

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135494/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 16 November 2022
Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 5 Mereland Avenue, Manchester, M20 6SF
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward
Applicant: Mr Andrew Wood
Agent (if any): Mr Philip Kirk, Plans and Planning
Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 10 January 2022



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10 January 2023

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 25 November 2022 Expired: 16 December 2022

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 semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red brick with a hipped pantile roof and bay windows. The property features a front porch and an existing two storey side and rear extension approved in 1974 under ref F01090. The plot includes a paved driveway to the front, with access to the side leading to a rear garden.

Description of area

Mereland Avenue is a short cul-de-sac off Fog Lane in East Didsbury. It is residential in nature, characterised by similar post-war semis, and benefits from its proximity to Didsbury Village's shops, eateries and transport links. The rear garden of the application site backs onto Fog Lane Park.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation in the form of a downstairs bathroom and utility.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments 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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012, amended in 2021):

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places

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

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a single storey side extension to provide additional living space is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity. Given the location of the extension, it is not considered to impact upon residential amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The single storey extension would project 2.77m from the original south-west side wall of the property and would be setback by 3m from the principal elevation. It would have an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 3.8m. It would be sited 1.38m from the boundary shared with No.3. The eaves and ridge height are below those allowed under permitted development for single storey extensions and the width is less than half the width of the original property (5.7m). The reason it requires permission is due to adjoining the historic

two storey side and rear extension. It features a significant setback, a large gap to the shared boundary and the plot can easily accommodate the extension. The extension is therefore considered subservient to the main house and sited and scaled appropriately, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including facing brickwork with white paint to the side elevation, roof tiles and grey uPVC windows/doors, which has been conditioned. The roof would be hipped, with a pitch very similar to the main roof, containing 1no rooflight. The front elevation would feature a small window, whilst the side elevation would feature a door. The extension would feature within the street scene, however due to the siting on an inner-corner plot, the significant setback, distance to the highway, matching materials and appropriate design, it is not considered to form a prominent feature. The design is standard, to be expected of such development, therefore the appearance of the development is considered acceptable and is not thought to harm the visual amenity of the house nor wider area.

Residential amenity – The extension would be sited 1.38m from the boundary shared with No.3 at its closest point, with no side-facing windows, hence privacy is not considered to be impacted. The proposal would be sited north of the adjacent neighbour's plot, with a low hipped roof, and therefore should not cause overshadowing. In addition to this, no objection were received.

Parking and refuse – The driveway, with space for a car off the street, is to be retained, as is the access to the rear garden (via a 1.38m gap) allowing bins to be stored at the rear out of sight, as shown on the site plan, in accordance with core strategy policy DM1.

Conclusion – The proposal complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, it received no objections and it is not thought to harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and construction may continue 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 applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and it has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the development management policies.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this 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 drawings numbered 'P100' and 'P101', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 16th November 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.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building, as stated within the submitted application form.

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

3 Mereland Avenue, Manchester, M20 6SF

7 Mereland Avenue, Manchester, M20 6SF

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

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA