

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 136211/FH/2023

Date registered valid: 9 February 2023

Proposal: Erection of a single storey side and rear extension together with associated elevational alterations to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 34 Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1QB

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Chris Jevons

Agent (if any): Mr Andy Pyatt Knight Pyatt Ltd

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 04 April 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 8 March 2023

Standard consultations: Printed: 8 March 2023 Expired: 29 March 2023

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 8 March 2023 Expired: 29 March 2023

Site notice: Posted: 8 March 2023 Expired: 29 March 2023

Press advert: Published: 14 March 2023 Expired: 4 April 2023

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two-storey end-terraced C3 dwellinghouse of redbrick with a blue slate tile half hipped roof. The property features white render at ground floor level on its principal elevation in addition to a white rendered lower third along its north-western elevation (at ground floor level), a portion of white render at ground floor level along its rear elevation and a painted white wall along its two-storey outrigger, facing north-west. The property also features white uPVC windows, an inset front porch canopy, a two-storey rear outrigger, a modest front garden bordered by a high-level hedge and spacious rear garden bordered by a high-level redbrick wall.



Figure 1. Principal elevation of No.34 Cavendish Road.



Figure 2. Rear view of No.34 Cavendish Road.

Description of area

Cavendish Road is a residential street situated within the Didsbury West ward of Manchester in the Albert Park Conservation Area. The Albert Park Conservation Area is principally an area of housing but also includes a district shopping centre on Burton Road, a smaller group of shops on Barlow Moor Road, schools, public houses and a number of churches. The conservation area was designated in March 1988 and the boundaries are Barlow Moor Road to the south, Withington Hospital and Government buildings to the west, the disused Midland railway line to the north and Palatine Road to the east, the latter being a common boundary with the Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension together with associated elevational alterations to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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

West Didsbury Residents' Association – no comments or objections received.

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
- Policy DC18 – Conservation Areas

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 EN3 – Heritage
- Policy EN19 – Waste

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021)

- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Chapter 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- Chapter 16 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

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

Issues

Principle – the principle of erecting a single storey side and rear extension in order to provide additional space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes rather than move. However, consideration must be given to the proposal’s siting, scale and massing, appearance, and impact upon existing levels of visual and residential amenity, the Albert Park Conservation Area, existing trees, waste storage and parking.

Siting, scale and massing – the single storey extension would be sited at the side and rear of the property, adjoining the existing two-storey rear outrigger, acting as a small infill extension. It would project 3.32m rearwards with a width of 1.83m, mono pitch roof height of 3.62m and eaves height of 3.35m. It would be sited 2.77m from the boundary bordering Perrygate Avenue and would be sited 4.915m from the boundary which borders the shared rear alleyway.

The 3.32m rearward projection does not exceed the limit stipulated within policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3.65m) and is thus considered acceptable as implementation of the proposal would not result in an ‘excessively large or bulky’ addition to the property.



Figure 3. Existing plans, as submitted by the applicant's agent.



Figure 4. Proposed plans, as submitted by the applicant's agent.

Appearance and visual amenity – the extension would be built of double-glazed wall and roof panels with aluminium frames in matt black. As such, the proposal's elevations would almost entirely consist of glass with a glass sliding door present on its north-western elevation.

The proposal is relatively standard in terms of its design and would be in-keeping with the overall precedent of residential extensions in this area. Though sited on a corner plot, the

majority of the proposal would not be visible from a public highway due to the presence of a high-level redbrick wall which borders the rear garden. As such, the proposed extension would not feature prominently within the street scene and the overall character of the area should not be substantially harmed by these works.

Thus, the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 and is acceptable as its impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Residential amenity – given that the extension would be single storey, sited on a corner plot and would maintain large gaps to the plot's boundaries, it is believed that the proposal would not cause an undue loss of sunlight or daylight for neighbouring residents. Moreover, though the extension would predominantly be made of glass, its lack of adjoining properties ensures that the privacy of neighbouring occupants would not be compromised.

The proposed extension 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.

Impact upon the Albert Park Conservation Area – the overall form and design of the proposed extension is not believed to cause significant harm to the existing character of the Albert Park Conservation Area.

Indeed, despite introducing a more contemporary / modern extension to the property, it is believed that this would not cause undue harm to the overall appearance / character of the dwellinghouse as the property already features external elements which deviate from the predominantly uniform appearance of the redbrick residential properties sited along Cavendish Road and its surrounding area (e.g. white render and white paint). Moreover, its siting at the rear of the property (in an area enclosed by a high-level redbrick wall), also means that the majority of the proposal would not be visible from a public footpath or highway. As such, it would not feature heavily within the street scene and therefore should not cause substantial or undue harm to the historic character of the area.

The proposal therefore accords with Core Strategy policy EN3, UDP policy DC18 and chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Trees – Although not detailed in the description of the proposal, the applicant also indicated that they intended to undertake works to a tree sited within the plot boundary. The existing plans indicate that this tree is sited within the rear garden of the property, along the boundary which borders Perrygate Avenue, with the proposed plans indicating that this tree is to be removed entirely.

During the site visit, it was noted that this tree had already been felled. Following review of information available the tree in question was not considered worthy of receiving a TPO nor would an objection to a 'Notification of Proposed Works to Trees in a Conservation Area' application been forthcoming. In this instance, the felling of the aforementioned tree is considered acceptable.

No objections were received relating to the felling of this tree.



Figure 5. Excerpt from Google Street View, depicting the tree prior to its felling, dated to November 2022.

Waste storage – the storage of bins would be unaffected by this proposal as adequate space and access to the rear would be retained. The bins would therefore be screened from the street scene, which accords with policies EN19 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Parking – the current parking arrangements would be unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion – given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity and effect upon the Albert Park Conservation Area, waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with policies DC1 and DC18 of the UDP, policies DM1, SP1, EN1, EN3 and EN19 of the Core Strategy and chapters 12 and 16 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 drawing labelled:

- 'PLANS AS PROPOSED', numbered '1593/4', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 9th February 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 specified on the submitted application form and approved drawings.

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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

West Didsbury Residents Association

2 Perrygate Avenue, Manchester, M20 1JR

32 Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1QB

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 - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA