

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135617/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 13 December 2022

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension at the rear and front porch to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 6 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6GS

Ward(s): Withington Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Iyasu Hagos, 6 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6GS

Agent (if any): Mr Talat Zeria, HSH Engineering Design Service Ltd, 428 Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester, M8 9LE

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 01 February 2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 January 2023

Standard consultations: Printed: 4 January 2023 Expired: 25 January 2023

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 4 January 2023 Expired: 25 January 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 mid-terraced C3 dwellinghouse of redbrick with grey concrete roof tiles. The property features white uPVC windows, a small existing front porch (which is considered to be an unauthorised addition as it does not accord with permitted development regulations and does not have planning permission), an alleyway situated between the property and the adjoining property at No.4, a large front driveway and two outbuildings in the rear garden (both of which are set to be removed as part of this proposal, as indicated by the submitted plans).



Figure 1. Photograph of the principal elevation of No.6 Abergele Road.

Description of area

Abergele Road is a residential street situated within the Withington ward of Manchester, close to Kingswood Park, Kingsway (A34) and the Fallowfield Loop. The area predominantly consists of terraced and semi-detached residential properties and is in relatively close proximity to the University of Manchester's Fallowfield student accommodation.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension together with a front porch, following the demolition of the existing (unauthorised) porch and removal of the two outbuildings located to the rear, in order to form additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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

HS2 made the following comments:

- "The red line location plan boundary falls within sub-surface safeguarding for Phase 2b of HS2."
- "Having reviewed the proposal, it is unlikely that the foundations required to construct the proposed development will affect HS2 works in that location."
- "In light of the above, I can confirm that HS2 Ltd have no objection to the proposal."

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

General Permitted Development Order (GDPO, 2015)

- Schedule 2 – Permitted Development Rights

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 single storey rear extension together with a replacement front porch 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.

Siting, scale and massing – The single-storey extension would be sited at the rear of the property, facing south, and would replace the two outbuildings that are currently situated along the rear boundary (as indicated by the submitted plans). The proposed extension would project 5m from the current rear wall, with a width of 5.406m, hipped roof height of 3.64m and eaves height of 2.515m. It would be sited 0.2m from the boundary shared with No.8 and would maintain a 1.549m gap to the boundary shared with No.4. The 5m rearward projection exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 of the UDP (of 3.65m), however is considered acceptable under the General Permitted Development rules, which allow single-storey rear extensions up to 6m through a prior approval process and in the absence of objections in this case. Thus, having reviewed the dimensions of the proposal and having noted the gaps to shared boundaries, the siting, scale and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable.



Figure 2. Photograph of the rear elevation of No.6 Abergele Road.



Figure 3. Photograph of the outbuildings to be removed as part of this proposal.

The front porch extension would create a new entrance at the property, replacing the existing (unauthorised) porch, facing north. It would project 2m from the current principal elevation, with a width of 2.49m, hipped roof height of 3.38m and eaves height of 2.515m. The proposal would be sited along the boundary shared with No.8 and would maintain a 4.741m gap to the boundary shared with No.4. Its northerly orientation and maximum height of 3.38m should ensure that the development does not result in significant overshadowing or create an overbearing feel for neighbouring residents. Overall, it is considered that the dimensions detailed above would not result an 'excessively large or bulky' addition to the property. It is therefore considered acceptable as it accords with policy DC1 of the UDP.

Appearance and visual amenity – The rear extension would be built of brickwork, concrete roof tiles, uPVC windows and a uPVC door to match the existing. The side elevations of the proposal would be blank except for the presence of one rooflight on each side. The rear elevation would feature one window and a set of doors. The front porch would also be built of brickwork, concrete roof tiles, uPVC windows and a uPVC door to match the existing. The porch

itself would occupy a rectangular footprint and would feature one window on each of its side elevations as well as two windows, a fanlight and a set of doors on its principal elevation.

The proposed rear and porch extensions are relatively standard in design and would be in-keeping with other residential extensions in this locale. The rear extension especially would mimic the extension already present at No.25 Lindleywood Road. Moreover, the rear extension would be sited at the back of the property and, therefore, would not feature prominently within the street scene. Hence, the overall character of the house and area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The design and appearance of the proposed developments therefore accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Residential amenity – Initially, there were some concerns regarding the rear extension's potential to impact upon the residential amenity and access to daylight of those occupying No.8 due to their noticeably smaller rear garden, both in size and shape. However, the rear extension would be orientated so that it faces south, therefore No.8's garden should still receive adequate sunlight during the morning and daytime and should only lose access to light in the latter hours of the day. Moreover, No.8 also possesses a sizeable private front/side garden and would therefore have access to alternative outdoor amenity space. Thus, given the maximum roof height of 3.64m, southerly orientation and No.8's large front/side garden, the proposal should not cause an undue loss of sunlight or daylight for neighbouring residents. Moreover, the blank side walls of the extension should ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents should not be compromised. Similarly, given the maximum height of 3.38m, northerly orientation and single storey nature of the front porch, this portion of the proposal should also not cause undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy for neighbouring residents.

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

Waste management – The current arrangements for the storage of bins would be unaffected by this proposal.

Parking – The front porch extension would encroach slightly onto the front driveway, however a space measuring to at least 5m by 6.63m would be retained, meaning that at least two car parking spaces (measuring to 4.8m by 2.4m, as specified by Highways) would be maintained. The proposal is therefore acceptable in regard to its minimal impact upon parking arrangements.

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 materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby submitted 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.

3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings numbered '03' and '04', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 30th November, and the drawing numbered '05', stamped as received on the 13th December 2022.

Reason - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

4) The proposed window, situated on the side elevation of the original dwellinghouse facing No.4 Abergele 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

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited

7 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6QR
5 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6QR
3 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6QR
8 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6GS
4 Abergele Road, Manchester, M14 6GS
23 Lindleywood Road, Manchester, M14 6QP
4 Pensarn Avenue, Manchester, M14 6GW
2 Pensarn Avenue, Manchester, M14 6GW

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
HS2 Phase 2b Safeguarding Zones - HS2 Safeguarding Zones (June 2022)
HS2 Phase 2b Safeguarding Zones - HS2 Safeguarding Zones (October 2020)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA