

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 135063/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 28 September 2022
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension
Address: 13 Tours Avenue, Manchester, M23 0LN
Ward(s): Brooklands Ward

Applicant: Ms. Ruth Samuel, 13 Tours Avenue, Manchester, M23 0LN
Agent (if any): Mr Paul Reid, Reid Design Limited, 26 Raven Road, Altrincham, WA15 6AP
Case officer: Janine Renshaw-Livesey
Tel: 0161 234 4555
Email: janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 6 December 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 8 November 2022

Standard consultations:

Printed: 18 November 2022 Expired: 9 December 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 29 November 2022 Expired: 6 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: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of site/building

The site relates to a two storey semi-detached property located on Tours Walk in the Brooklands ward area of Manchester. The property is located on a triangular corner plot.

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension to provide a kitchen diner.

There have been no previous planning applications at the address.

Negations

The original submission comprised of a two-storey side extension and the widening of the existing access arrangements to create space for two cars. The scheme was amended to remove the first-floor element due to concerns for impacts relating to overbearing and overlooking and the amendments to the driveway was also omitted from the scheme.

Consultations & Notification Responses

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted and no representations were received.

Issues

Policy and Issues

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN19 Waste
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

Principle

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

The application proposes a single storey side extension to create a kitchen diner.

The extension would be in line with the front wall of the property and set back approximately 2.5 metres from the rear elevation. The projection from the sidewall is 2.9 metres. The roof would be hipped, and the windows are situated on the front and rear elevation.

The extension would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene, however, it is considered that the character of the area has been retained and therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible. The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to

the property especially as the proposal is single storey. Given the gap together with the height of the proposal, this would not lead to overshadowing or loss of light to surrounding properties and therefore complies with City Council policies.

The window on the rear elevation facing the garden was considered to be acceptable as it does not provide any additional overlooking that already exists from the existing rear windows.

It is not anticipated that there would be harm given by the introduction of a single storey side extension.

Overall, the proposal is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property.

The proposal complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is comparable in size to many others found in the area and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is therefore considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring property at the side and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the proposal would be an acceptable addition to the property and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials as specified in the application form.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable.

Parking

Not affected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any undue loss of amenity, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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

The application has been determined in a positive and proactive manner. In this instance no issues have arisen during consideration of the proposals and appropriately worded conditions are proposed.

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 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 following drawings and documents:

PL-104, PL-100 Rev B and the Flood Map, stamped as received on the 28 September 2022 and PL-106 Rev B, stamped as received on the 28 November 2022.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) The development hereby approved shall be constructed using materials that match those used in the original property in terms of size, colour and texture.

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 Core Strategy.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without

modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved drawings.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services

15 Tours Avenue, Manchester, M23 0LN
33 Hillend Road, Manchester, M23 0LL
35 Hillend Road, Manchester, M23 0LL
38 Hillend Road, Manchester, M23 0LG
36 Hillend Road, Manchester, M23 0LG
34 Hillend Road, Manchester, M23 0LG

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