

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134995/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 29 September 2022

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension together with front porch

Address: 22 Stretton Avenue, Manchester, M20 6HE

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Elliott Miller, 22 Stretton Avenue, Manchester, M20 6HE

Agent (if any): Mr Ian Grainger, Blu Room Architecture, 5 Uplands Road, Darlington, DL3 7SZ

Case officer: Janine Renshaw-Livesey
Tel: 0161 234 4555
Email: janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 21 November 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: 10 October 2022 Expired: 31 October 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

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of red brick with a grey tiled hipped roof. The property sits on a triangular plot which includes front and rear gardens.

Description of area

Stretton Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac within the Didsbury East Ward.

Description of development

Erection of a two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension together with front porch

There is no planning history at the site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were consulted, and two objection letters were received. Concerns raised by one objector related to the first-floor extension of the proposal would give rise to overlooking, shadowing and constitutes over development. A preference would be to have a single storey rear and a two-storey side extension.

Other matters raised by the same objector were none planning issues that relate to building regulations structural matters and civil matters such as the extent of interventions and the impact they have on the integrity of other properties in relation to the party wall act.

A letter of objection was received raising concerns to potential noise from construction and work activity may have on the occupiers of nearby properties. Construction noise associated with this type of development cannot be control through the planning system. The other issue raised by the same objector related to car parking and whether the development would impact on the car parking arrangements. The proposal does not impact on the current car parking arrangements that exist at the site.

The matters raised by the objector regarding residential amenity issues as a result of the proposal will be discussed within the issues section of the report.

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 does not accord 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 applicant proposes to erect a two-storey side and part single part two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

The property is located on at the head of a Cul de Sac within a predominantly residential area.

Ground Floor

The ground floor element of the proposal would be set back from the front of the property considerably, extending along the side and forming a wraparound extension extending across the rear up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling house no. 21 Stretton Avenue. The projection from the rear of the wall would be 1.8 m. A projection towards the side boundary would be approximately 2m at its widest with a gap varying from 700mm and 2 metres is retained to the shared boundary respectively with no.24 Stretton Avenue. One window is proposed on the side elevation. To ensure that there is no overlooking or loss of privacy on the adjacent neighbouring property no. 24 Stretton Avenue, a condition for obscure glazing has been attached.

First Floor

The first-floor element of the proposal would be setback from the front wall of the property considerably extending along the side and forming a wraparound partially across the rear wall of the house.

The first floor projection of the extension is 1.8 meters off the rear wall and pulled in from the adjoining property No 21 Stretton Avenue by approximately 3 meters. A projection towards the side boundary is the same as the ground floor which maintains a gap between the boundary of no 24 Stretton Avenue. The roof would be set down significantly from the existing ridge height and hipped at the rear element of the extension. No windows would be located on the side. The first-floor rear windows face the garden of the property.

Given the retained gap to the shared boundary of the adjacent semi-detached property and the fact the single storey rearward projection measures 1.8m and the first floor would be pulled away from the boundary of the adjoining property by approximately 3 metres coupled with the orientation of the property, it is not considered that the proposal would provide any undue harm caused by overshadowing or loss of light to the existing residential amenities for the occupiers. Given the relationship to the adjacent property no. 24 Stretton Avenue and the setback provided by the extension, it is considered that the proposal would not provide terracing or any loss of amenity within the street scene.

In terms of residential amenity, it is not considered that there will be any significant impact and the proposed development therefore accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

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. The appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and are 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 would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. In terms of the proposed materials, it is intended to use brick and tiles as specified in the application form. 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

rear and is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure.

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

Off street car parking space would be retained to the site and therefore it is considered that car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

Conclusion

Although the proposal would be visible from the public highway and therefore would be a feature within the street scene, the character of the area is still retained. The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwellinghouse and the proposal is considered 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, or the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

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 / agent in a positive and proactive manner to guide the application through all stages of the planning process and resolve any issues that arose in dealing with the planning application. Further information was sought from officers during the application and amendments were made to the proposal.

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:

Location Plan, 03, 04 and 05, stamped as received 21 September 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.

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 drawings.

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

5) Prior to the first occupation of the development, the first floor en suite window and the ground floor utility room, shown on the proposed drawings, stamped as received on the 21 September 2022, 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 properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

21 Stretton Avenue, Manchester, M20 6HE
37 Willow Way, Manchester, M20 6JT
35 Willow Way, Manchester, M20 6JT
43 Willow Way, Manchester, M20 6JT
1 Benham Close, Manchester, M20 6GG
20 Stretton Avenue, Manchester, M20 6HE
12 Stretton Avenue, Manchester, M20 6HE
11 Stretton Avenue, Manchester, M20 6HE
59 Willow Way, Manchester, M20 6JT
41 Willow Way, Manchester, M20 6JT
39 Willow Way, Manchester, M20 6JT

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