

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135430/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 10 November 2022
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension
Address: 14 Toddbrook Close, Manchester, M20 1NB
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr P Muff, 14 Toddbrook Close, Manchester, M20 1NB
Agent (if any): Mrs E Caunce, House Architects The Oaks, 3 Village Road, CH48 3JN
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: 8 December 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: Located adjacent to Albert Park Conservation Area 1988

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The application relates to a 3-storey dwellinghouse of redbrick with grey concrete roof tiles. The property features black uPVC windows and doors, a front driveway and garage, side alley used for external access to the rear of the property and a spacious rear garden.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide 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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 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-east. It would project 3.938m from the current wall with a width of 5.615m and a mono-pitch roof height of 3.63m. It would be sited along the border shared with No.15, whilst a gap to the shared border with No.13 would be maintained. The 3.938m 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. It should however be noted that this particular property does not have permitted development rights due to them being removed from the estate’s original permissions. However, given that the rearward projection of the proposal would only extend 0.288m beyond that which would be permitted under policy DC1 of the UDP, the proposal is considered to be reasonable.

Thus, having reviewed the dimensions of the proposal, the siting, scale and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extension would be built of brickwork, grey concrete roof tiles, black uPVC rooflights and black uPVC doors to match the existing. The southwest-facing side elevation would form a blank wall, whilst the rear elevation would feature two bi-folding doors and the northeast-facing elevation would feature one bi-folding door. Additionally, three rooflights are to be implemented on the extension roof. The proposal is relatively standard in design and would be in-keeping with other residential extensions in the area as well as being similar in design to the features of the original dwellinghouse. Sited at the rear, it would not be

visible from a public highway and therefore would not feature within the street scene, hence the overall character of the area should not be harmed by these works.

Thus, the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 and is acceptable as its impact upon visual amenity is considered to be minor.

Residential amenity – Given the maximum roof height of 3.63m in addition to the proposal's south-easterly orientation and existing timber fencing, it is believed that the proposed extension should not cause undue loss of sunlight or daylight for neighbouring residents. Moreover, the blank side elevation sited along the shared boundary with No.15, should ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents should not be compromised.

The proposed extension is therefore acceptable in regard to its minimal effect upon residential amenities as it accords 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 and waste management and parking as it broadly complies with the rules of General Permitted Development 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. Minor 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 drawing numbered 'H103-PL-01', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 10th 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 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.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

44 Toddbrook Close, Manchester, M20 1NB
45 Toddbrook Close, Manchester, M20 1NB
15 Toddbrook Close, Manchester, M20 1NB
13 Toddbrook Close, Manchester, M20 1NB

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
Conservation Area - Albert Park Conservation Area 1988
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA