MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	138934/FH/2024
Date registered valid:	2 January 2024
Proposal:	Erection of a first floor side extension and a part single/part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation; erection of a roof extension with associated dormers to the side and rear.
Address:	95 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PU
Ward(s):	Whalley Range Ward
Applicant:	Mr. Basharat Hussain
Agent (if any):	Mr. Niamat Ali NA Design
Case officer:	Joshua Lee Tel: 0161 219 2851 Email: joshua.lee@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: **01/02/2024**

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 31/01/2024

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 10 January 2024 Expired: 31 January 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 proposal relates to a detached dwellinghouse on Springbridge Road. The property features existing rear extensions and a conservatory. The property features hardstanding to the front, for off street parking and landscaping to the rear.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable



Figure 1. Street scene



Figure 2. Rear elvation

Description of area

The property is in a mostly residential part of the Whalley Range ward of Manchester. Directly adjacent to the property is William Hulme Grammar School and associated grounds.



Description of development

The applicant is proposing the erection of a first-floor side extension and a part single/part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation; erection of a roof extension with associated dormers to the side and rear.

Planning History

Pre-application advice

The applicant sought pre-application advice from the LPA. The office advised:

“There is an issue with the massing that the proposal would add to the property which is out of character with the area and effect the street scene… the size and scale of the addition to the roof makes the property a defacto 3 floor property which sits out of place within the character of the street scene…the property already has significant extensions, and any further extensions will need to be modest”

137787/FH/2023
Description: Erection of a first floor side and rear extension; erection of extensions to roof, including raising the roof height with associated dormer to the side and erection of gables features to the front and rear elevations
Decision: Refuse 20/09/2023

110273/FH/2015/S1
Description: Erection of dormer to both sides and rear to form additional living accommodation
Decision: Refuse

Consultations & Notification Responses

Consultations

We did not consult any consultees on this proposal.

Notifications

Local Residents

As stated in Appendix 1, people who live near the area were told about the proposal.

No one commented, objected, or gave their opinion on this application.

Policies & Principle

Summary of relevant policy

Applications for planning permission must be assessed against the local development plan, unless there are important reasons not to, as stated in planning law.

In considering this application, we consider the following policies relevant.

Local

- The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 The City Council adopted the core strategy on July 11, 2012. It is the key document in the Manchester Local Plan. The plan determines how Manchester will grow and is used to review development applications. We consider the following Core Strategy Policies relevant to this proposal.
    - DM 1 - Development Management
    - SP 1 - Spatial Principles
    - EN 1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The Core Strategy replaced most of the UDP. However, some UDP Development Control policies are still in effect. The following extant policy are still considered relevant to this proposal.
    - DC1 - Residential Extensions

Regional

- Places for Everyone Plan - The Places for Everyone Plan is a strategic plan for nine of the 10 boroughs in Greater Manchester. Once Manchester adopts the Places for Everyone Plan, it will become part of the city's development plan.

National

- The National Planning Policy Framework (The NPPF) - The Government released the NPPF on March 27, 2012, and updated it on September 5, 2023. Here, you can find the government's planning policies for England. It also explains how to apply them. We consider the following sections relevant to this proposal.
    - Section 4 – Decision-making
    - Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Principle of the development

Residents can usually expand their homes for more space, as long as it doesn't affect the neighbourhood or property's character.

The proposal's principle is unacceptable. There are several factors in amenity terms that would warrant refusal.

After careful consideration, it is concluded that the proposed development opposes the Manchester Core Strategy, Extant UDP, and the NPPF. This conclusion is based on the assessment in the sections that follow.

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan (2012-2027)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Core Strategy.

DM 1 – Development Management

New developments must adhere to the 'Development Principles' and design guidance in the Supplementary Planning Documents.

We have assessed the proposal against the following issues.

Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials, and detail

The applicant is seeking the erection of a first-floor side extension and a part single/part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation: erection of a roof extension with associated dormers to the side and rear.

The new addition raises the roof height of the property, out of line with the existing line of dwellinghouses and out of character with the street scene.

Taken overall the proposal and existing extensions considerably increases the scale and massing of the property from the original dwellinghouse and any form of subservience is removed.

Officers consider the new development to be unacceptable in its siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials, and detail.

Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale, and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

The size, scale and massing of the proposal, in particular raising the roof height, is out of character with the row of houses along Springbridge Road.

Although the property is detached it has been designed to blend with the row of semidetached dwellings and the proposal would change the features of the house to sit out of line with the design of the houses.

In general, the proposed development has an impact on the surrounding areas. The design, scale, and appearance oppose the development management principle.

Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation.

The proposal adds 1no window in the front of the building. It doesn't affect privacy much because there are other windows to this elevation.

The proposal includes adding large glass doors at the back of the building. The design of the boundary and its distance help reduce privacy concerns.

The proposal adds a side dormer with a window facing into a neighbouring property. The projection and height would create overlooking concerns.

The proposal is expected to have a negligible effect on Air Quality.

The proposal in of itself has a negligible effect on local noise levels. We understand that demolition and construction can be loud and disruptive to the local residents. Contractors should use construction guidance to reduce emissions and minimize disruptions for residents.

The proposal has no effect on road safety and traffic generation.

Overall, the proposal has an impact on privacy, light, noise, air quality, and other factors. So, it opposes this principle of development management.

Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes.

The proposal does not change how people can get in and out of the building.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with this development management principle.

Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.

The proposal adds massing to the property which would create and imbalance between internal and external accommodation.

This opposes the development management principle.

Refuse storage and collection.

The proposal itself has little impact on waste from the site. It uses the current storage and collection methods on site. We recognize that demolition and/or construction works often generate commercial waste. We expect contractors to follow best practices in waste management.

The proposal is in accordance with this development management principle.

Vehicular access and car parking

The proposal doesn't change how vehicles access and park at the property, so it follows the development management principle.

Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage

The applicant and consultees did not find any contamination or stability issues at the site.

The proposal does not sit within a Conservation Area or near a designated heritage asset.

On balance the proposal has minimal effect on local biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage and is therefore in accordance with this development management principle.

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private

The dwelling benefits from a garden beyond the siting of the proposed development.

The proposal would minimally affect green infrastructure and would balance new development with existing green space.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with this development management principle.

Flood risk and drainage.

The site is not located in a flood risk area and therefore does not require a flood statement or assessment.

The proposal has a negligible impact on drainage using the existing drainage on site.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with this development management principle.

SP 1 - Spatial Principles

This policy outlines the guiding spatial principles and core development principles of Manchester City Council.

Most notably the core development principles highlight development should ‘make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice’.

We consider this proposal to oppose the principles of this policy.

EN 1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas

This policy outlines the key design principles for development in Manchester. All development in Manchester will be expected to follow the seven principles of urban design.

This proposal sits within the ‘Southern Character Area’.

We consider this proposal to oppose the principles of this policy.

Extant Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

The Core Strategy replaced most of the UDP, but some UDP policies still apply to this proposal.

DC1 - Residential Extensions

This policy outlines the key issues when considering proposed residential extensions.

We consider this proposal to oppose the principles of this policy.

Places for Everyone Plan

The 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. Once the Places for Everyone Plan is adopted it will form part of Manchester’s development plan.

To date, five consultations have taken place in relation on the Plan. The Examination of Plan, following its submission in February 2022, began in November 2022. Following the completion of the Examination of the Plan, main modifications have now been proposed which will now become the subject of further public consultation.

The City Council's Executive agreed the Main Modification on 4 October 2023 and endorsed an 8-week period of public consultation on the Main Modifications commencing no earlier than 9 October 2023.

Any representations will be forwarded to the Examination team managing the Plan. The Inspectors will consider all representations on the proposed Modifications before finalising the examination report.

Given the stage the Plan has reached, and level of public consultation and scrutiny it has received, 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.

We consider this proposal to oppose the principles of this policy.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework explains the government's planning policies for England. It also explains how to use these policies.

At all stages of the application, we have adhered to and considered the NPPF.

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 4 of the NPPF outlines how local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way.

Section 4 of the NPPF has been adhered to and considered at all stages of the proposal.

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 12 of the NPPF outlines the need to achieve well-designed places.

We consider this proposal to oppose the principles of this policy.

Other Material Considerations

Other material considerations & policy may be relevant to the proposal as follows:

- Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (April 2007)
- Manchester Residential Quality Guide (July 2016) (MRQG)
- Manchester, Salford, and Trafford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Manchester City Council Highways Developer Design Guidance – Sustainable Drainage Systems
- Manchester City Council Planning and Noise Technical Guidance (2022)
- Air Quality & Planning Technical Guidance (2022)
- Planning and Contaminated Land Technical Guidance (2021)
- Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document (GMJWDPD)
- Waste Storage and Collection Guidance for New Developments (2017)
- Hot Food Takeaway Supplementary Planning Document (2017)
- Manchester City Council Houses in Multiple Occupation Guidance and Amenity Standards (2020)
- Manual for Streets (2007)
- National design guide & National Model Design Code (2021)
- Outdoor advertisements and signs: a guide for advertisers (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 polices 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.

Conclusion

The design, size, and shape of the proposal are not acceptable in this area. This proposal will cause problems for the people nearby and change the look of the street. The proposal will have a harmful impact. It goes against the Core Strategy, UDP, NPPF policies, and other considerations.

Recommendation: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

The officers worked with the applicant to find solutions for problems with the planning application. There were problems with the application, so the officer talked to the applicant and others. But they couldn't agree on a solution.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. **Visual Amenity**

Due to its design, scale and massing (notably the raising of roof height) the proposal would result in an overly dominant and visually obtrusive feature within the area, to the detriment of the general character of the property and the visual amenity of the area within which it is situated. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM 1, SP 1, and EN 1 of the Core Strategy, Policy DC1 of the Extant UDP and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. **Overbearing massing**

Due to its design, scale, and massing, in particular the side dormer extension, the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent properties in the area to the detriment of the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM 1, SP 1, and EN 1 of the Core Strategy, Policy DC1 of the Extant UDP and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

1 Gildridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PS
William Hulmes Grammar School Academy, Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PR
97 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PU
99 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PU
5 Gildridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PS
4 Gildridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PS
3 Gildridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PS
2 Gildridge Road, Manchester, M16 8PS

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA