

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 136533/FH/2023
Date registered valid: 20 March 2023
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension with associated raised terraced area.
Address: 21 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Molloy
Agent (if any): Mr Jack Cannon Whitebox Architecture Ltd
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 15th May 2023



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application	
Development type:	Householder	
Date of site visit:	19 April 2023	
Standard consultations:	Printed: 4 April 2023	Expired: 25 April 2023
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 4 April 2023	Expired: 25 April 2023
Site notice	Posted: 19 April 2023	Expired: 10 May 2023
Press advert	Published: 11 April 2023	Expired: 2 May 2023
Departure from Development Plan:	No	
Environmental Statement:	Not required	

Description of site/building

The site relates to a large detached 3 storey property located within the Didsbury West ward area of Manchester. The property which features period characteristics has large brick bays with Tudor style projecting gables. The entrance to the property is recessed with decorative timber canopy set between the brick bays. The property sits within a large plot bounded by a brick wall to the front and brick walls to the side boundaries shared with Elmwood Lodge and no. 23 Parkfield Road South. Situated along the rear boundary is timber fencing.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Blackburn Park Conservation Area 1979
Tree Preservation Order:	NA

Description of area

Parkfield Road South is a residential street situated within the Blackburn Park Conservation Area of Manchester in the Didsbury West ward. Blackburn Park Conservation Area was first designated in 1979 and predominantly consists of mainly large, detached garden fronted properties, many which have been extended over the years.

Description of development

The proposal will see the erection of a single storey rear extension with associated raised terraced area.



Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1. Two letters of objection from a local resident – summary of comments as follows:

- Our neighbour recently (with permission) felled several mature trees and grubbed up the borders of his/her garden, removing some mitigating natural screening.
- Now they wish to construct a huge decking area which will stand four foot high in the garden. The land falls away as it goes into the middle of our estate making something 4 foot high at 21 become five high from our perspective. The owner of 21 could have decking at ground level without even needing planning permission, yet they are seeking something which is 400% high that that which would usually be required.
- We have a five foot wall between, but this will only shield the ankles and calves only of someone sitting on a chair on this decking. They will tower above our bedrooms and lounges and be able to observe everything we do.
- Because our flats have a horseshoe construction incoming noise rebounds and echoes. Any noise generated on this terrace will travel further if it is generated higher. If people were sitting in their garden at a usual level, then the wall would screen out some of the sound. If it is built we will not have recourse to the licencing regulations that govern licensed premises, yet someone have late night BBQs could make getting up for work (6.00 for a lot of our residents) an absolute misery.
- If the proposal is agreed, I think that there should a restriction placed on it that this should not be used after 21.00 if the property is used for short term lets.
- Any mitigation needs to consider baffling noise as well as maintaining privacy. I would also argue that the use of decking by a family would be significantly different if the property ever had commercial use and that for the avoidance of any doubt any granting of planning permission should contain a proviso limiting commercial use.
- Blackburn Park Conservation Society – No comments received in respect of this application
- Local members
- Councillor Deborah Hilal - I am objecting in support of my residents on Elmwood Lodge as the proposed decking area over 4 ft in height in the garden will overlook their properties and impact on their privacy it will tower above their bedrooms and lounges and anyone using the decking will be able to see into their properties - they have no option to enter

another room for privacy. If the decking were to proceed it would be necessary for them to purchase blinds and keep them closed to ensure their privacy. This is not acceptable.

- There is a five foot wall between 21 Parkfield and the flats but this will shield the ankles and calves only of someone sitting on a chair on this decking
- As the flats have a horse shoe construction incoming noise rebounds and echoes. One neighbour actually thought that noise from the building works at 21 were on Elmwood Lodge es because of the way the noise travels. Any noise generated on this terrace will travel further if it is generated higher up whereas if people were sitting in their garden at a usual level then the wall would screen out some of the sound.
- Due to the the impact on privacy and noise generated from this higher decking I ask this application is rejected.
- Councillor John Leech – is not commenting on the application, however, has forwarded comments from a local resident. In addition, asked if a condition for hours of use for the outside space could be attached.
- Please see the email from my constituent, regarding the application for 21 Parkfield Road South. Just to confirm, that I have explained to Frances that I am on the committee, and therefore I am forwarding her objection without commenting on the merits or otherwise of the application.
- I would be grateful if you could confirm whether it would (if deemed appropriate) be possible to include a condition relating to hours of use of the outside space, if the property was being used as a short term let?

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 DC18 for Conservation Areas
- 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 3 Heritage
- o Policy EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (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 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) 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 (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

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

Previous applications relating to the site as follows:

135660/TCA/2022 - No objection - 22.02.2023 Works to trees - proposed removal of 2x Sycamore trees (T1, T2) and prune Holly and Laurel group (G1) and mitigation replanting,

120890/TCA/2018 - No objection - 17.09.2018 Work to trees - proposed felling of self seeded trees in G1

113359/TCA/2016 - Application Approved - 06.09.2016 Works to trees - proposed felling of an Ash and Silver Birch (G1) within front garden and proposed pruning works to reduce the lateral branch of the Sycamore (T1) in rear garden to provide a 2m clearance and remove the overhanging branches from the Plum (T2) back to the boundary wall, - this Plum tree situated in neighbours garden at 23 Parkfield Rd South

084590/TCA/2007/S2 - Application Approved - 10.10.2007 NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO CARRY OUT WORKS TO TREES WITHIN BLACKBURN PARK CONSERVATION AREA - Works to 1 Sycamore tree

Residential Amenity

The proposal will see the erection of a single storey rear extension with associated raised terraced area. Objections have been received from a local member and residents with concerns regarding the height of the raised decking, loss of privacy, overlooking, noise generated and commercial use. The City Council raised these concerns with the applicant and following receipt of amended plans, is satisfied that concerns relating to loss of privacy have been addressed.

In terms of noise generated, the City Council expects that noise emitted from the residential use of the property would be of a nature and scale which would be consistent with the prevailing residential character of the area. The property is a large, detached property with sizeable private amenity space. The proposed enlargement and terrace subject of this application are not considered to give rise to significantly differing or greater scale of impacts than the existing situation that would justify a refusal of the application or addition of specific conditions to limit the use of the external spaces. Furthermore, should the property be used for a commercial use in the future, planning permission would be required for such a use.

Single storey rear extension

The extension would project off the rear wall measuring 1.65m with a width across the rear wall of 11.6m approximately and a height measuring 4.0m. The extension would accommodate an enlarged kitchen and family room. Given the nature of the use, the City Council considers that the extension is acceptable, particularly its limited projection.

Rear raised terrace

The applicant proposes to create a raised terraced area which would project off the rear extension measuring a total of 4.8m with the addition of stairs leading to the rear garden area.

To ensure that there is no overlooking or loss of privacy given by the introduction of a raised terrace, a condition has been attached for privacy screens to run in line with the projection of the terrace comprising timber slats. Given the existing boundary treatment together with the distance to these boundaries and the inclusion of privacy screens, it is not anticipated that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by raised patio.

The extension and raised terrace would not be visible from the public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene, however, the character of the area is retained although houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended; therefore, the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area and would not provide a domineering and harmful outlook on the occupiers of the adjoining properties. Therefore, it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not provide a significant impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers and surrounding properties in the area and therefore is considered accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and SP1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Siting, scale and massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house, is not excessively large or bulky and are therefore considered to accord with the principles set out in saved UDP policies DC1 and accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The proposal is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to Brick timber cladding Flat roof with zinc/aluminium fascia 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 properties at either 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.

Impact on the Blackburn Park Conservation Area

The proposal is considered to provide less than substantial harm that is outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.

The proposal would be located in a suitable position and would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the conservation area. Material choice would be an acceptable selection for the conservation area.

On balance, it is believed that the proposal would enhance the character of the Conservation Area which is considered accords with Core Strategy Policy EN3 and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC18.

Waste management

The storage of bins are not affected by this proposal as adequate space is still retained to the rear. Therefore the bins would be screened from within the street scene which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

Parking

Current parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal 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.

For the above reasons, the proposal is unlikely to have any detrimental impact and therefore accords with saved UDP policies DC1 and DC18 and policies SP1, EN3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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

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

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Received on 20th March 2023 numbered 001 Proposed Site Plan

Received on 20th March 2023 numbered 006 Proposed Basement Plan

Received on 15th May 2023 numbered 007 Revision A Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Received on 20th March 2023 numbered 008 Proposed First Floor Plan

Received on 20th March 2023 numbered 009 Proposed Second Floor Plan

Received on 15th May 2023 numbered 010 Revision A Proposed Front and Rear Elevation

Received on 15th May 2023 numbered 011 Revisions A Proposed Side Elevations

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the 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.

4) The privacy screen as detailed within the submitted drawings received on 15th May 2023 numbered 010 Revision A, 011 Revision A and 007 Revision A shall be installed prior to the first use of the raised terraced area and be retained in perpetuity.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies DM1, and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Blackburn Park Conservation Society

Flat 5, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 23, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 21, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 20, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 17, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 15, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 13, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 9, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 7, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 6B, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 6A, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 4, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 3, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 2, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 1, 23 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

14 Pine Road, Manchester, M20 6UY

Flat 24, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 22, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 19, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 18, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 16, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 14, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 12, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 11, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 8, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

Flat 10, Elmwood Lodge, 17 Parkfield Road South, Manchester, M20 6DB

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

Conservation Area - Blackburn Park Conservation Area 1979

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA