

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134979/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 7 October 2022

Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front porch to form additional living accommodation

Address: 142 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH

Ward(s): Longsight Ward

Applicant: Mr Muhammad Naeem, 142 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH

Agent (if any): Mr Ahmad Turkmani, AT A. Design, 12 Hastings Gardens, Stockport, Manchester, SK5 8BF

Case officer: Harriet Aidoo
Tel: 0161 234 4532
Email: harriet.aidoo@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 30 November 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 18 October 2022

Standard consultations:

Printed: 13 October 2022 Expired: 3 November 2022

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 13 October 2022 Expired: 3 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

Description of site / building / area

The application relates to a hipped roof, end-of-terrace dwellinghouse within a predominantly residential area of the Longsight ward of Manchester. The application property is sited along a triangular shaped corner plot position, which has a diagonal boundary with the adjoining property, no.2 Elsham Gardens. The application site benefits from amenity space along the front elevation (depth, approximately 3.9 metres), side elevation, and rear elevation (minimum depth, approximately 2.1 metres, maximum depth, approximately 8.2 metres), off-street car parking along the side of the existing house, including boundary treatment approximately 1.8 metres along the rear elevation which incorporates a wrought iron gated access along the side elevation of the existing house to access the rear garden.

There is an existing single storey extension within the rear garden of no. 140 Stanley Grove, which projects approximately 3.2 metres in depth along the common shared boundary.

In terms of the application site, there is existing built form within the rear curtilage which has not been accurately reflected on the submitted plans and as noted at the time of the planning officer's site visit, dated 18/10/2022. It is noted that a single storey rear extension which covers approximately 70% of the rear garden, and projects approximately 3.2 metres in depth, and

covers a significant width of the rear building line of the original dwellinghouse is substantially complete.

Description of development

The submitted application proposes the erection of a two storey side extension and front porch to form additional living accommodation.

The proposed two storey side extension would be flush with the front building line of the original dwellinghouse and come forward of the common shared boundary with no. 2 Elsham Gardens approximately 7559.50mm wide, whilst retaining a small gap of approximately 98mm from this boundary; it will then project approximately 8804.00mm along this side boundary, then return and come forward of the side elevation of the existing dwellinghouse approximately 1359.50mm wide, and flush with its rear building line. The proposed extension would incorporate a pitch roof configuration, 2no. windows along the ground floor front elevation, 2no. windows along the first floor front elevation, 1no. window along the first floor rear elevation, including a door along the ground floor rear elevation.

With regards to the proposed front porch, it would be placed in front of the existing front door and would be stepped away approximately 155mm from the common shared boundary with no. 140 Stanley Grove, leaving a small gap. It would measure approximately, 1500mm deep x 3300mm wide x 3000mm high. The porch would have a combined shallow hipped and lean-to pitch roof design and incorporate 1no. stepped access centrally placed in front of the proposed front door which would be flanked by windows either side along the Stanley Grove elevation, including further windows along the side elevations facing the common shared boundary with no.140 Stanley Grove and no.2 Elsham Gardens.

In terms of external facing materials, it is intended to use matching materials.

Consultations & Notification Responses

1. Local residents

Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. No objections, comments, or representations were received.

2. Environmental Health

No comments regarding application on this occasion.

POLICY

The following guidance and policies are considered to be relevant to the proposed development.

1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (July 2021) -

This Framework came into effect on 27th March 2012 and was amended and updated in February 2019. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It defines the Government's requirements for the planning system 'only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so'. It provides a mechanism through which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities'.

The Framework has been related to the proposed development, with particular emphasis given to the following:

- Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities.
- Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places.

2. Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ('the Core Strategy') was adopted by the Council on 11th July 2012.

It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.'

The following policies are relevant to the proposed development:

Policy SP 1 (Spatial Principles) - Specifies the Core Development Principles for parts of the City. In this case the relevant principles relate to the extent to which the development:

- a. Makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including the creation of well designed places that enhance or create character; making a positive contribution to the health, safety and well-being of residents, considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income and to protect and enhance the built and natural environment;
- b. Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible.

Policy DM1 (Development Management) - States that all development should have regard to the following specific issues:

- i. Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development to ensure that development has regard to the character of the surrounding area;
- ii. Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality and road safety and traffic generation;
- iii. Community safety and crime prevention;
- iv. Design for health;
- v. Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space;
- vi. Refuse storage and collection.

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) - States that all development in Manchester will be expected to follow the seven principles of urban design, as identified in national planning guidance and have regard to the strategic character area in which the development is located.

Policy EN19 (Waste) - States that developers should have full regard to the economic and environmental benefits that well designed and run, waste management facilities can bring to the District, subject to any conditions required to protect the amenity of existing adjacent users, and encourage communities to take responsibility for the waste they create through the provision of accessible facilities.

Policy T2 (Accessible areas of opportunity and need) - States that the Council will actively manage the pattern of development to ensure that in new development:

- The car parking standards are maximums and the cycle and disabled car parking standards are minimums. However the Council will take the circumstances of each proposal into account to establish what level of parking is appropriate.

3. Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (UDP)

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan. However, saved Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still of relevance. This states:

DC1.1

In determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the council will have regard to:

- a) the general character of the property
- b) the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- c) the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs
- d) the overall appearance of the proposal in the street scene
- e) the effect of the loss of any on site car parking

DC1.2

Extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the plan and the following criteria:

- a) they are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of the original buildings)
- b) they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy
- c) they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details
- d) they would not result in the loss of off street car parking in a situation where there is so severe an existing on street car parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the council will not normally approve:

- a) rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12ft) in length
- b) 2 storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway
- c) 2 storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house
- d) flat roofed extensions to bungalows
- e) extensions which conflict with the council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance)

DC1.4

In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a) The development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b) The actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c) The actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved.

As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

Policy DC1.6

For the avoidance of doubt, policies DC1.1 to DC1.4 apply to domestic houses, flats, houses in multiple occupation, nursing homes, rest homes and hotels.

Reasons: Many people prefer to extend their existing homes rather than move, and the planning system needs to accommodate this demand for more living space, while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed. The Council is not generally in favour of dealing with this issue by laying down firm rules about home extensions; the policy therefore allows each case to be looked at on its individual merits, having regard to a range of criteria.

4. Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007 - The document aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

The following paragraphs are of particular relevance:

i. Section 2 Design - Discusses the importance of the design of new development in relation to surrounding neighbourhoods and the character of its streets, in terms of its layout, design, scale, massing and orientation of its buildings to achieve a unified urban form to enliven the neighbourhood and its sustainability. The density of the development should also be informed by the characteristics of an area and the specific circumstances of the proposals. It is considered that these design principle have not been satisfactorily incorporated into the development.

ISSUES

Principle of development

The principle of extending one's home is acceptable and the planning system accommodates this demand for more living space, while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed. The key issues for this application are therefore the impacts on visual and residential amenity.

Residential and Visual Amenity

Having assessed the proposal, a number of concerns relate to the scheme. Firstly; with regards to the proposed width of the 2 storey side extension - the existing dwellinghouse is approximately 6600mm wide, the proposed extension would follow the existing front and rear building lines but would project 7559.50mm wide beyond the existing side elevation facing Elsham Gardens. A gap of approximately 98mm would be left from the side elevation of the proposed extension to the common boundary fence with no.2 Elsham Gardens, and therefore, in light of the pre-existing site topography, with the application site commanding a prominent corner plot position within the streetscene at the junction of Stanley Grove and Elsham Gardens, the proposed extension would therefore be quite prominent along Elsham Gardens and Stanley Grove, which is a primary highway. It is considered that the proposal is excessively large resulting in a development which is out of character with the style of development in the area and the surrounding streetscene by virtue of design and as a result, it is considered that the overall character of the surrounding area would be harmed if the proposal were to be allowed.

The proposed 2 storey side extension would also create a building with an overly large footprint, which would not be in keeping with the character of adjoining properties. Furthermore, the proposed extension would not be seen as subservient to the main house and would be overly intrusive in the streetscene.

It is therefore considered that the scale of the development in relation to the surrounding context, is excessively large and bulky and would have an unacceptable impact on no. 2 Elsham Gardens and the wider area. On this basis, it is considered that development does not respond positively to The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policies SP1, DM1 and EN1; saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC1; and The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance.

With regards to the proposed front porch, given the proposed scale of the porch, measuring approximately, 1500mm deep x 3300mm wide x 3000mm high, whilst the proposed depth and

height would be in line with the limitations of general permitted development, there is a variance of approximately 300mm in excess of the limitations of general permitted development in terms of the proposed width. In addition, once the structure is in situ, it would be less than 2 metres of the property boundary and the highway and therefore, it is considered that if the proposed width were pulled in, in line with the limitations of general permitted development, although it comes forward of the highway, this element of the proposal on its own could be accommodated in this location without unduly impacting residential or visual amenity. Notwithstanding this factor, it is considered that coupled with the combined scale of the 2 storey side extension element, and the resultant cumulative impact of the development in relation to the surrounding context, is excessively large and bulky and would have an unacceptable impact on no. 2 Elsham Gardens, the appearance along streetscene, and the wider area.

The submitted information also indicates a significant loss of the existing on-site car parking space along the side elevation of the existing dwellinghouse to accommodate the proposed 2 storey side extension. However, light of the fact that Stanley Grove is a primary highway, it has not been demonstrated if at least one off-street car parking space, in line with Manchester City Council's standard can be retained. It is therefore considered that the proposed development does not respond positively to policy T2 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

In terms of refuse management arrangements, a significant amount of the existing amenity space along the side elevation of the existing dwellinghouse and the existing gated access to the rear garden would be lost to accommodate the proposed 2 storey side extension, although it is unclear from the submitted information the proposed storage location of wheeled bins. It is therefore considered that the proposed development does not respond positively policy EN19 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Correspondence was sent to the agent on 14/11/22 and 29/11/22 expressing the concerns relating to the proposal and requesting confirmation regarding how they wished to proceed. No revisions have been received. The proposal cannot be supported in its current form and therefore will be recommended for refusal.

Conclusion

In this instance, it is considered the proposal does not sufficiently accord with the principles of the policy documents outlined above. Although the proposed development would allow the adaptation of the existing house to meet changing residential needs, on balance, it is considered that the proposal is excessively large resulting in a development which is out of character with the style of development in the area and the surrounding streetscene by virtue of design. It is therefore considered that the overall character of the surrounding area would be harmed. It is therefore considered that the proposed development does not respond positively to The National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021); policies SP1, DM1, EN1, EN19 and T2 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (July 2012); saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995); and the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (April 2007).

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

In assessing the merits of a planning application officers will seek to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. The application has been determined in accordance with the guidance contained within saved policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material considerations; however, in this instance, a solution that was satisfactory to both the Local Planning Authority and the agent could not be reached as the nature of the proposal was considered to be unacceptable.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposal by virtue of the footprint of the two storey side extension and its position along the side garden of the application site coming significantly forward of the common shared boundary with no.2 Elsham Gardens and the junction of the Stanley Grove and Elsham Gardens highways would result in an overly dominant and visually intrusive feature along the streetscene that is not subservient to the original dwellinghouse, to the detriment of the general character of the property and the visual amenity of the area within which it is situated, coupled with the resultant loss of on-site car parking space and failing to demonstrate refuse management arrangements, would as a consequence cause a harmful loss of residential amenity to occupiers of surrounding properties and the wider neighbourhood; contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021); policies SP1, DM1, T2, EN19 and EN1 of The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan (1995).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Environmental Health

151 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DL
Flat 18, Gorebrook Court, Pink Bank Lane, Manchester, M12 5UZ
Flat 17, Gorebrook Court, Pink Bank Lane, Manchester, M12 5UZ
Flat 16, Gorebrook Court, Pink Bank Lane, Manchester, M12 5UZ
Flat 15, Gorebrook Court, Pink Bank Lane, Manchester, M12 5UZ
153 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DL
149 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DL
144A Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH
144 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH
140 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH
138 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH
136 Stanley Grove, Longsight, Manchester, M18 7DH
4 Elsham Gardens, Manchester, M18 7DJ
2 Elsham Gardens, Manchester, M18 7DJ

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
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA