

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 137473/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 4 July 2023

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension following demolition of existing outrigger to form additional living accomodation.

Address: 66 Martindale Crescent, Manchester, M12 4WQ

Ward(s): Ardwick Ward

Applicant: Mr Mohammed Enam Shardar

Agent (if any): Mr Dominic Lim Team2Design

Case officer: Adam Mitchell
Tel: 0161 234 4165
Email: adam.mitchell@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: APPROVE

Date of recommendation: 24.08.2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 19 July 2023

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 12 July 2023 Expired: 2 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of Site/Area

The application site lies within a row of terraced properties within a residential area of Ardwick, Manchester. Martindale Crescent is characterised by dwelling houses with gardens situated to the front and rear. There are varying types of boundary treatment along the row, most of which allow access for off street car parking. The host property benefits from a modest sized rear garden. An existing single storey rear outrigger is attached to the original rear elevation.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature with houses of similar style and size.

Description of development

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing outrigger to form additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were notified however no responses were received.

Policy

The following policies are considered relevant to provide guidance and consideration to this application:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Saved policy DC1 of the UDP
- DM1, SP1, EN19 of the Manchester Core Strategy

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced. The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

Chapter 8: Promoting health and safe communities

91. Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: promote social inclusion, are safe and accessible and enable and support healthy lifestyles.

Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places

124: The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

A number of UDP policies have remained until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. The following remaining policies are considered relevant to this application:

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky (for example resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of original buildings);
- b. They do not create undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the council will not normally approve:

- a) rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12ft) in length
- b) 2 storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway
- c) 2 storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house
- d) flat roofed extensions to bungalows

Core Strategy

Manchester's Core Strategy was adopted on 11th July 2012 and is the Key Development Plan Document in the Local Development Framework. It states that all new developments should follow the 'Development Principles' and accord with the design guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Documents.

Policy SP 1 - Specifies the Core Development Principles for parts of the City. In this case the relevant principles relate to the extent to which the development:

- Makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including the creation of well-designed places that enhance or create character; making a positive contribution to the health, safety and well-being of residents,
- Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible;

Policy DM 1 Development Management- All development should have regard to the following specific issues for which more detailed guidance may be given within a supplementary planning document:

- Appropriate 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.

Policy EN19 Waste - Requires consideration of the submitted details relating to determine if the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated how: -Both construction and demolition waste will be minimised and recycled on site wherever possible; -The sustainable waste management needs of the end user will be met.

Policy DM1 - Requires that consideration is given to the particular circumstances of each proposal to determine the appropriate levels of car parking have been proposed.

Issues

Principle

The submitted application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension. This is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to alter and extend their homes rather than move in order to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring's properties' residential amenity. As the property is to remain a single family dwellinghouse it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any significant additional waste or car parking pressures.

Residential and Visual Amenity

The proposed single storey side extension has approx. dimensions of Height 2.9m x Width 5.6m x Depth 4m. The extension would run alongside the shared boundaries with no.64 and 68 Martindale Crescent.

As outlined above the extension would replace the existing single storey rear outrigger and would cover the full width of the existing property and as such the host tenant have served notice on both adjoining properties. The proposed extension will replace the existing boundary treatment along the northern boundary however given the single storey nature of the extension and the acceptable depth of the proposal it is not considered to create an over dominate feature along the boundary. Further, no windows would be inserted along the northern elevation and as such would not give rise to any overlooking or privacy implications.

Given the orientation of the properties along Martindale Crescent's streetscene, it is anticipated that some additional shadowing impacts would be present along the neighbouring property however this will be alleviated during the afternoon and evening sun and is not considered significant residential amenity to warrant a refusal.

The extension would run alongside the southern boundary with no.68 Martindale Crescent however the existing boundary treatment will be retained and with their existing outrigger footprint, the proposal is not expected to contribute to an overbearing feature along this boundary. The extension would protrude past the outrigger by 1.85metres and it is deemed an acceptable addition to the host property.

It should be noted that the depth of the extension exceeds the recommended length outlined in the Saved UDP Policy (DC1.3), however some element of the proposal could be achieved under the Large Homes Prior Approval application, it is not considered that the extension's depth of 4 metres would be significant to warrant a refusal.

The proposed fenestration elements are in keeping with the existing fenestration in the property in terms of visual amenity and appear to be acceptable to the character of the property. The new fenestration elements are situated along the rear overlooking the rear garden. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in design terms and would not have any adverse impact on the character of the property or surrounding area and would maintain existing privacy levels of neighbouring properties.

Overall, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on visual and residential amenity. It is designed to be subservient to the main dwelling and is of relatively modest scale which does not amount to an overdevelopment when seen in the local context.

Design and Appearance

It is not considered that the proposed development would unduly harm the character of the building or the general area. The roof profile constitutes a flat roof for the single storey rear which adds a contemporary feel to the proposal. The extension's footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property.

The materials of the extension will match the existing. Although it is recommended a materials condition is attached to ensure that the materials are adhered to, pursuant with the requirements of Core Strategy DM1, EN1 and SP1 and saved UDP Policy DC1.

Waste Management

The proposed development would not affect the existing bin management strategy.

Car Parking

The proposed development would not affect the existing car parking arrangements, due to the existing hardstanding area dimensions at the front of the property being too small to allow off street car parking therefore, the existing car parking arrangements will be continued.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable in this location, in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing occupiers to adapt their homes to meet their residential 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 reasons above, the proposal is unlikely to have any detrimental impact and therefore accords with saved UDP policy DC1 and policies SP1 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 to guide the application through all the stages of the planning process and resolve any issues that arose in dealing with the 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 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 following drawings and documents: Local plan and drawings numbers:

Drawing- Location Plan

Drawing- Plans ref. 01

Drawing- Elevations ref. 02

All stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 04 July 2023

Reason- To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies SP1, and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

- 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) 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 extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved plans.

Reason- In the interest of residential amenity pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 and DM1.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

62 Martindale Crescent, Manchester, M12 4WQ
16 Edlin Close, Manchester, M12 4WG
68 Martindale Crescent, Manchester, M12 4WQ
21 Edlin Close, Manchester, M12 4WG
72 Martindale Crescent, Manchester, M12 4WQ
70 Martindale Crescent, Manchester, M12 4WQ
64 Martindale Crescent, Manchester, M12 4WQ

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