

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135249/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 21 October 2022

Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension and entrance canopy following demolition of existing garage

Address: 6 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX

Ward(s): Chorlton Ward

Applicant: Mr Tariq Mehmood, 6 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX

Agent (if any): Mr. Niamat Ali, NA Design, 47 Egerton Road South, Chorlton Cum Hardy, Manchester, M21 0YW

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 12 December 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 8 November 2022

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 3 November 2022 Expired: 24 November 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 dwellinghouse of redbrick with red clay roof tiles. The property features white uPVC windows, including a bay with white mock Tudor detailing, a side alley used for external access to the rear of the property and an existing rear extension and outbuilding/garage.

Description of area

Dacre Avenue is a cul-de-sac situated within the Chorlton ward of Manchester, close to Wilbraham Road (A6010), Manley Park and Abbotsford Road Allotments. The area is predominantly characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties and is also within close proximity to a high street with shopping facilities, bars and restaurants.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a side and rear extension together with a front entrance canopy following the demolition of the existing rear extension and garage/outbuilding.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 - no comments or objections were 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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 side and rear extension together with a front entrance canopy in order to provide additional space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable given that many people prefer to adjust and alter their homes rather than move. 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 side and rear of the property, wrapping around the western and northern elevations of the dwellinghouse. The ‘rear’ portion of the proposal would project 4m rearwards (approximately 0.97m beyond the existing rear extension), with a width of 8.37m and a maximum hipped roof height of 3.77m. The ‘side’ portion of the proposal would have a length of 7.32m, width of 1.95m and a maximum hipped roof height of 3.19m. The proposed extension would be sited along the shared boundary with No.8 (which also has a rear extension, projecting 5m rearwards) and would be situated 0.95m from the boundary shared with No.4. The 4m 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 extensions up to 6m for semi-detached dwellinghouses.

Thus, having reviewed the dimensions of the proposal and having noted the 0.95m gap to the shared boundary with No.4 as well as the similarities to the extension already present at No.8, the siting, scale and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable under the rules of General Permitted Development.

The canopy porch would be sited at the front of the property, facing east/southeast. It would project 1.675m frontwards from the current wall with a width of 3m and a hipped roof height of 3.47m. The proposal would not affect the current gaps to the boundaries shared with No.8 and

No.4 and, thus, 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. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable as it accords with policy DC1 of the UDP.

Appearance and visual amenity – The side and rear extension would be built of brickwork, red roof tiles, white uPVC windows and white uPVC doors to match the existing. The side elevations would both form blank walls, whilst the rear elevation would feature two doors and one window. The front elevation would also feature one window and the rear roof would feature two rooflights.

The front entrance canopy would comprise of a hipped, red-tiled roof supported by two Tuscan-style columns atop a slightly raised, rectangular base along with one white uPVC door to match the existing.

The proposals are both relatively standard in design and would be in-keeping with the residential extensions in the area, particularly the rear extension at No.8 and the front porch at No.9, as well as being relatively similar in design to the features of the original dwellinghouse. Moreover, though sited at the front, side and rear of the property, it is believed that the proposed developments would not feature prominently within the street scene as the materials used would be in-keeping with those already present at the property. Hence, the overall character of the house and area should not be significantly harmed by these works.

The design and appearance of the proposed developments therefore accord with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN1 and are acceptable as their impact upon visual amenity is considered to be relatively minor.

Residential amenity – Given the maximum heights of 3.77m for the 'rear' portion of the extension and 3.19m for the 'side' portion of the extension as well as the north-westerly orientation and siting away from the shared boundary with No.4, it is thought that the proposed wraparound extension 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 is not compromised.

The proposed front entrance canopy should also not cause any issues of overshadowing, loss of light or invasion of privacy as it would have a maximum height of 3.47m and would be sited a considerable distance away from the plot's shared boundaries.

The proposed developments 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 these proposals 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 not significantly affected by this proposal. Though the addition of a porch would reduce the space available at the front of the property slightly, a parking space measuring at least 2.4m by 4.8m would be retained. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable.

Conclusion – Given the above issue, 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 the General Permitted Development rules,

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 drawings numbered 'NA-B01' and 'NA-B02', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 24th 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

9 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX
8 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX
5 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX
7 Strathmore Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BU
7 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX
4 Dacre Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BX
5 Strathmore Avenue, Manchester, M16 0BU

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