

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135398/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 4 November 2022

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension together with front porch following demolition of existing rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 194 Blackcarr Road, Manchester, M23 1PA

Ward(s): Baguley Ward

Applicant: Mr D Alty, 194 Blackcarr Road, Manchester, M23 1PA

Agent (if any): Mr Phil Robinson, Graham Lea Architecture, Office 5 Newlands House, 60 Chain House Lane, Preston, PR5 0JT

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 19 December 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 29 November 2022

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 21 November 2022 Expired: 12 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 dwellinghouse of redbrick with grey concrete roof tiles. The property features white uPVC windows, including a two-storey bay, a front porch canopy, a side alley used for external access to the rear of the property, a small existing rear extension and an outbuilding located in the rear garden.

Description of area

Blackcarr Road is a residential street situated within the Baguley ward of Manchester, close to the North Cheshire Motorway (M56), railway line and Baguley Park. The area predominantly consists of semi-detached and terraced residential properties with relatively spacious rear gardens.

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 rear extension in order to form additional living accommodation.

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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

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 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 north/northeast, replacing the existing rear extension. It would project 3.979m from the current wall with a width of 7.85m and a mono-pitch roof height of 3.7m. It would be sited along the boundary shared with No.196 and would maintain a gap to the boundary shared with No.192. The 3.979m 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 as in this case. Thus, having reviewed the dimensions of the proposal and having noted the gap to shared boundary, the siting, scale and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable.

The front porch extension would create a new entrance at the property, with the existing canopy being removed. It would project 1.511m from the current principal elevation, with a width of 2.335m and a hexagonal roof height of 3m. The proposal would maintain the current gap to the shared boundary with No.192 and would be single storey with a south/southwest orientation and, therefore, should not result in any significant overshadowing or be overbearing for neighbouring residents. Overall, it is considered that the dimensions detailed above would not result in 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 and concrete roof tiles to match the existing along with smooth white render (as detailed on the approved drawings). The side elevations of the extension would form blank walls, whilst the rear elevation would feature one window and one bi-folding door with the roof featuring three rooflights.

The front porch would be built of brickwork and concrete roof tiles to match the existing. The porch itself would be hexagonal in shape with windows lining each of the elevations, except for the southeast-facing elevation which would feature the door.

The proposed rear and porch extensions are relatively standard in design and would be in-keeping with other residential extensions in the area. The front porch especially would mirror the porches already present at No.192 and No.196. Moreover, whilst the rear extension would introduce new materials (e.g., smooth white render) to the property, this would be sited at the rear 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 development(s) therefore accord with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Residential amenity – Given the maximum roof height of 3.7m in addition to the north/north-easterly orientation of the rear extension, the proposal should not cause undue loss of sunlight or daylight for neighbouring residents. Moreover, the blank side elevations of the extension should ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents should not be compromised.

Similarly, given the maximum height of 3m, south/south-westerly orientation and location away from shared boundaries, the front porch extension should also not cause undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy for neighbouring residents.

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 storage of bins would not be affected by this proposal as adequate space and access to the rear is retained, therefore the bins would be screened from the street scene, which accords with policies EN19 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Parking – The current parking arrangements are 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.

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. 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 revised drawing pack numbered 'GL449F', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 22nd 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 external elevations of the development hereby approved shall be constructed using materials of a similar visual appearance to the existing dwellinghouse and as indicated on the submitted householder application forms and approved drawings.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

196 Blackcarr Road, Manchester, M23 1PA
33 Biddall Drive, Manchester, M23 1PE
192 Blackcarr Road, Manchester, M23 1PA
61 Hall Lane, Manchester, M23 1NF
59 Hall Lane, Manchester, M23 1NF

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA