

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 136941/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 26 July 2023

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear and front porch extension together with the erection of a single storey rear outbuilding

Address: 154 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TS

Ward(s): Chorlton Park Ward

Applicant: Ms Wan Koon Chau

Agent (if any): Mr Gooding, LDM Group

Case officer: Holly Wright
Tel: 0161 219 6381
Email: holly.wright@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 19 September 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 31 August 2023

Standard consultations: Printed: 14 August 2023 Expired: 4 September 2023

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 14 August 2023 Expired: 4 September 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of redbrick and white render with a red concrete tile hipped roof. The property features white uPVC windows, including a two-storey bay and first-floor bay to the front and a two-storey bay to the rear, a large, paved driveway, single storey rear outrigger, and a detached outbuilding situated within a spacious rear garden.



Figure 1. Principal elevation.



Figure 2. Rear elevation.



Figure 3. Rear view.



Figure 4. Rear garden.

Description of area

Brantingham Road is a residential street situated within the Chorlton Park ward of Manchester, close to St Margaret's Sports Fields, Maine Road Football Club, and Wilbraham Road (A6010). The area is primarily residential in terms of its character, consisting of semi-detached residential properties, and benefits from its proximity to public outdoor amenity and green spaces.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear and front porch extension together with the erection of a single storey rear outbuilding.

Planning History

130619/FH/2021 - Erection of single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation – **APPROVED** (04.08.2021).

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – no comments or objections received.

Flood Risk Management made no objection to the proposal, requesting an informative note be attached to the decision notice.

Policies

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

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 – Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy – Development Plan Document 2012-2027 (“the Core Strategy”) was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012:

- Policy DM1 – Development Management
- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy EN1 – Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- Policy EN19 - Waste

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021)

- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered that the proposal accords with the principles of these policy documents.

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 and DC1.4 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 – the principle of erecting a single storey rear and front porch extension together with a single storey rear outbuilding in order to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes to meet changing household needs rather than move. The principle of the proposal therefore accords with policy DC1 of the UDP; however, consideration must be given to the development's siting, scale and massing, appearance, and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity, waste storage, and parking.

Siting, scale, and massing – the single storey rear extension would be sited at the back of the property, adjoining the existing single storey outrigger, facing north. It would project 4m from the rear elevation of the host dwellinghouse, with a width of 6.187m, and a flat roof height of 2.462m. A gap of 0.15m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.152 Brantingham Road and a gap of 1.158m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.156 Brantingham Road.

The front porch extension would create a new entrance to the property, facing south onto Brantingham Road. It would project 1.37m frontwards, with a width of 2.433m, a hipped roof height of 3.076m and an eaves height of 2.2m. A gap of 3.903m to the boundary shared with No.152 Brantingham Road and a gap of 1.161m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.156 Brantingham Road.

The detached outbuilding would be situated within the northeast corner of the rear garden. It would measure to 4m in length / depth and 7m in width with a dual pitch roof height of 3m and an eaves height of 2.406m. It would be sited 0.06m away from the boundary shared with No.99 Manley Road, 0.173 from the boundary shared with No.152 Brantingham Road, and 3.325m from the boundary shared with No.156 Brantingham Road.

The 4m rearward projection (of the rear extension) exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3.65m), however is considered acceptable given that general permitted development regulations allow single storey rear extensions up to 6m (for semi-detached dwellinghouses), through a prior approval process and in the absence of objections, as in this case. Moreover, all three of the developments are considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of their dimensions and would not result in 'excessively large or bulky' additions to the property.

The proposal therefore accords with policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Appearance and visual amenity – the rear extension would be built of brickwork and uPVC windows and doors to match the existing with a flat roof. Its side elevations would be blank, whilst its rear elevation would feature one window.

The front porch extension would be built of brickwork, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows and doors to match the existing. Its front elevation would feature one window, whilst its side elevation, facing No.152 Brantingham Road, would feature one window. Its side elevation facing No.156 Brantingham Road would feature one outward-opening door.

The detached outbuilding would also be built of brickwork, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows and doors to match the existing. Its northern and eastern elevations would be blank, whilst its western elevation, facing No.156 Brantingham Road, would feature two windows and a set of outward-opening doors. Its southern elevation, facing the host dwellinghouse, would feature one window.

The proposal is relatively standard in terms of its design and scale for developments of this type and would be in-keeping with the existing precedent of residential extensions in this locale. Its use of matching materials should also provide a blended appearance with the host dwellinghouse, ensuring that the developments do not form prominent visual features within the street scene or public realm. Hence, the overall character of the property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The design and appearance of the proposed developments therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 as well as chapter 12 of the NPPF as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Residential amenity – given that the rear extension would be single storey, with a maximum flat roof height of 2.462m and sited to the north of the host dwellinghouse (within its shadow), it is believed that the extension should not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. Moreover, its blank side elevations should also ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupants is not compromised.

Similarly, given that the front porch extension would be single storey, with a minor frontward projection and with large gaps to the shared boundaries maintained, this aspect of the proposal should also not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor would it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. Moreover, though its eastern side

elevation would feature a window, this is sited a considerable distance away from the shared boundary and, as such, should not infringe upon the privacy of neighbouring occupants.

Lastly, given that the detached outbuilding would be single storey, sited at the northeastern corner of the rear garden, with a maximum roof height of 3m, the extension should not cause issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. Moreover, though its western side elevation would feature two windows, these would be sited a considerable distance away from the shared boundary and, as such, should not infringe upon the privacy of neighbouring occupants.

In addition, no objections have been received in relation to the proposal's potential to affect residential amenity.

The proposal therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 due to its minimal impact upon residential amenity.

Waste storage – the current waste storage arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal.

Parking – the current parking arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal as sufficient space would be retained on the existing driveway (at least 2.4m by 4.8m) so as to allow for the parking of at least one car.

Flood Risk Management – made no objection to the proposal, requesting an informative note be attached to the decision notice.

Other matters – the proposal also includes the installation of a new door along the western side elevation of the existing rear outrigger. This alteration is considered acceptable given its minimal impact upon visual and residential amenity.

Conclusion – given the above issues, it is considered that the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity as well as waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with policy DC1 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, EN1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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. Minor issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the agent to reach a satisfactory resolution.

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 permission.

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

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

- 'Planning Drawings (Proposed)', numbered 'A01-B REV H', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 29th August 2023.

- 'Planning Drawings (Proposed Outbuilding)', numbered 'A01-C REV H', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 29th August 2023.

-‘Flood Risk Assessment’, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 13th July 2023.

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 of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwellinghouse 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 extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2, and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) The developments as shown on approved plans ‘A01-B REV H’ and ‘A01-C REV H’, stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 29th August 2023, shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as No.154 Brantingham Road, M21 0TS.

Reason - To ensure the proposed use remains ancillary to the principle use on the site. In the interest of residential amenity, in accordance with the policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Informatives

1) As per the FRA, the proposed site is within Flood Zone 1-2, floor levels should be set no lower than existing floor levels of the existing property.

The site is within Flood Zone 1-2. The applicant is encouraged to consider signing up for Environment Agency Flood Warnings - <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>

The applicant should design and construct drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. We recommend considering green SuDS components to mitigate for any loss of permeable area.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

156 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TS

Playing Field Next To 185, Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TT

99 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WE

185 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TT

103 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WE

101 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WE

97 Manley Road, Manchester, M16 8WE

158 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TS

152 Brantingham Road, Manchester, M21 0TS

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) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA