

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134903/FO/2022

Date registered valid: 9 September 2022

Proposal: Erection of a 2-storey rear extension and front and rear roof extensions to form additional accommodation to existing offices (Class E)

Address: 1018 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN

Ward(s): Levenshulme Ward

Applicant: Mr Muhammad Shahid, 1016 -1018 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN

Agent (if any): Mr Dean King, NK Architectural Services, Office 2, 1st Floor, 227 Finney Lane, Heald Green, Cheadle, SK8 3PX

Case officer: Carl Glennon
Tel: 0161 234 4530
Email: carl.glennon@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 3 November 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Dwellings

Date of site visit: 23 September 2022

Standard consultations:

Printed: 15 September 2022 Expired: 6 October 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 15 September 2022 Expired: 6 October 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: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

The application site is located close to the junction of Stockport Road and York Street. The site is separated from York Street by No 1020 and an alley shared with 2-storey terraced houses to the west of the site. The frontage of the application property forms part of a 2-storey terrace with windows in the roof plane to Stockport Road. The front and rear of No 1018 has white painted elevations to the rear and a pair dormer extension incorporated into a pitched slate roof. The first floor (rear) is access via a metal external staircase. The rear roof plane incorporates a pair of dormer extensions. The application property comprises two businesses namely: United Solicitors and Brick Properties. The submission indicated that the ground, first floor and roof space is used as office accommodation.

The yard the rear of the property is hard surfaced and used for bin storage and car parking behind of palisade gates. There is a TRO at the junction with Stockport Road partially returning to both sides of York Street but unrestricted elsewhere (along York Street). There are part single, part two storey extensions to the rear on 1020 Stockport Road. It projected to the full extent of the rear yard but set back at the first floor elevation and extending to a mid-point across the rear wall. The rear of No 1014 also includes a part 2-storey, part single storey rear extension with a flat roof.



Fig.1 – Views of the application site from Stockport Road, York Street and rear alleyway

Description of development

The proposed development would involve:

Stockport Road elevation

- i. The maintenance of the existing ground floor shopfront and first floor windows set within a rendered elevation;
- ii. The formation of flat roof extension within the principal roof plane. It would be positioned below the main ridge and offset from the side boundary. The principal elevation of the extension would incorporate four windows set within grey cladding panels.

Rear elevation

- i. The formation of a part single, part two storey extensions and a roof extension. The extensions would have a stepped configuration. The respective elements would have rearward projections of:
 - Ground – 13.7 metres;
 - First floor – 8.3 metres;
 - Roof level – 4.5 metres.

The proposed flat roofs to the rear extensions would have heights of 8.1metres, 5.1metres and 3 metres.

- ii. The ground floor extension would be offset from the rear (west) boundary by 2 metres to allow the formation of bin and cycle storage area in an open hardstanding area;
- iii. The elevations of the ground and first floor extensions would be composed in brickwork with the rear elevations punctuated with rectangular floor to ceiling windows. The ground floor elevation would incorporate a centrally positioned doorway;
- iv. The roof extension would reflect the design of the front roof extension. It would incorporate elongated windows set within zinc cladding;
- v. All side elevations would incorporate blank brickwork.

Internal layout – involves the retention of existing offices to each floor, supplemented with:

- i. Ground floor – Two new offices separated by a centrally positioned corridor leading to the rear doorway, staircase to the first floor and formation of the WCs and storeroom;
- ii. First floor – A new office, WCs, staff welfare areas and staircase to roof space;
- iii. Roof space – Enlarged office WCs and staff welfare areas.

Site History

132325/FO/2021 - Erection of a 3-storey rear extension and front roof extension, conversion of existing roof space and new boundary treatments in connection with the formation of additional accommodation to existing offices and the formation of new offices (Class E) with access via alleyway to York Street
Withdrawn 14 July 2022

101370/FO/2013/N2 - Erection of first floor rear extension and rear roof dormer extension and repositioning of existing staircase and creation of ramp to front entrance
Approved 11 March 2013

100514/FO/2012/N2 - Change of use of premises to Class A2 Solicitors Office and installation of new shop front
Approved 2 January 2013

043360/FO/CENTL3/93 - Installation of a new shop front
Approved 1 June 1993

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents – One email of objection has been received and is summarised below:

- i. The development would be overly large and would undermine the character of the local area;
- ii. The scale of the development restrict sunlight to neighbouring windows;
- iii. The proposed upper floor extensions would overlook neighbouring houses and thereby be harmful to the privacy of residents;
- iv. The siting the rear extension would undermine the operation of extraction flues to neighbouring properties;
- v. The development would encroach on to land outside the applicant's ownership;
- vi. The development has not been supported with satisfactory arrangements for surface water drainage;
- vii. The proposals has not made appropriate provision for the repositioning of air conditioning units;

- viii. Satisfactory arrangements for the storage and collection of waste and recycling as part of the development;
- ix. The development would increase employee numbers leading to additional activity around the site to the detriment of the amenity of residents of York Street. The development would also increase traffic generation and car parking on York Street and Pascal Street.

Highway Services – The following comments have been made:

- i. The application site is accessible by sustainable modes, including public transport facilities;
- ii. Given the magnitude of the development, it is not anticipated that the proposals would generate a significant increase in the level of vehicular trips. The development would not raise any network capacity concerns;
- iii. Pedestrian access arrangements are acceptable from a highway perspective;
- iv. Waste storage arrangements are acceptable to Highways. It has been assumed that the arrangements for waste collection would remain as existing;
- v. Should the planning permission be granted the development should be related to a construction management plan condition;
- vi. The proposed cycle storage provision is considered to be acceptable;
- vii. Any requirements for licensing, hoarding / scaffolding, building maintenance and any associated temporary traffic management arrangements should be agreed with the Council's Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester.

Environmental Health – The following comments have been received:

- i. The development should be related to a construction management plan that accords with appropriate guidance;
- ii. Opening hours should be agreed and conditioned;
- iii. Deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 7:30 am to 8:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, no deliveries/waste collections on Sundays/Bank Holidays.
- iv. Any external plant and equipment required as part of the development should be related to a scheme of acoustic attenuation that should be conditioned for implementation as part of the development.
- v. The submitted waste management plan should be amended to include:
- Estimated volumes and types of waste produced by the development;
 - Details of internal and external stores for both waste and recycling, including any plans and designs;
 - Location of the proposed collection point and details of the route the collection vehicle will take;
 - Details of how waste will be transferred between stores and to the collection location;
 - Details of number and capacity of bins proposed for both waste and recycling, and collection frequency.
- vi. The development should be related to a watching brief condition to address any land contamination that may be encountered during the implementation of the development.

Flood Risk Management Team – A drainage condition is not required in this case as the site is in Flood Zone 1 the development would lead to the formation of a minor extension of less than 250 sq. metres. Should planning permission be granted an informative is recommended advising that consideration be given to the design and construction of a drainage system to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage.

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security – No objection but the following recommendations are made:

i. General security -

- Any new external fittings (i.e. shutters, windows or doors, cycle storage) should be certified to Secured by Design standards;
- All aspects of the proposed change of use, particularly doorways should be illuminated with dusk 'til dawn lighting;
- Coverage for any CCTV systems and alarms will need to be reviewed to check all areas of the development are covered;
- Due to there being single storey element of the building and the inclusion of upper floor windows becoming potentially accessible we would recommend that these windows are also certified to SBD standards.

ii. External Cycle Store

- External storage specifically designed for the secure storage of bicycles and other property must be certified to a recognised security standard.

Issues

National Planning Policy Framework - This Framework came into effect on 27th March 2012 and was amended and updated in July 2021 and sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It defines the Government's requirements for the planning system 'only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so'. It provides a mechanism through 'which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities'.

The Framework re-iterates that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory status of the development plan remains as the starting point for decision making. It states that 'at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development' and, in 'decision-taking', this means that development proposals should accord with the development plan should be approved without delay unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted. The Framework has been related to the proposed development, with particular emphasis given to the following:

Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities - States that planning decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive, accessible and safe places, where crime and disorder (and the fear of crime) do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion. These considerations have been related to the layout and design of the proposed development and the incorporation of measures to address issues of security and potential opportunities for criminal and anti-social behaviour.

Notwithstanding the comments of GMP Design for Security, it is considered that the proposed doorway the rear of the building and adjacent to an alleyway, would be vulnerable to attack due to a lack of natural surveillance and the absence of and appropriate boundary treatment. Similar concerns are related to the siting of the proposed cycle storage. It is not considered that these aspects of the development would be satisfactorily related to chapter 8. In other respects, the comments of GM Police could be potentially incorporated into a more appropriately designed development.

iii. Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport - States that in assessing specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) Appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- b) Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- c) Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

The development is within a sustainable location with access to transportation links. Notwithstanding the comments of Highways Services, it is considered that the development would result in some traffic generation that would not be supported within the application site. The impact of additional congestion and parking on the highway is a concern.

iv. Chapter 11: Making effective use of land - States that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land. It is acknowledged that an appeal decision permitted the formation of a single storey office building. However, the formation of a part single, part 2-storey building with roof extensions would significantly increase the magnitude of built form in the site with an accompanying increased intensity of activity. It is not considered that the development would be appropriately related to the scale, proportions and character of the host building and the limited capacity of the application site. Chapter 11 would not, therefore, be accorded with.

v. Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places - States that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. The proposed rear extensions would fail to acknowledge the character of the existing building in relation to its composition, scale and massing. The composition of the front roof extension exceeds the proportions of roof extensions in the presented to Stockport Road. The extensive use of glazing in the component rear elevations would contrast sharply with built form relating to York Street and present concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed design would be harmful to the character of the host building and the wider area and thereby be contrary to chapter 12.

Planning Practice Guidance - On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched this planning practice guidance web-based resource and is relevant to key planning issues of significance to applicants and local authorities. In considering this application consideration has been given to the following aspects of the PPG:

- i. Consultation and pre-decision matters
- ii. Health and well-being
- iii. Noise

For the reasons set out below, it is not considered that the development would safeguard the health and well-being of neighbouring residents.

Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ('the Core Strategy') was adopted by the Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in

accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents. The following policies are relevant to the proposed development:

Policy SP 1 - Specifies the Core Development Principles for parts of the City. In this case the relevant principles relate to the extent to which the development:

- i. Makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including the creation of well designed places that enhance or create character; making a positive contribution to the health, safety and well-being of residents, considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income and to protect and enhance the built and natural environment;
- ii. Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible;
- iii. Improve access to jobs, services, education and open space by being located to reduce the need to travel and provide good access to sustainable transport provision.

It is considered that the expansion of the Class E use within the site would generate additional levels of activity, noise and disturbance that would be harmful to residential amenity and well-being. The excessively large rear extensions and roof extensions would fail to achieve a quality of design that would enhance appearance of the host building or the character and appearance of the streetscene to Stockport Road and York Street. The limited employment opportunities presented by the development would be offset by the incongruous nature of the design. It is not considered, therefore, that the development would be satisfactorily related to policy SP1.

Policy C 1 Centre Hierarchy - States that the development of town centre uses (as defined in national planning policy) will be prioritised in the centres identified in this policy, taking account of the different roles of the City Centre, District Centres and Local Centres. Policy C1 states that district centres, such as Levenshulme, have an essential role in providing key services to the City's neighbourhoods including shopping, commercial, leisure, public and community functions, ensuring that residents can access such services easily. They are also a focus for the City's residential neighbourhoods, providing an important opportunity to define local character. It further states that these centres should primarily respond to the needs of the catchment and recognise the need to support the vitality and viability of other centres. The application site is located within Levenshulme District Centre. However, the applicants has not justified the need for the additional office accommodation. Notwithstanding the above, its considered that any potential benefit of the expansion of the existing use would be offset by the harm caused by the disproportionate magnitude and appearance of the development and adverse impact on the residential character of York Street. The development would thereby fail to comply with policy C1.

Policy C 2 District centres - States that development will support thriving district centres, with distinct local character, providing a good range of accessible key services, including retail, health facilities, public services, leisure activities and financial and legal services. The delivery of this floor space should respect the network of centres across the City and in neighbouring districts. The applicant has not indicated that the development would generate additional employment. Any contribution to Levenshulme District Centre would be offset by its harmful impact in terms of the introduction of excessive built form and activity associated with the use. Policy C2, therefore, would not be positively accorded with.

Policy EC9 South Manchester - States that within South Manchester, including Levenshulme District Centre, development proposals and planning applications should have regard to: ensure the efficient use of existing employment space; improving public transport, walking and cycling connectivity between residential neighbourhoods and employment locations. In this case, the development would introduce excessive additional floorspace and unduly increase activity

around the site to the detriment of residential amenity. The development would not, therefore respond positively to policy EC9.

Policy EC1 Employment and Economic Growth in Manchester - The relevant sections of policy EC 1 include the contribution of the development to:

- o Improving access to jobs for all via public transport, walking and cycling;
- o Demonstrating that employment-generating development has fully considered opportunities to provide jobs for local people, through construction or use;
- o Ensuring the continued social, economic and environmental regeneration of the City;

The applicant has not indicated that the development would deliver additional employment opportunities.

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) - States that all development in Manchester will be expected to achieve an appropriate standard of urban design, as identified in national planning guidance and have regard to the character area in which the development is located. In this case, the relationship of the proposal to both the existing building and the surrounding context, including neighbouring housing, is not considered to be acceptable.

Policy EN 14 (Flood Risk) – Relates to the provision of appropriate drainage and the management of flood risk. The development is in Flood Zone 1 and the scale of the development would not usually have a significant increase the risk of flooding.

Policy EN18 Contaminated Land and Ground Stability - States that any proposal for development of contaminated land must be accompanied by a health risk assessment. No specific land contamination issues have been identified by Environmental Health and any emerging issues would be addressed through the watching brief condition.

Policy EN19 (Waste) - Requires consideration of the submitted details relating to determine if the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated how:

- i. Both construction and demolition waste will be minimised and recycled on site wherever possible;
- ii. The sustainable waste management needs of the end user will be met.

Policy EN19 has been related to the proposed waste management arrangements, which have not clearly demonstrated that waste and recycling can be appropriately managed as part of the development.

Policy T1 Sustainable Transport - Relates to the delivery of sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, which encourages a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking and prepare for carbon free modes of transport. In this case, the application site is in a sustainable location with easy access to bus routes on Stockport Road. Cycle storage would not be provided. Policy T1 has been responded to positively.

Policy T 2 Accessible areas of opportunity and need - The Council will actively manage the pattern of development and the relevant section of the policy states: that new development should provide appropriate car parking facilities, including meeting the needs of disabled people and the provision cycle parking. The development would not supported with cycle storage or on-site car parking. Notwithstanding the sustainable location of the site, there is concern the development would have the potential to generate car parking in relation to the expanded Class E use. Any potential increase in vehicular activity and congestion would be potentially harmful to

amenity of residents of York Street. The development therefore would not positively respond to policy T2.

Policy DM1 Development Management - States that all development should have regard to the following specific issues, which are relevant in relation to the proposed development:

- o Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail;
- o Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development;
- o Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area;
- o Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, road safety and traffic generation;
- o Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes;
- o Community safety and crime prevention;
- o Design for health;
- o Refuse storage and collection;
- o Vehicular access and car parking;
- o Flood risk and drainage.

As previously discussed, it is considered that the scale and magnitude of the proposed development, together with the related intensity of the use, would be harmful to the amenity and well-being of residents and the wider locality. Policy DM1 would therefore not be accorded with.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) saved policies - The following saved policy is considered to be relevant:

Policy E3.3 Upgrade the appearance of radial and orbital routes - This policy (E3.3) is relevant given the views of the site from Stockport Road, which is a major radial route to the City Centre. It requires that new development contributes to the improvement of the appearance of such routes. As discussed, the interventions the Stockport Rod elevation would undermine the appearance and character of the building and its relationship to the streetscene. It is not considered that the development would achieve a standard of design that would contribute positively to Stockport Road as a radial route, policy E3.3 would not be accorded with.

Policy DC26 Development and Noise - Is relevant to the proposed development due to its potential to generate noise and disturbance through the operation of the proposed use and any external associated equipment. The following aspects of this policy (DC26) are considered to be relevant to the proposed development.

Policy DC26.1 - Has been related to the proposal potential contribution of the development to the local noise environment.

Policy DC26.4 - Requires that where an existing noise source might result in an adverse impact upon a proposed new development, or where a new proposal might generate potentially unacceptable levels of noise, consideration is given to measures to deal with it satisfactorily. This is particularly relevant given the proximity of the site to established residential uses.

Policy DC26.5 - Has been related to the assessment of the development, in terms of measures to control noise, including the provision of noise insulation.

Based on the comments of Environmental Health, it is considered that these noise outbreak issues from the building and any require external plant and equipment are capable of being addressed through a noise attenuation condition. However, the more unpredictable impact of

additional activity generated by customers and traffic movements potentially into the later evening has the potential to significantly harm residential amenity, particularly with regard to the occupants of houses on York Street. It is therefore not considered that the development has the potential to introduce additional noise impacts.

Positive and proactive engagement with the applicant - An amendment to the DMPO, which came into effect on 1st December 2012, requires every decision notice relating planning permission and reserved matters application to include an explanation as to how the local planning authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems, which arise during the determination of the planning application. This includes the identification of issues and 'problems' associated with the proposals that have required positive consideration, dialogue and negotiation to secure positive outcomes.

In this case, the applicant was advised that the principle of the development was not supported due to its excessive magnitude of the proposed extensions and their incongruous relationship to the surrounding context and potential harm to residential amenity. The applicant engaged in a dialogue with officers and submitted a revised proposal for consultation purposes. However, the proposed revised design was not considered to be satisfactory as it did not address concerns regarding design and relationship of new built form to the surrounding context. In these circumstances, it was considered appropriate for the development to be assessed on basis of the originally submitted drawings supplemented with details of in-curtilage cycle storage. The applicant was advised accordingly.

Principle of the development - Whilst the application site may have the potential to accommodate a proportionate addition to the building, the submitted proposal would lead to the formation of an excessively large extension that would be harmful to the character and amenities of the area. There is also concern that the design and commercial appearance of the rear extensions would detract from the character of York Street and lead to the inappropriate intrusion of Class E use into a residential street this would be harmful to residential amenity.

Siting – It is acknowledged that the amendments to the first floor extension have reduced the extent of its rearward projection compared to withdrawn application ref: 132325/FO/2021, however, concerns remain regarding the scale and composition of the proposed extensions, the amount of additional floorspace and its proximity to neighbouring housing on York Street.

Consideration has been given to the amount of floorspace added the rear of the neighbouring 1020 Stockport Road, which is orientated towards the gable elevation of 1 York Street and is predominantly related to the ground floor thereby reducing its impact. It also appears that part of the yard area has been retained to the rear of the property to reduce its site coverage. At first floor level the extensions have a staggered configuration thereby retaining a sense of space across the site and providing some articulation within the built form. By contrast, the proposed extensions would extend across the full width of the application site. The development would also bring built form into much closer proximity to the garden and windows of the nearest house at 1 York Street. It is considered that the graduated height of the building, from ground to roof level, would produce an oppressive relationship to neighbouring houses due to its resulting close proximity to the alleyway and loss of open setting within the application site. It is considered the proposals would represent an excessive magnitude of development that would not be appropriately related to the constraints of the site.

Height, scale and massing – The positioning of the roof extensions would relate appropriately to the main ridge line (and the eaves in relation to the front roof extension). However, these extensions would extend across almost the full width of the existing roof planes. The main roof would thereby a disproportionately large and bulky appearance when viewed from both Stockport Road and York Street. It is acknowledged that the rear extension would have a

stepped configuration with the first floor element related the height of the existing ridge line. However, when viewed cumulatively the extension would have disproportionately large and bulky appearance, which would be emphasised by the position of these additions across the full width of the original building at ground and first floor levels. The graduated height of the extensions, when viewed from the adjacent alleyway, would be exacerbated by the arrangement of the proposed elongated windows with extensive glazing and the extent of the site coverage. The development would lead to the disproportionate enlargement of the original building.

Design – The inclusion of flat roofs to neighbouring extended properties is acknowledged. However, the scale of and proportion of the proposed rear extensions, including the roof extension, would be excessive and fail to secure an appropriate subservience to the host building. Neighbouring buildings do not incorporate such extensive glazing. The incorporation of this detailing materially affects the relationship of the application property to its context and effectively results in the formation of a dual frontage building. The facias formed to the eaves at ground and first floor level would emphasise the width of new built form and the extent of its site coverage. The proposed front roof extension would detract from the existing roof composition to the detriment of the streetscene to Stockport Road. On balance, it is considered that design of the development has not been satisfactorily informed by or related to the existing building and its context.

Inclusive access – The ground floor rear elevation would incorporate step and the existing front entrances to Stockport Road also incorporate steps. There would be no change in circumstance with regard to access to the building. An accessible WC to one of the ground floor offices would be retained.

Residential amenity – The development would harm the amenity of the residents of No 1048 through the formation of a disproportionately large rear extensions. Residential amenity would be further harmed by the noise activity and disturbance from the expanded operation of the Class E uses. There is also concern that, if the rear doorway were to be brought into use as a secondary entrance, the resulting pedestrian activity would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents (particularly No 1). Given the extensive incorporation of glazing within the rear elevation, there is strong concern that light spillage may occur causing undue disturbance to neighbouring houses, particularly in the evening periods during autumn and winter. It is not considered that these harmful impacts could be mitigated against as part of the development. Residential amenity would not, therefore, be appropriately safeguarded.

Car parking and highways issues – The existing rear yard is currently used for car parking. This arrangement has not been authorised and is not considered to be appropriate due to its access and egress via an alleyway. However, this existing car parking arrangement demonstrates that the existing development generates traffic that would be displaced into neighbouring streets as a result of the development. The applicant has not demonstrated how traffic would be managed beyond the provision of cycle storage to reduce reliance of car usage. Any potential increase in vehicle movement and on-street car parking within the vicinity of the site, would be experienced by residents on York Street as a result of increased activity, noise and disturbance that would be harmful to residential amenity.

Cycle storage - There is concern that the proposed cycle storage racks would be located to the rear of the site and in a location with restricted natural surveillance. Cycles would thereby be vulnerable to theft and vandalism. There is also concern that the siting of cycle racks would compromise access to the proposed bins, including their movement from and return to collection points. The cycle storage arrangements are therefore not considered to be acceptable.

Crime reduction and site security – Notwithstanding the comments of GMP Design for Security, it is considered that the proposed doorway the rear of the building and adjacent to an alleyway, would be vulnerable to attack due to a lack of natural surveillance and the absence of and appropriate boundary treatment. Similar concerns are related to the siting of the proposed cycle storage. There is also concern that the absence of a secure boundary treatment to adjacent to the alleyway would increase the vulnerability of the rear door and cycle storage. In other respects, the comments of GM Police could be potentially incorporated into a more appropriately designed development.

Waste management – The applicant has indicated that the development would be supported with six 240 litre bins in two timber enclosures at each side of the courtyard. However, the waste streams to be stored in the bins and the collection points have not been identified. Appropriate waste management has not been identified as part of the development.

Land conditions – No specific land contamination issues have been identified by Environmental Health and any emerging issues would be addressed through the watching brief condition.

Flood risk – The site is in Flood Zone 1 and has a relatively low risk of flooding. The provision of improved drainage would be encouraged if a more suitable development were to be brought forward in the future.

Conclusion – It is considered that the development would result in the cramped overdevelopment of the site. Furthermore, the development would fail to secure satisfactory subservience to the composition of the host building and would be poorly related to neighbouring housing. The development would also extend commercial activity into a residential street to the detriment of local amenity. The development would thereby be unacceptable due to its be harmful impact on the character and amenity of residents of York Street, including increased pedestrian and highway activity.

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: Refuse

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. In this case, the applicant was advised that the principle of the development was not supported due to its excessive magnitude of the proposed extensions and their incongruous relationship to the surrounding context and potential harm to residential amenity. The applicant engaged in a dialogue with officers and submitted a revised proposal for consultation purposes. However, the proposed revised design was not considered to be satisfactory as it did not address concerns regarding design and relationship of new built form to the surrounding context. In these circumstances, it was considered appropriate for the development to be assessed on basis of the originally submitted drawings supplemented with details of in-curtilage cycle storage. The applicant was advised accordingly.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its component proportions, height, siting, scale, massing and design, would result in the formation of incongruous, overly dominant and excessively bulky additions that would detract from the appearance of the existing building and the character of the neighbouring context. Furthermore, the magnitude of the development would not be appropriately related to the constraints of the application site and would thereby result in its cramped overdevelopment and have harmful and overbearing impact on neighbouring housing and the streetscene. The proposed development would thereby adversely affect the residential and visual amenity contrary to policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 of Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The design of the proposed rear and roofs extensions, by virtue of the composition of the related flat roofscape and extensive incorporation glazing within the rear elevations (with potential for light spillage and disturbance to neighbouring houses), would be poorly related to the existing building and the proximity, scale, appearance and character of neighbouring built form, particularly adjacent houses in York Street. The development would thereby be harmful to the residential and visual amenities of the areas and contrary to policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The development would lead to the formation of dual frontage building and increase the amount of office accommodation Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) and levels of pedestrian vehicular activity, noise and disturbance in and around York Street. The potential expansion of a Class E use into a residential street would be harmful to its character and thereby be harmful to the amenities and privacy of neighbouring residents. The development would thereby be contrary to policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, save policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The development has failed to demonstrate that appropriate arrangements for the siting and operation of external waste/recycling enclosures and the provision of secure cycle storage to encourage the adoption of sustainable transportation modes. The development would thereby be contrary to policies SP1, T1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management
Greater Manchester Police

1022 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
Flat 1, 1012 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
Flat 1, 955A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
955A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
Mecca Bingo, 1008 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
Flat Above, 949 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
Top Flat, 1020 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
Top Flat, 1014 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
First Floor Flat, 1 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
Ground Floor Flat, 1 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
1010A Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
Flat 1, 951 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
1020 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
1008 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
959 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
71 Manor Road, Levenshulme, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 3EU
2 York Street, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 3YS
1024 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WX
5 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
955 - 957 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
Flat 2, 951 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
1014 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
1010 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
1006 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
949 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
951 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3NP
3 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
3 York Street, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 3YS
1012 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
7 Pascal Street, Manchester, M19 3WW
Bricks Properties, 1016 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3WN
1 York Street, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 3YS

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA