

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 136796/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 24 April 2023

Proposal: Part retrospective application for the erection of a single storey front porch extension.

Address: 13 Longhope Road, Manchester, M22 1UP

Ward(s): Woodhouse Park Ward

Applicant: Antonio Gonsalves

Agent (if any): Tomislav Vuletic Flocc Studio Ltd

Case officer: Janet Lawless
Tel: 0161 234 4535
Email: janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 19 June 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: May 2023 and 15th June 2023

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 27 April 2023 Expired: 18 May 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 property that is the subject of this householder application is an end of terraced property identified as 13 Longhope Road. It is within the Woodhouse Park ward of the City. It has a small garden to the front with off road parking for one vehicle, there is a good- sized garden to the rear of the property. There is a low boundary wall to the frontage with the remainder of the boundary treatment comprising of timber fencing.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature comprising of properties of a similar size age and style to the proposal site. Opposite the site on Longhope Road is Kirkup Gardens which has play areas and play equipment and grassed areas.

Description of development

The proposal is for retrospective planning permission for the part constructed front canopied extension which runs the full width of the property and across the single storey side extension. It would be open sided with 4 classic inspired decorative columns as supporting pillars, a dual pitched feature roof central above the entrance door and a hipped roof over the remainder of the structure. The roof would have a tiled finish.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were informed- no representations have been received.

Issues

NPPF (2019)

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 NPPF states that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways, these are: an economic objective, a social and an environmental objective

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- i. Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities- States that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places and policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements.
- ii. Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport - States that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives.
- iii. Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places- Reflects upon the importance of design to the built environment and its contribution to sustainable development and making places better for people. With this in mind, the design of the substantive development has been assessed in relation to the quality and cohesion of its composite building, as well as the function and appearance of public and private spaces.

Extant UDP Policies

DC1.1 states that in determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property;
- b. The effect upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;
- c. The desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;
- d. The overall appearance of the proposal in the a street scene;
- e. The effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.

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

Local Development Framework Manchester Core Strategy (adopted 11 July 2012)

Policy SP1 identifies the City Council's Core Development Principles and states that development in all parts of the City should:-

Make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including:-

- Creating well designed places that enhance or create character
- Making a positive contribution to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents
- Protect and enhance the built and natural environment

Policy DM 1 states that 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.
- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality and road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise.
- Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.
- Refuse storage and collection.
- Vehicular access and car parking.

Principle of development

The submitted part retrospective application is for the erection of single storey front porch. The application site relates to a two storey terraced property which sits within a wider housing estate. The properties within the area are consistent in character having strong building lines with front gardens enclosed by a mix of low brick walls, timber panel fencing and hedges. Whilst the principle of a porch is considered acceptable, this must be assessed in terms of its impact upon the residential and visual amenity of the neighbouring properties and upon the character of the host property itself and the area within which it is located.

Residential Amenity

It is not considered that the proposal would positively contribute to the residential amenity of the residents of the property or the neighbouring properties. It is bulky and incongruous and yet does not provide any greater usable amenity space for the occupants of the property. Nor is it to enable adaptation of the property. It is therefore considered that the size of the proposed extension is not commensurate to the additional space achieved by the physical structure.

Visual Amenity

The development as applied for is a front porch, there are no front porches on the houses that immediately surround the application site with the floating canopy just over the entrance doors being a common feature within the area. These are however on a much more modest scale, and not occupying any ground area at all. There are a couple of porches within the wider area, with these complying with the Permitted Development criteria for porches. The proposal as applied for however is considered to be a front extension due to its dimensions, the proposed extension occupies the full width of the property and extends outwards towards the side boundary across the front of the side extension, it covers approximately a third of the depth of the front garden and sits just below the first- floor windows. It is considered that the proposal has a detrimental impact upon the visual appearance of the property.

It is not subservient to the existing property, and it is considered that the proposed single storey front extension would create a negative impact on visual amenity by virtue of its appearance, siting, size and its relationship to the original property, which would be visually intrusive, forming an over prominent and incongruous feature upon the property. The proposed extension is not considered to be subservient and is contrary to Saved Unitary Development Plan Policy DC1.1, which states that the Council will have regard to the general character of the property, the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing

household needs and policy DC1.2, which states that extensions will be allowed where they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or surrounding street scene by virtue of design etc.

Design/ Siting

The proposed extension is not typical of a porch on a property of this scale. It is over dominant when viewed against the property as a backdrop. It sits very far forward of the front building line, which has been observed by the other properties along the road, which therefore makes the siting of this extension all the more prominent.

Car Parking

The existing front garden currently provides one off street car parking space within the curtilage of the site. This could still be achieved post development.

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. Officers have communicated their concerns about the proposal to the agent during the course of the planning application, but these concerns cannot be overcome. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan.

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

1) The single storey porch/front extension by virtue of its siting, scale, bulk, massing, appearance and its relationship to the original property, would be visually intrusive, forming an over prominent and incongruous feature at the front of the property. The resulting effect would be unduly harmful on the character of the application property and the local street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC1 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

15 Longhope Road, Manchester, M22 1UP

11 Longhope Road, Manchester, M22 1UP

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 15M

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA