

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 137294/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 14 June 2023

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

Address: 24 Ormskirk Avenue, Manchester, M20 1HF

Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ismail

Agent (if any): Mr Jonathan Renshaw Ebrdesigns.com Ltd

Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 6th September 2023



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	12.07.2023
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 10 August 2023 Expired: 31 August 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

The site relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Old Moat area of Manchester. The property features large garden to the front and rear of the property. The property is surrounded by similar type properties some which have undergone enlargements in the past.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in character

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of single storey front and rear extension and part single part two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.



Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. One letter of objection has been received in respect of this application. Summary of comments below:

- The property would be overbearing and have a dominating effect on the neighbourhood
- The proposal would impact on privacy
- Overshadowing
- Impact on wildlife

Policy and Issues

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

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

Principle

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon

either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

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

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

History

There are no previous applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of single storey front and rear extension and part single part two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.

Concerns were initially raised by the City Council in relation to the front porch and its projection along the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property and overbearing impact within the street scene also a potential to provide terracing from the first-floor side extension. Other objections were raised by a local resident who shared those concerns. Following negotiations with the agent/applicant, the proposal was reduced from the front of the property including the front porch and a projection beyond the rear wall introduced at first floor.

Ground floor

The extension would be in line with the front wall of the house extending rearwards along the side of the property up to the shared boundary with no. 26 Ormskirk Avenue and wrapping around extending across the rear and up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 22 Ormskirk Avenue. Projection beyond the rear wall would measure 4.0m. It is noted that although there would be some overshadowing first thing in the morning, given the orientation, there would be no overshadowing or loss of light in the afternoon or early evening.

The roof at the rear would be flat with the inclusion of a large roof light and a mono pitch sloping roof on the front element. A garage door is proposed on the front with a door and bi folding doors proposed on the rear elevation leading into the garden. No windows are proposed along the side.

Whilst the proposed rearward projection would exceed the guidance set out with the City Councils Saved Policy DC1.3 (a), the overall ground floor rearward projection meets the criteria for prior approval of larger homes extensions if built independently.

First floor

The extension would be set back from the principle elevation of the property extending along the side with a projection beyond the rear wall measuring 2.0m. A gap would be retained to the shared boundary with no. 26 Ormskirk Avenue. The roof would be hipped in design reflecting the current roof form and would be set down from the original ridge height of the roof. Windows are proposed on the front and rear elevation, no windows are proposed along the side. It is considered that the windows to the front and rear elevations, would provide no further view than those of the existing front and rear windows.

Given the relationship to the adjacent property no. 22 Ormskirk Avenue, it is considered that there would be no terracing within the street scene. Therefore, the introduction of a two-storey extension in this location would provide minimal interruption to the street scene and is considered to be an acceptable addition.

Front porch

A porch measuring 1.0m in projection and 3.077m in width is proposed to the front of the property. The porch would be constructed in brick with a hipped roof.

It is not considered that the introduction of an extension to the side and rear and front porch would provide visual harm to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area. The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property and given that the building line is retained within the street is considered to be an acceptable addition. Furthermore, no comments or objections have been received from local residents notified of this application.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and are 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 be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. In terms of the proposed materials, it is intended to use matching bricks and tiles as specified in the application form. The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the side and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure.

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.

Bins

The storage of refuse bins are not affected by this proposal as access would still be available through the garage to the rear of the property and therefore would accord with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Car Parking

Off street car parking would be retained to the front of the property on the driveway and therefore would be unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

Although the proposal would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene, the character of the area is still retained. The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the existing property and is considered acceptable in this location, in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, or the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

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 - The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 drawing:-

Received 14th August 2023 numbered AO.3 Revision A Proposed Floor Plans

Received 9th August 2023 numbered A0.05 Revision A Proposed First Floor Plan and Elevations

Reason - To ensure 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 the application form in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

St Bernadettes Presbytery, Princess Road, Manchester, M20 1HH
22 Ormskirk Avenue, Manchester, M20 1HF
3 Ormskirk Avenue, Manchester, M20 1HF
26 Ormskirk Avenue, Manchester, M20 1HF
1 Ormskirk Avenue, Manchester, M20 1HF

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) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA