

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 139832/FH/2024

Date registered valid: 19 April 2024

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation,

Address: 12 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU

Ward(s): Gorton & Abbey Hey Ward

Applicant: Mr. M. Abdullah Bajwa

Agent (if any): Mr. Niamat Ali NA Design

Case officer: Harriet Aidoo
Tel: 0161 234 4532
Email: harriet.aidoo@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 June 2024

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 15 May 2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 13 May 2024 Expired: 4 June 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

Description of site / building / area

12 Hinstock Crescent is an end of terraced dwellinghouse within a short row of four houses which are slightly elevated, and sited along the head of a turning circle within a short cul-de-sac of houses of similar type. The immediate area is predominantly residential.

The application site has an existing front porch, approximately (2.8 metres wide x 1 metre deep x 3 metres high); existing single storey lean-to side extension approximately (2.2 metres wide x 5.7 metres deep x 3.3 metres high, with a rearward projection of approximately 2.2 metres, and set back approximately 2.6 metres from the front building line of the original dwellinghouse, and retaining a separation distance of approximately 5.4 metres from the common shared boundary with no.10 Hinstock Crescent, whilst being off-set from the common shared boundary with no.14 Hinstock Crescent by approximately minimum 3.5 metres and maximum 12.1 metres).

There is existing amenity space along the front, side and rear elevations, with timber frame panel fencing along the boundary incorporating a gated access.

A narrow gated alleyway/footpath, with access from Jessop Street runs along the rear boundary of the application site.

The existing side garden is relatively large, approximately 12 metres deep from the side elevation of the existing single storey side extension.

The existing amenity space along the front elevation has been hard surfaced and serves as off-street car parking, which mirrors the same arrangement as most of properties along Hinstock Crescent.

The existing rear garden is approximately 6.9 metres deep, with the existing separation distance from those properties along the rear of the application site at approximately 16.7 metres (first floor window to window), resulting in the potential for overlooking along this elevation.

Various extensions have been built on dwellings on Hinstock Crescent in close proximity to the site and the immediate neighbouring streets - Garlick Street and Chapman Street. For example, no. 14 Hinstock Crescent has been extended with a single storey rear and two storey side extension, together with a porch to the front of the property to form additional living accommodation (planning approval ref: 117053/FH/2017), and no. 13 Hinstock Crescent benefits from permission for a part single part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation, including retention of front porch and elevational alterations to original dwellinghouse and rear roof dormer (ref: 134392/FH/2022).

Site history:

- 137980/FH/2023, Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation, APPROVED 10/23
- 136894/FH/2023, Erection of part single, part two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation, REFUSED 07/23.
- 135656/FH/2022, Erection of part single, part two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation, REFUSED 02/23.

Description of development

Consent is sought for a part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

The submitted information indicates that the proposal would serve the needs of a disabled occupier residing at the property.

The proposed side extension at ground floor level would be flush with the front building line of the original dwellinghouse and have a width of approximately 2289mm along the front elevation. It then cranks to run parallel to the side boundary with no. 14 Hinstock Crescent, approximately 2149mm wide, whilst retaining a separation distance of approximately 805mm from this boundary. It then projects approximately 8751mm within the side garden and runs along the rear elevation of the existing house, leaving a small gap of approximately 101mm from the common shared boundary with no. 10 Hinstock Crescent.

The proposed maximum rearward projection would not exceed 4000mm. The proposed ground floor element would incorporate 1no. window along the front elevation, 1no. window along the side elevation (obscurely glazed), together with 1no. window, French doors and Bi-fold doors along the rear elevation; including 1no window along the rear roof slope; whilst incorporating a

lean-to pitch roof design; maximum height - approximately 3418mm along the front elevation and 3816mm along the rear elevation.

At first floor level, the proposed side extension would be set-back approximately 1500mm from the front building line of the original dwellinghouse, whilst maintaining a proposed width of approximately 4000mm wide along the front elevation. It then projects approximately 7594mm within the side garden and runs along the rear elevation of the existing house, whilst leaving a separation distance of approximately 3261mm from the common shared boundary with no. 10 Hinstock Crescent. The proposed maximum rearward projection along the first floor would not exceed 3000mm. This element would incorporate 1no. window along the front elevation, including 2no. small windows along the rear elevation (both would be fully obscurely glazed), whilst incorporating a hipped roof configuration, with the proposed roof ridge set below that of the existing house. It is intended to use matching materials.

Consultations & Notification Responses

1. Local residents

Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. The following objections, comments, or representations was received from one local resident:

They advise they would like again for the fourth time to object strongly to the proposed application as in their view the scheme is not acceptable. They have reviewed the submitted plans and object strongly to them. They are of the view that it looks like another property will be built next to their property.

They state that their previous objection letters dated 17th December 2022, 16th May 2023, and 17th September 2023 for the previous three planning applications also remain valid and still stand. The full grounds of their objection are set out below and they wish to highlight several areas of concern and irregularities:

1. Not in keeping with the context or scale of this area and having a layout and density that is inappropriate for this area, and would give rise to overlooking, loss of privacy, and loss of light.
2. The proposed development would encroach onto their boundary.
3. The depth of the rearward extension is contrary to policy.
4. The front porch has already been built without the benefit of building regulations or planning permission, and the roof materials do not match those of the existing house.
5. The floorspace which would be created exceed that in the existing house.
6. The side extension would effectively be merging this property with the adjacent house like terraced houses. This undermines the Hinstock Crescent integrity, changes the character of this cul-de-sac and makes the area overcrowded and loses its 1933 unique character.
7. Concerns raised regarding the resulting number of bedrooms, the number of occupants and the impact (traffic, noise, utilities) will create on the Hinstock Crescent, and whether the property would be subdivided into two units in the future or used as an HMO.
8. The roof on the second floor has been designed to make it hard to determine if it is a hip roof or a gable end roof. This roof will cause an extreme loss of sunlight to their property and would not match the surrounding properties in the crescent.

9. Concerns raised in regard to the gap between the proposed side extension and the boundary, and the potential for infringement. Issues have also been raised in relation to the type of any foundation and whether piling would be required, and whether there would be damage to their property.
10. Matters have been raised in regard to drainage, and whether any rainwater goods would overhang their boundary.
11. They are of the view that the scheme would have a negative impact on them and their family's health and wellbeing, e.g., noise, odour, light pollution, loss of daylight, privacy, or late-night activity.
12. They believe their property would suffer from reduced air passage flow between our properties resulting in narrowing of wind flow. This will result in extreme noise, damp issues and loss of natural draft and air stagnation.
13. The small gap between the two houses would reduce the ability of an emergency crew to enter the property in case of fire hazards. The application property has no rear access. The proposed side extension will make it harder for fire fighter access in an emergency situation.
14. Concerns about safety during the construction period, associated with scaffolding, and debris or loose materials falling into their garden or driveway. No.12 has not mentioned in their planning application form that there is an easement right of way between their and the adjacent property.
15. The proposed development would give rise to traffic congestion, access, and safety issues, and reduce availability for car parking, and give rise to on street parking issues. They legally have no right to park or store anything in the front joint passageway leading to their property, because of an easement of right of way over the joint passageway between 14 Hinstock crescent and 12 Hinstock Crescent which is legally binding.
16. Concerns about impacts to the natural environment e.g., a significant loss of trees. The owner has already cut all existing mature conifer trees in the back garden and removed the turf causing significant loss of natural habitat for animals e.g., birds, squirrels and foxes, and loss of green area.
17. The date on the submitted proposed plan not being updated and remains November 2022, which suggests that the plan has not been officially revised.
18. They consider the proposed development would have a significant impact on their family's mental health. Furthermore, a lot of Hinstock Crescent residents are elderly and require a fast response emergency service and this development and associated traffic congestion will very likely cause delays.
19. The objector has expressed concerns regarding the application form and stated there is misinformation in relation to changes and information they had noticed on the Council website. Moreover, they had also noticed references made to pre-application advice indicating planning officers having advised the applicant to submit an application.
20. They have also indicated that they cannot comprehend why the Council's Planning Department keeps sending notifications to provide comments regarding no.12 when an application has already been approved with no consideration for neighbour's opinions.
21. They are of the view that a family member's disability has been used to ignore planning policies and building regulations without any consideration to the surrounding neighbours, and their human rights, equality and privacy and would like assurance and clarification from the Council that their human rights, equality, and privacy would be protected, so that their mental health and well being would be preserved from the proposal.

Subsequently to the objector's comments, an acknowledgment was sent, (correspondence, dated 03/06/2024).

2. Environmental Health

Environmental Health officers have advised for the following to be attached to any recommendation for planning approval:

A Contaminated Land (Watching brief condition), in addition to a Proprietary gas membrane condition as records indicate that the proposal site is on or in the vicinity of an infilled pond/potentially contaminative historic land uses.

POLICY

The following guidance and policies are considered to be relevant to the proposed development.

1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (July 2021):

- Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places.

2. Places for Everyone (2024):

Places for Everyone Plan is a Joint Development Plan Document, providing a strategic plan and policies, for nine of the 10 boroughs which make up Greater Manchester. The plan was adopted by the Council on 20 March 2024 and came into effect from 21 March 2024. The plan sets out the kind of development that takes place across the city-region. It maximises the use of brownfield land and urban spaces; protects green belt land from the risk of unplanned development; releases some sites for housing and employment in key locations; ensures all new developments will be integrated into Greater Manchester's transport network to ensure new roads and transport will support them. The Plan and its policies are a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications, and therefore must be given significant weight in the planning balance.

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

- Policy DM1 (Development Management)
- Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles)
- Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas)
- Policy EN19 (Waste)
- Policy T2 (Accessible areas of opportunity and need)

4. Unitary Development Plan (UDP), (1995) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.

- Saved Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance.
- Saved Policy DC1.5 relating to applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

5. Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007:

- Chapter 2: Design

ISSUES

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects, and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale, and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context.

Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, DC1.4 and DC1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks a high standard of design in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers.

Principle of development

The principle of extending one's home is generally acceptable in circumstances where there is no overriding unduly harmful impact upon either the character of the property, or upon the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. In this instance, the application has been submitted with the view of benefitting the needs of a disabled occupier residing at the property. Notwithstanding this factor, the key issues for this application are therefore the impacts on visual and residential amenity.

Residential and Visual Amenity

Impact of works (part single part two storey side and rear extension) - Upon assessment of the submitted information and in view of the site planning history, whilst records indicate a recent planning permission having been granted for a similar development, (reference number: 137980/FH/2023) there appears to be three differences to the previously approved scheme. These relate to the proposed width along the first-floor side extension element, and the resultant proposed roof configuration; including the proposed use of the first floor front bedroom as a sensory room for a disabled occupier.

Therefore, in light of the factors outlined above, together with the existing and proposed contextual relationship in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the Hinstock Crescent street scene and the wider neighbourhood, although the proposed first floor side extension would be set-back approximately 1500mm along the front elevation, it would measure approximately 4000mm wide - (approximately 1017mm wider than the previous permission), and therefore, it is this variance which planning permission is sought. On this basis, and that a separation distance would still be retained from the common shared boundary with no. 14 Hinstock Crescent, that the proposed roof design would mirror that of the existing dwellinghouse and broadly those along the Hinstock Crsecent street scene, and the proposed siting in relation to neighbouring properties; specifically, nos. 10 and 14 Hinstock Crescent, nos. 95 and 97 Chapman Street, and along Jessop Street, it is considered that the proposed scale of the development would not give rise to significant issues in regard to residential and visual amenity to warrant refusal of the proposed development. The proposed extension would also appear as subservient to the existing dwellinghouse.

Moreover, given the maintained relationship of the application property to neighbouring buildings; specifically, nos. 10 and 14 Hinstock Crescent, nos. 95 and 97 Chapman Street and those properties along Jessop Street, it is not considered that the development would have an unduly harmful impact on the surrounding context as it would be contained within the curtilage of the application site and it would not affect the relationship of the site for configuration of neighbouring houses as a separation distance that would be retained from the common boundaries. The siting of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the fact that the overall proposed rearward projection along the ground floor at 4000mm, would be approximately (350mm) in excess of the guidance set out in saved policy DC1.3(a) regarding rearward extensions, it is considered that this variance would not unduly impact on residential amenity as it would be significantly screened by the common boundary fence. The overall proposed rearward projection along the ground floor at 4000mm is also in line with the limitations for a larger homes' extension application. In addition, the overall proposed rearward projection along the first floor at 3000mm, is line with the limitations for Householder General Permitted Development and the proposal at first floor level would be set way from the first floor common boundary with no. 10 Hinstock Crescent and maintain a separation distance of approximately 3261mm from this boundary.

Given the existing limited separation distance at the rear of the application site, and the projection of the proposed rearward extension, it is recommended that the proposed 2no. small windows at first floor level in the rear elevation of the rear extension would be obscurely glazed to safeguard privacy of both the existing residents and the occupiers.

Although a bedroom window is proposed at first floor level in the side elevation, this would be approximately 10m from the side boundary and would overlook the reasonable sized triangular shaped side garden area. With no direct line of sight to any habitable room windows (no. 14 Hinstock Crescent has a blank side gable). It is considered that it would be better located in this position, rather than along the rear elevation in light of the existing limited separation distance to the rear of the dwellinghouse. Given the depth of the side garden that would be retained, and the significant separation distance that would be maintained from the elevations to the north of Jessop Street elevation and the (blank wall) side elevation of no. 14 Hinstock Crescent and in-part its rear garden, it is not considered that any impacts to privacy would be so significant as to warrant refusal this application.

The application under consideration has been submitted with a view to meeting the needs of a disabled occupier. Saved UDP policy advises that the Council will consider on their merits exemptions to policies DC1.1-1.4 in the cases of application from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

For these reasons set out above, and on balance, and subject to planning conditions, it is considered that the proposal could be accommodated in this location on the basis that there are no undue overbearing adverse impacts from massing, nor would the proposal result in undue overlooking or loss of privacy, or unduly impact on the character and appearance of the Hinstock Crescent street scene. Moreover, it is considered that the proposed development responds positively to saved policy DC1 and policies SP1 and DM1, in that it would improve the living environment for the resident and thereby their well-being and continued occupation of the house, subject to conditions. It is however recommended that additional conditions are attached in the interest of privacy, restricting any further window or door openings, and ensuring that proposed materials are adhered to. It is also considered necessary that an informative in relation to restricting construction hours in order to safeguard residents in regard to noise from building processes is attached to any recommendation for planning approval.

Impact of works (Design and appearance) - The proposal represents a simple design form that responds to the character of the original house and the properties along the Hinstock Crescent street scene in terms of the proposed brick façade, and use of traditional materials. Additionally, the property is not within a designated area of special control such as a Conservation Area, or is it a Listed Building, or near a listed asset. It is therefore not considered that the development would undermine the residential character of the Hinstock Crescent due to the scale of the development, the quality of the proposed design and proposed materials. In addition, a condition has been included to relate the development to specified external facing materials.

Impact of works (Car parking) - The existing arrangement would be unaffected. Whilst acknowledging that the proposed development would still maintain three bedrooms (same as existing), the number of bedrooms could increase due to the provision of sensory rooms for the disabled occupiers. Based on the proposed use, it is not considered that this would lead to a significant increase in parking associated with the dwellinghouse to warrant the refusal of planning permission. Moreover, the property benefits from a driveway to the front of the dwelling which can accommodate two vehicles.

Impact of works (Waste management) - The proposed development would retain an access of approximately 805mm along the common shared boundary with no.14 Hinstock Crescent which would enable the storage of 140 litre bins (480mm in width) in the rear garden to be brought to the side of the kerb on collection days .

Terracing - As stated earlier in this report, although the proposed first floor side extension would wider than the previous planning permission, (reference number: 137980/FH/2023), the proposal has been designed as a subservient addition to the existing dwellinghouse in terms of its height and proportions; that it would maintain a set-back along the first floor front elevation and the proposed roof ridge has been set below the existing roof ridge. Furthermore, although the proposed first floor side extension would wider than the previous permission, it would still be set at right angles to no. 14 Hinstock Crescent, due the siting of both properties around the turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac. Therefore, a terracing effect would not result, based on the scheme under consideration.

Boundary Encroachment - The submitted plan indicate that the proposed development would be set off the boundaries with the neighbouring properties. This issue, however, is a civil matter.

Use of dwellinghouse as an HMO - Concerns raised in relation to the extended property being used in the future as an HMO have been noted and a condition regarding this matter is proposed to be attached to any recommendation for planning approval.

Objectors' comments - In terms of planning comments raised by the objector, these have been duly considered in the issues section above. Comments relating to civil matters, trespassing, shared ownership matters, boundary disputes, party wall issues and issues regulated by building control legislation would fall outside of planning legislation and therefore cannot be considered as part of this planning application.

Conclusion - For the reasons outlined above, and subject to planning conditions, it is considered that the proposed development responds positively to The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) chapters 8 and 12; policies SP1, DM1, EN1, EN19, T2 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and chapter 2 of the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007).

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

In assessing the merits of a planning application officers will seek to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. In this instance, the local planning authority had no issues to raise with the agent but have attached appropriate conditions to the approval.

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 and Site Plan with application site edged in red, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 19 April 2024.
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations, DRAWING No: NA-P01, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 19 April 2024.
- Proposed Floor Plans, DRAWING No: NA-P02, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 April 2024.
- Proposed Elevations, DRAWING No: NA-P03, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 April 2024.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans; pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and policies DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy (July 2012).

3) The external facing materials to be used on the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the primary dwellinghouse in terms of type, colour, texture, scale, pointing and coursing and as stated on the application form and approved drawings.

Reason - To ensure that 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 Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and Policies DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy (July 2012).

4) Prior to the commencement of development appropriate and comprehensive construction designs for the installation of a proprietary gas membrane, in order to alleviate any possibility of

landfill gas ingress to the building, shall be submitted for approval to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall then be implemented as part of the development.

Reason - the development site lies within 250 metres of a registered landfill site or in close proximity to a potential historical source of landfill gas pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City Manchester (1995).

5) In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas are encountered on the site at any time before the development is occupied during the watching brief, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until a report detailing what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Remediation Strategy), is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed Remediation Strategy. If no contamination is found, then a post-completion report shall be submitted to evidence this prior to occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason - To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety. Pursuant to policy EN18 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City Manchester (1995).

6) 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 development hereby approved other than those shown on:

- Proposed Floor Plans, DRAWING No: NA-P02, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 April 2024.
- Proposed Elevations, DRAWING No: NA-P03, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 April 2024.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995); and policy DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester (2012).

7) Before first occupation of the development thereby approved, the proposed window along the ground floor side elevation to serve the annotated "WETROOM" and as shown on: Proposed Floor Plans, DRAWING No: NA-P02; and Proposed Elevations, DRAWING No: NA-P03, both received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 April 2024; shall be obscurely 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 - In the interest of privacy and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), and policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995).

8) Before first occupation of the development thereby approved, the proposed 2no. windows along the first floor rear elevation to serve the annotated "M BEDROOM" and associated ensuite and as shown on: Proposed Floor Plans, DRAWING No: NA-P02; and Proposed Elevations, DRAWING No: NA-P03, both received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 April 2024; shall both be obscurely 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 - In the interest of privacy and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), and policy DC1 of the saved Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995).

9) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no part of the development shall be used for any purpose other than the purpose(s) of Class C3(a) of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason - In the exceptional circumstances of a proliferation of HMO's restricting housing choice and adversely affecting sustainability and in the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to policy 7.4 of the Guide to Development in Manchester: Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Informative

1) Construction/demolition works shall be confined to the following hours.

Monday - Friday: 7.30am - 6pm

Saturday: 8.30am - 2pm

Sunday / Bank holidays: No work

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

9 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
97 Chapman Street, Manchester, M18 8UA
95 Chapman Street, Manchester, M18 8UA
14 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
13 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
10 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
8 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
16 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
15 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
7 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
6 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
5 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU
11 Hinstock Crescent, Manchester, M18 8UU

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
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA