

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135297/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 9 November 2022

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension; erection of a hip to gable roof extension.

Address: 67 Bronington Close, Manchester, M22 4ZR

Ward(s): Northenden Ward

Applicant: Mr Shakeel Ahmad

Agent (if any): Mr Mohammed Khan, Ash 4 Homes

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 21 February 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 14 December 2022

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 16 November 2022 Expired: 7 December 2022
Printed: 27 January 2023 Expired: 17 February 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 detached C3 dwellinghouse of redbrick with a grey concrete roof tiled part-hipped roof with a front-facing gable end with decorative bargeboard. The property features white uPVC windows (including a ground floor bay), a small front porch, a large driveway, an attached garage, spacious rear garden, and existing outbuildings to the rear.



Figure 1. Photograph of the principal elevation of No.67 Bronington Close.

Description of area

Bronington Close is a residential street situated within the Northenden ward of Manchester, close to Manchester Outer Ring Road (M60), Rosehill Community Farm & Garden and the River Mersey. The area predominantly consists of detached and semi-detached residential properties, though the property is also in relatively close proximity to Wythenshawe industrial centre.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a two-storey side, part-single / part-two storey rear and a hip to gable roof extension.

Planning History

044574/FO/SOUTH3/93 - Residential development comprising 82no.dwellings including associated parking and landscaping – **APPROVED** (24.12.1993)

045295/JO/SOUTH3/94 - Variation of Condition No 11 attached to planning consent 044574/FO/SOUTH3/93 to restrict preventative measures relating to land fill gas to part of site only – **APPLICATION WITHDRAWN** (06.10.1994).

047599/FO/SOUTH3/95 - Substitution of house types at plots 33 to 57 (reduction by 5 units: revised plots numbered 33 to 52) – **APPROVED** (22.05.1995)

079769/FH/2006/S2 - Erection of 2 storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation following demolition of existing double – **REFUSED** (04.08.2006)

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – 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

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

Principle – The principle of building a two-storey side extension, part-single / part-two storey rear extension and hip to gable roof extension in order to provide additional space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposal’s siting, scale and massing, appearance, impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity as well as waste management and parking.



Figure 2. Photograph of the rear elevation of No.67 Bronington Close.

Siting, scale and massing – The two-storey side extension would be sited at the north-western edge of the property, within the footprint of the existing attached garage. It would have a maximum depth of 5.6m, a width of 5.3m and a dual pitch roof height of 6.9m with an eaves height of 4.85m. As such, the extension's ridge would be set 0.352m below the ridge of the original dwellinghouse with its eaves being situated 0.15m lower. The dimensions of the proposed development are therefore understood as being subservient to those of the original dwellinghouse. Sited within the footprint of the existing garage, the proposed development would also maintain the current gap to the boundary shared with No.65 and would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, therefore avoiding the creation of a terracing effect. The proposed extension is therefore considered to be acceptable as it would not result in an 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the property, therefore according with policy DC1 of the UDP.

The single storey rear extension would project 1.08m rearwards from the existing garage and 3.3m from the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse. It would have a total width of 13.55m with a maximum height of 2.832m at the extension's north-western end, 3.4m at its south-eastern end and an eaves height of 2.442m. A gap of 1m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.69 and a gap of 0.847m would be maintained to the boundary shared with No.65. The maximum rearward projection of 3.3m does not exceed the limit stipulated within policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3.65m) with the proposal therefore being considered as acceptable. The first-floor element of the rear extension would adjoin the first-floor portion of the side extension. Its dimensions would be as follows: 2.217m in depth, 2.452m in width and 6.9m in height with the eaves set at 4.85m. It would also be set back from the edge of the single storey rear by 1.08m. Again, the 2.217m rearward projection does not exceed the limit stipulated within policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3.65m), therefore this portion of the proposal is considered acceptable.

The proposal also includes a hip-to-gable roof extension which would be situated at the north-western edge of the roof of the main dwellinghouse. The roof conversion would have a maximum height of 1.599m, a width of 1.831m and depth of 5.379m, which would be subservient to the current dimensions of the roof as well as being similar in appearance to other properties with gabled roofs in the area, namely those present at No.60, No.62, No.65 and No.71. This alteration is considered to be a very minimal addition to the property and would not result in an 'excessively large or bulky' extension and, as such, is deemed acceptable as it accords with policy DC1 of the UDP.

Appearance and visual amenity – The proposed developments would be built of brickwork, concrete roof tiles, a clay ridge and uPVC double-glazed windows to match the existing in addition to aluminium double-glazed doors.

The front elevation of the proposal would feature the two existing garage doors at ground floor level and one window at first floor level. Both side elevations would be blank, whilst the rear elevation would feature two sets of bi-folding aluminium doors, one set of regular aluminium doors and one window at ground floor level and three windows at first floor level. One UPVC velux rooflight would also be implemented on the rear-facing roof of the main dwellinghouse.

The proposal is considered to be relatively standard in design, would be in-keeping with the appearance of the residential properties in this area and would utilise materials that would be either in-keeping or subservient to those already present at the property. Moreover, the rear portions of this proposal would not feature prominently within the street scene. Hence, the overall character of the house and local area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The design and appearance of the proposed development(s) accord with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 and chapter 12 of the NPPF as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Residential amenity – Given the maximum roof height of 6.9m in addition to its north-westerly orientation and siting within the footprint of the existing garage, the proposed two-storey side extension should not cause an undue loss of sunlight or daylight for neighbouring occupants. Moreover, its blank side elevation should ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents should not be compromised.

Similarly, given the maximum roof heights of 3.392m for the single-storey side extension and 6.9m for its first-floor element as well as their north-easterly orientation, these developments should also not cause an undue loss of sunlight or daylight for neighbouring residents. Their blank side elevations should also ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents is not significantly impacted.

The hip-to-gable roof conversion should also not cause issues associated with loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy for neighbouring occupants as it is a very minimal addition to the property in terms of its scale and massing, would be situated on the north-western edge of the roof of the main dwellinghouse and would have a blank side elevation.

The proposed development(s) are therefore acceptable in regard to their minimal effect upon residential amenities as they accord with Core Strategy policies DM1 and SP1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Waste management – The current waste management strategy would be unaffected by this proposal as adequate space and access to the rear would be retained, therefore the bins could 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 principle, siting, scale and massing, appearance and visual amenity, residential amenity, waste management and parking as it broadly complies with General Permitted Development rules as well as 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 drawings labelled:

- 'Proposed elevations', numbered '05 REV 01', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 20th January 2023.

- 'Proposed floor plans', numbered '03 REV 01', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 20th January 2023.

- 'Existing & proposed site plans', numbered '01 REV 01', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 20th January 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, including brickwork and roof tiles to match existing.

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

62 Bronington Close, Manchester, M22 4ZR
60 Bronington Close, Manchester, M22 4ZR
69 Bronington Close, Manchester, M22 4ZR
65 Bronington Close, Manchester, M22 4ZR

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 45M
Green Belt Land - Green Belt Area (LDF)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA