

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 137182/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 23 June 2023

Proposal: Erection of front porch following demolition of existing together with replacement roof to existing garage and associated elevational alterations

Address: 82 Bankside Road, Manchester, M20 5GD

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Chris Sidebottom

Agent (if any): Mr Andrew Wilson, Cameron Wilson Project Services Limited

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 14 August 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 07 July 2023

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 3 July 2023 Expired: 24 July 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 with hanging tile at first-floor level along its principal elevation and a grey composite clay tile dual pitch roof. The property features white uPVC windows, including a ground floor bay to the front, a front porch, a driveway, a small front garden, a single storey side extension / attached garage, a conservatory extension and a small rear garden.



Figure 1. Principal elevation of property.



Figure 2. Existing attached garage.



Figure 3. Rear elevation of property.



Figure 4. Existing windows along the side elevation of garage.

Description of area

Bankside Road is a residential street situated within the Didsbury East ward of Manchester, close to the River Mersey, Manchester Outer Ring Road (M60), and Millgate Fields. 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 front porch following demolition of existing together with replacement roof to existing garage and associated elevational alterations.

Planning History

No previous planning history.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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

Flood Risk Management recommended that the following conditions be attached to the decision notice:

“No development shall commence until a flood risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may take the abbreviated form of a desktop-study flood risk statement (FRS). For the avoidance of doubt, as per the government standing advice, the assessment must include the following:

- A description of your development.
- An assessment of the flood risk from all sources (such as: fluvial, surface water, groundwater, sewer, reservoir and canal) of flooding for your development (this does not require bespoke hydraulic modelling and may be based on data obtained freely via an Environment Agency data request and opensource data on the DEFRA and government platforms). *Note this should include publicly available maps where applicable.*
- Identification of any historic flood events on site or within close proximity to the site.
- The estimated flood level for your development (the estimated flood level is a river flood level with a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability, plus an allowance for climate change). The estimated flood level may be obtained freely from the Environment Agency.
- Provide a plan showing the finished floor levels (FFLs) and the estimated flood levels. FFLs should take into consideration predicted flood levels and should be set to an appropriate level, this may be either no lower than existing internal FFLs of the adjoining dwelling or 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level. All levels should be in mAOD.
- If you cannot raise FFLs 300 mm above the estimated flood level, you should demonstrate flood resilience and resistance measures in your design. Use the following guidance: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice#extra-flood-resistance-and-resilience-measures>

- Consideration of flood safety measures (such as signing up for EA flood warnings) and evacuation plans where required.
- Any supporting plans and drawings.
- See <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice> for further guidance on preparing your documents and obtaining the required data.

Reason: To ensure that the development is not at an increased risk of flooding (from various sources) and that the appropriate flood resilience and resistance measures have been implemented on site where required."

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 front porch following the demolition of the existing together with a replacement garage roof and associated elevational alterations 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 front porch extension would create a new entrance at the property, facing Bankside Road, replacing the existing porch. It would project 1.5m from the current principal elevation, with a width of 2.42m, mono pitch roof height of 3.287m and an eaves height of 2.426m. A gap of 2.848m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.80 Bankside Road and a gap of 4.158m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.84 Bankside Road.

Overall, it is considered that the dimensions detailed above would not result in an ‘excessively large or bulky addition to the property’, thus according with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appearance and visual amenity – the front porch extension would be built of brickwork, roof tiles, and windows to match the existing. The side elevations of the extension would be blank, whilst its front elevation would feature one window and one inward-opening door.

The proposal is considered to be relatively standard in terms of its design and would be in-keeping with the overall precedent of residential extensions in this area. The porch would utilise materials that would either be in-keeping or subservient to those already present at the property and should therefore avoid forming a visually prominent feature within the street scene. Hence, the overall character of the property and its surrounding area should not be unduly harmed by these works.

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

Residential amenity – given that the porch would be single storey, sited west of the host dwellinghouse and at a considerable distance away from the plot's shared boundaries, it is believed that the proposal would not result in issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. Its blank side elevations should also ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers is not compromised.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in regard to its minimal effect upon residential amenity as it accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

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

Parking – though the front porch would slightly reduce the current dimensions of the driveway, this is acceptable as adequate space would be retained for at least one car (i.e., 2.4m by 4.8m).

Flood Risk – the application sites lies within Flood Zone 2 and an EA Flood Warning Area.

As such, the Flood Risk Management team have recommended that a pre-commencement condition, requiring the applicant to submit a flood risk assessment prior to any development, be attached to the decision notice.

However, in these circumstances, attaching the aforementioned condition is believed to be unnecessary and excessive as the submitted plans and supporting information indicate that the floor level of the proposed (replacement) porch is to be consistent with the floor level of the existing porch. Moreover, the proposed porch would be relatively minor in terms of its scale of development and would feature an access / egress point along its front elevation, thus ensuring the retention of adequate emergency evacuation routes in the event of a flood.

The proposal is therefore understood as complying with the Government's standing advice and policy EN14 of the Core Strategy.

Other matters – the proposal also includes the replacement of the existing roof of the attached garage extension. The replacement roof would be slightly sloped and sited approximately 0.3m above the existing position, in line with the existing parapet wall to the front. This alteration is considered acceptable given its minimal impact upon visual and residential amenity.

The proposal also includes the replacement of the two ground floor windows sited along the southern elevation of the attached garage, along the shared boundary. The replacement

windows would be sited approximately 0.3m higher than the existing and have been conditioned to be obscurely glazed so as to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion – given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance and visual amenity, residential amenity, 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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

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 documents labelled:

- 'PROPOSED PLANS', numbered 'CS/ED/PROPL/0223 REV C', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 23rd June 2023.
- 'PROPOSED EXTERNAL ELEVATIONS', numbered 'CS/ED/PRO/EL/0223 REV D', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 23rd June 2023.

Reason - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and supporting documents, 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) Before first occupation, the proposed ground floor windows in the side elevation facing No.80 Bankside Road shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

84 Bankside Road, Manchester, M20 5GD
80 Bankside Road, Manchester, M20 5GD
24 Farlands Drive, Manchester, M20 5GB
45 Bankside Road, Manchester, M20 5QE
43 Bankside Road, Manchester, M20 5QE

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
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 45M
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA