

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135677/FO/2022

Date registered valid: 6 December 2022

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension with elevational alterations to form additional living accommodation

Address: 3 Richmond Grove, Manchester, M13 0LN

Ward(s): Ardwick Ward

Applicant: Mrs Syeda Chowdhury

Agent (if any): Mr Shaun Stephenson, MEAP, Manchester Equipment & Adaptations Partners

Case officer: Adam Mitchell
Tel: 0161 234 4165
Email: adam.mitchell@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: APPROVE

Date of recommendation: 27.01.2023

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Dwellings

Date of site visit: 10 January 2023

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 20 December 2022

Expired: 10 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The proposed application relates to a two storey, mid-terraced brick built property within Ardwick Ward of Manchester. The property benefits from a small front garden and a rear paved area. Boundary treatment in the form of timber fencing occupy the rear and shared boundaries.

The remainder of the area is residential in nature with houses of similar style and size. Greater Manchester Police Longsight Station is situated to the northwest of the application site.

Description of development

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. The extension accommodates an additional bedroom for the disabled occupant, including one rear elevation window, and one rear facing door implemented into the original rear elevation, intended to enhance the accessibility for the occupant. The rear extension would have approx. dimensions of Height 3.5m x Width 3.9m x Rear Projection 3.6m. The extension would run alongside the shared boundary with no. Richmond leaving a gap of 0.17metres.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were notified however none responded.

Policy

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of this policy document.

Issues

Principle

The proposed development is for the erection of a single storey rear extension to a residential dwelling, this is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to extend their homes rather than move in order to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is proposed to erect a single storey extension to the rear of the property to provide accessible living accommodation to support a disabled user. As mentioned above the proposed extension would run alongside the shared boundary with no. 1 Richmond Grove and given the single storey nature of the extension and the existing boundary treatment it is not considered to form an overbearing or overpowering feature along the boundary. Additionally, no windows are proposed in that side elevation facing the northern boundary and therefore no overlooking or loss of privacy will be experienced. Furthermore, a condition that removes the permitted development rights for the implementation of windows and doors will be attached to any approval. The extension would not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring property.

The gap (2 metres) will be maintained to the southern boundary with no.5 Richmond Grove, therefore it is not considered that the extension will form an overbearing feature. The scheme does include the introduction of a rear door along the original rear elevation close to this shared boundary however given this is a common feature and the existing boundary treatment it is not expected to cause significant overlooking or loss of privacy implications to the neighbouring property as to warrant refusal to the proposed development.

Visual Amenity

The proposal would not be seen from Richmond Grove's streetscene given its position at the rear of the property. The extension would be visible from Marshall Close's streetscene however given materials will match existing and this is single storey extension, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the property, nor the area within which it is located. The proposal is considered acceptable and therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategies policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 and DC1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Design and Appearance

It is not considered that the proposed development would unduly harm the character of the building or the general area. The materials would match the existing, although it is recommended a materials condition is attached to ensure that the materials are adhered to, pursuant with the requirements of Core Strategy policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 and saved UDP policy DC1.

Height Scale and Massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house, is not excessively large or bulky and are therefore considered to accord with the principles set out in saved UDP Policies DC1 and accords with Core Strategy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Waste Management

There is sufficient land to the rear of the property to store the bins without causing any additional residential amenity.

Conclusion

The proposal complies with the above policies; received no objections and the City Council recognises the importance of adapting homes to suit the changing household needs and accommodate disabled residents, with the needs of the occupants outweighing the insignificant residential and visual harm of the development. The single storey rear extension would improve the safety and comfort of the dwelling for the resident, allowing them to remain independent in their own home, therefore development may commence in accordance with the following conditions.

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 agent/applicant in a positive and proactive manner to guide the application through all stages of the planning process and resolve any issues that arose in dealing with the application.

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 date of three years beginning with the date of permission.

Reason- Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Drawing: Elevations

Drawing: GF Layout

Drawing: Section

Drawing: Location Plan

All stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on 06 December 2022

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

- 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the proposed extensions 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.

- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved plans.

Reason- In the interest of residential amenity pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Longsight Police Station, 2 Grindlow Street, Manchester, M13 0LL
7 Marsham Close, Manchester, M13 0LW
11 Marsham Close, Manchester, M13 0LW
9 Marsham Close, Manchester, M13 0LW
7 Richmond Grove, Manchester, M13 0LN
5 Richmond Grove, Manchester, M13 0LN
1 Richmond Grove, Manchester, M13 0LN
376 Stockport Road, Manchester, M12 4FT
374 Stockport Road, Manchester, M12 4FT
372 Stockport Road, Manchester, M12 4FT

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
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA