

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134451/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 21 July 2022
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension to the rear and porch to the front
Address: 19 Arthog Road, Manchester, M20 6HR
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Niall Mizba, 19 Arthog Road, Manchester, M20 6HR
Agent (if any): Mr Ian Grainger, Blu Room Architecture, 5 Uplands Road, Darlington, DL3 7SZ
Case officer: Janet Lawless
Tel: 0161 234 4535
Email: janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 02.09.2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 31.08.2022

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 1 August 2022 Expired: 22 August 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

The property that is the subject of this householder application is a 2 -storey red brick semi-detached house. It has a bay window to the ground floor at the front, garden area to the front and rear with the front having been block paved historically to provide off road parking. The boundary comprises of a small area of low brick wall and timber post and panel fencing. To the rear is an original single storey outrigger that occupies half the width of the house, with the rear garden comprising of patio and lawned area.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in nature with properties of a similar age and style to the proposal site. Many of the properties within the immediate area have had the benefit of extensions to them, and similar porches to the front elevation. To the east lies the rail line, and beyond that Didsbury Park.

Description of development

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear. It would project from the rear by 4 metres and run across the width of the property being extended a further 1 metre beyond the side elevation towards the common boundary with number 21 Arthog Road. The proposed extension would have a mono-pitch roof. There are no windows proposed in the side elevations with the windows and bi-fold doors being in the rear elevation and additional natural lighting being provided by 2 Velux type roof lights within the slope of the roof. There is also a

single storey porch proposed to the front elevation. The finish on the rear extension is proposed as render.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents were informed- no representations have been 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 EN 19 - Waste Management
- 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 extending a residential property in an established residential area to create additional living accommodation is generally considered 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 to indicate otherwise.

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 applicant proposes a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing outrigger. The roof would be a mono- pitch roof with the installation of 2 x no. roof lights. A window and Bi folding doors are proposed on the rear of the property overlooking the applicants own garden. The proposed materials would be a contrasting render to the existing property. The extension would run horizontally along the rear of the property and would have a rearward projection of 4m. Given the pitch and slope of the roof, it is not considered that the extension would be overbearing. With the windows being on the rear, there is no overlooking of the neighbouring properties, and much of the extension would be screened by the boundary treatments. Whilst the proposed extension would take the property closer to number 21 Arthog Road it is

considered that at single storey and with the retention of 60cm retained to that common boundary that the proposal is acceptable.

The porch to the front is very modest in size, it only projects 1 metre from the front of the property, and is very similar in footprint to the porches on numbers 17 and 21 Arthog Road.

It is not therefore considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the level of amenity currently enjoyed by the neighbouring properties.

Visual amenity and impact on the character of the area

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and would not feature within the street scene, the porch although visible from within the street scene has no greater impact upon visual amenity than the many that already exist within the street scene. The character of the property would be retained and therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale, retains subservience and is in sympathetic to the design of the host property. It enables a better use of the development than the existing outrigger. It provides a much more usable space. The proposal therefore complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policy DC1.

Siting, scale and massing

The size and footprint of the proposed extension is not considered to result in an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is of a commensurate scale to the host property and there is no issue relating to the massing of the extension it 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 proposal is in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the materials, these are to match those of the existing; The design detail is what would be expected of an extension of this type and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

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.

Disabled access

Not applicable

Refuse

The storage of refuse bins is not affected by the proposal, as there would be continued access to the rear or side of the property for storage to bring kerbside on collection day., which accords with policy EN19 of the Core Strategy.

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, EN3 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

Officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. In this case no significant issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in a timely manner and in line with both national and local policies. Appropriate conditions have been attached to the permission granted.

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:

Drawing Pack 22/035-03 Proposed Ground Floor Plan.

04- Proposed First Floor Plan.

05- Proposed Elevations.

AI received 21st July 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 materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, including the mortar and patching in, the render shall be a colour through render and all materials shall be in accordance with those listed on the application forms.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 plans.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

87 Kingsfield Drive, Manchester, M20 6HU

21 Arthog Road, Manchester, M20 6HR

17 Arthog Road, Manchester, M20 6HR

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: SOUTH AREA