

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134690/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 25 August 2022
Proposal: Erection of single storey front porch and side extension, part single part two storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer, to provide additional living accommodation.
Address: 71 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JJ
Ward(s): Sharston Ward
Applicant: Mr. Imran Mir, 71 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JJ
Agent (if any): Mr. Niamat Ali, NA Design, 47 Egerton Road South, Manchester, M21 0YW
Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 30 November 2022



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 28 September 2022

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 2 November 2022 Expired: 16 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 C3 dwellinghouse of reddish brown brick with a hipped roof and round bay windows. The property features an existing two storey side extension and the plot includes a large garden and driveway to the front, wide side access and a generous rear garden, bound by timber fencing.

Description of area

Holliney Road, within the Sharston ward of Wythenshawe, is residential in nature and characterised by similar family dwellinghouses arranged in pairs with large plots. Many have already been extended, particularly by first floor side additions over the garages.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a single storey front porch and side extension, part single part two storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer, to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – 4 letters of objection were received:

Objector 1 - *It is understood that the owner is intending to turn this house into an Airb&b hotel, with the said owner living offsite. This will cause considerable disruption to a quiet residential area. The road itself is only 2 cars wide and they have already caused problems with*

inconsiderate parking, whereby driveways have been blocked, allowing no entry or egress to our own homes. They have also blocked the road itself so that traffic is unable to get through, causing much hooting of horns & raised voices. It is not merely a traffic hazard, but also dangerous for pedestrians, as the pavement is also regularly impassable. This situation will only get worse if this allowed to happen.

We are situated in close proximity to the airport and as such I envisage that

a), the said inconsiderate parking will happen at all hours of the day and night as their customers travel to and from the airport.

b) There will be the noise of car doors being slammed shut, luggage banged about & voices carried on the night air. The disruption will be severe to those of us living close to number 71.

The extension to what is already a 4 bedroom private house, is being undertaken to accommodate more people, with even more vehicles, to turn it into a business which is undesirable on this road.

Objector 2 – *The plans indicate that there will be 7 bedrooms and an increase in the number of bathing facilities. When I last spoke to the owner, he alerted me to his intention for an Airbnb as an option for the use of the property. I am opposed to this as I fear that there will be continuous coming and goings, leading to restless sleep patterns due to 24hr access.*

If the intent is to have an enlarged family could the party wall be soundproofed as the current walls are poorly engineered, allowing easy listening to each other's conversations.

The plans show an extension to the current kitchen, resulting in an extended brick wall whereby our current conservatory will have a reduction in the amount of light entering and it would mean looking at a brick wall instead of foliage. There will also be difficulties with external hygiene to the outside of the conservatory where the two walls will meet.

If the planning goes ahead, can I be assured that there will be no disturbance to our chimney, as you may be aware, the two properties have a shared chimney stack.

Objector 3 – *I live [nearby] and they have advised they will be turning it into a multi let property/B&B. This person lives on his own so why does he need 7 bedrooms, number 75 planning application is for family accommodation but this isn't and goes completely against why the estate was created by the two brothers who had it built. We will have strangers across the road from our daughter and it isn't fair on everyone on the road.*

Objector 4 – *I would like to raise serious concern about this planning application and how the property is going to be managed once it is extended. The homeowner has already advised that this would be used as a multiroom let. I am not sure if that is short term/long term and if a HMO or other short term where we will not know who we are living next too.*

It is already a large 4 bedroom house so unless he is doing multiple occupancy then why would he need 7 bedrooms as he lives on his own regardless of what he says. Currently at present he is also allowing his nephews to use the drive as a sales yard at present there are 7 cars parked in there that they come and sell. It is really unfair on the residents if this is approved number 75 plans were for a family of 5 for extra room, this no one minds but 7 bedrooms meaning probably 7 more cars speeding up the road and it will be built like an eye saw and its unfair as I have worked hard to live here as has everyone else.

Do you have proof he has sold it as the owner who we know still comes to the property regularly the same person who has been here 13 years. So I am not sure he has sold it rather letting someone else live there.

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 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012, amended in 2021) in particular:

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well designed places

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



Issues

Principle – The principle of building single and two storey side and rear extensions along with roof enlargements to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse is generally acceptable given the provisions of saved policy DC1 of the UDP. However, consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The first floor side element would sit at the rear of the historic first floor side, to infill this space. This would connect to the first floor rear element, which would project 4m with a width of 6.1m and a ridge height set 1.07m lower than existing. Below this the single storey rear element would project 5m with a width of 10m and a maximum height of 3.66m. The single storey side element would project 1.6m to the side, occupying the full depth of the extended property and would wrap around the front to meet the porch, 1.25m beyond the principle elevation. The porch itself would project 2.17m forward with a width of 2.7m and a height of 3.37m. The dormer would occupy the original rear slope with a width of 5.86m and an approximate volume of 26.8 cubic metres. This would be made possible by a large hip to gable alteration, extending the hip by 7.1m, over the historic side extension. The rear extension would be sited 0.1m from the party wall shared with No.69 at ground floor and 2.45m at first floor. The side extension would be sited 1m from the boundary shared with No.73 at ground floor and 2.6m at first floor. Due to the large plot and large gap to the neighbouring house (approx. 3.5m wall to wall at ground floor and 7.5m at first floor), the proposal would not form a terracing effect. In this case a lowered ridge is not required due to the strong local precedent which exists on Holliney Road, where at least 13 properties feature flush first floor/two storey side extensions. The rear element exceeds the limit stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m) by 1.35m. However, given the depth of the neighbouring extension (3.5m), size of the garden and permitted development allowances, this is not deemed significant. Originally the dormer was full width and negotiations took place to reduce this in line with the original rear slope. The revised scheme is considered appropriately sited and scaled, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extensions would be constructed from brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC windows/doors, all to match the existing house, which has been conditioned. The side extension and hip to gable features a ridge and pitch to match the existing roof, with 3no rooflights in the front and 1no in the rear. The first floor rear would feature a hipped roof with pitch to match existing. The flat roof box dormer would feature hanging tile cladding to match the rest of the roof. The single storey elements to the side and rear would be hipped, with a dual-pitched porch featuring columns. Due to the orientation and arrangement of these properties, the addition of the proposed extensions would not lead to a terracing effect nor form an obtrusive feature within the street scene, particularly as large two storey side extensions can be seen at many other properties along this street. The extension is to be built of appropriate materials, is standard in design and is in-keeping with the character of development in this area.

Residential amenity – The two storey side/rear corner at first floor would be sited 2.6m from the boundary shared with No.73, which far exceeds the requirement specified within policy DC1 of 1.52m. The roofs would mainly be hipped and side-facing windows have been obscurely glazed (conditioned). The large plot can easily contain the proposed extensions without significantly impacting upon neighbouring occupiers. One objection referred to the depth of the ground floor rear adjacent to the boundary shared with the adjoining semi, however this is only 1.5m beyond the neighbouring extension and therefore is unlikely to cause significant overshadowing. All 4 objections received mainly related to the issue of proposed use, stating that the current occupier has informed neighbours of plans to use the property as either an Airbnb/multi person short-term holiday let or a large HMO. Although the property would go from 4 bedrooms to 7, the agent has confirmed that the proposed use is single family dwellinghouse as existing and a C3(a) use condition has been attached to ensure this remains the case. On

balance, it is considered the revised scheme with conditions should not unduly impact upon residential amenity.

Parking and refuse – The off-street parking arrangement will remain as existing as the large driveway is to be retained, with space for 3-4 cars. A gap of 1m to the boundary is to be retained at the side, providing access to the rear for the transport and storage of refuse bins, in line with policy DM1.

Conclusion – Although it received objections, the revised proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and it is not considered to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. The proposed development is deemed acceptable and works may commence in accordance with the approved drawings and the following conditions.

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 applicant/agent to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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 revised drawings numbered 'NA-P02' and 'NA-P03', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 1st 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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form and drawings.

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.

4) The proposed first and second floor windows, on the side elevation facing No.73 Holliney Road, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) 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 part of the premises shall be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3(a) of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification)).

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to policies DM1 and H11 of the Core Strategy for Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

70 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JH
38 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JP
73 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JJ
40 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JP
36 Gresty Avenue, Manchester, M22 5JP
69 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JJ
72 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JH
68 Holliney Road, Manchester, M22 5JH

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 - Within Outer Area
Airport Noise Index Zone - Noise and Nuisance Index - 40-49
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA