91 Egerton Road, Manchester, M14 6RD
61 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
96 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
69 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
67 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
59 Derby Road, Manchester, M14 6RE
37 Exbury Street, Manchester, M14 6RF

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Flood Zones Type 3 (high risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA