

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134303/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 2 August 2022

Proposal: Erection of two storey side and rear extension, rear roof dormer and the rendering first floor walls

Address: 89 Greenhill Road, Manchester, M8 0NS

Ward(s): Crumpsall Ward

Applicant: Mrs Shameem Akhtar, 89 Greenhill Road, Manchester, M8 0NS

Agent (if any): Mr V Alyas, Architek, 916 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 3AB

Case officer: Adam Mitchell
Tel: 0161 234 4165
Email: adam.mitchell@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: REFUSAL

Date of recommendation: 23.09.2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 23rd August 2022

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 5 August 2022 Expired: 26 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of Site/Area

The property relates to an end two storey property located on the corner of the junction between Balliol Street and Greenhill Road. The property relates to a bay fronted semi-detached dwellinghouse situated within a predominantly residential area of Crumpsall in North Manchester. The site is next to the Metrolink line that runs through Crumpsall. The property benefits from hardstanding area to the front, side and rear, existing single storey side extension and detached garage, off street car parking spaces and boundary screening.

Description of development

The submitted application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey side and rear extension, rear roof dormer and the rendering first floor walls to form additional living accommodation. The two storey side extension would become flush with the original ridge roof height and measure approx. height 8m x width 4.5m x depth 10m x Rear Projection 2.1m. The extension would become flush with the principal elevation.

The two storey wraparound rear extension would have approx. dimensions of height 7.8m x width 6.6m x depth 2.1m. The extension would incorporate a set-in dimension (3.5m) from the shared boundary with 91 Greenhill Road.

The rear dormer would be situated along the original roof with approx. dimensions of height 2.1m x width 6.9m x depth 4.1m. Additionally the dormer would be level with the original eaves.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents were notified however none responded.

Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - The NPPF sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors.

Relevant to this application is Section 12 'Achieving Well Designed Places'

Paragraph 130 states:

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks;
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Paragraph 134 goes on to state that:

'Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.'

Manchester's Core Strategy was adopted on 11th July 2012 and is the Key Development Plan Document in the Local Development Framework. It states that all new developments should follow the 'Development Principles' and accord with the design guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Documents.

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

-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,

-Minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible;

Policy DM 1 Development Management- All development should have regard to the following specific issues for which more detailed guidance may be given within a supplementary planning document:

-Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.

-Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area.

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies- A number of UDP policies have remained until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. The following remaining policies are considered relevant to this application:

DC1.2 states that 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 original buildings);
- b. They do not create 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 scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.

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

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

Issues

Principle

It is believed that due to the scale, massing, appearance and siting of the proposed first floor side, two storey rear extension together with the erection of a rear dormer and rendering of the first floor elevations will have a harmful impact upon visual and residential amenity and the appearance of the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Residential and Visual Amenity

The proposed development would almost double the footprint of the property. The proposed two storey side extension does not comply with the City Councils 'Saved Unitary Development Plan Policy DC1.2 & DC1.4' which states,

DC1.2 states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding scene by virtue of design, use of materials or construction details.

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 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

The proposed two storey side extension has the potential to have a detrimental impact upon residential and visual amenity upon the existing property and surrounding neighbouring properties. The application site is at the corner of the junction between Greenhill Road and Balliol Street and is therefore situated in a prominent position within the streetscene. Given the proposed two storey side extension has not incorporated a dropdown level from the original ridge roof height or a setback level from the principal elevation, this extension is therefore not subservient to the original dwelling. The extension would not come forward of the building line on Greenhill Road however given its scale, it would compromise the sense of openness around the site.

The property is located on a prominent corner and there is little screening to the property boundary, it is considered that the effect would be that the proposed two storey side extension would form unduly visually-dominant and obtrusive features that would be detrimental to the appearance of the street and the general character of the area.

It is considered that the proposal would form an overly bulky and obtrusive feature on the corner, losing the sense of openness to the corner and blocking views through to the houses to the rear of the application site on Balliol Street. The proposal would be overly dominant and bulky within the street scene to the detriment of visual amenity.

Given the dwelling is a corner property the adjoining semi-detached property (no. 91 Greenhill Road) is the dwelling that has the potential to experience harmful residential amenity. The proposed two storey rear extension is not deemed to provide significant residential amenity to the no. 91 Greenhill Road due to the set-in dimension of the proposed two storey rear from the shared boundary, and therefore preventing an overbearing feature along the boundary line. Additionally, the orientation of the properties would lead to limited overshadowing and loss of privacy implications experienced by the neighbouring property.

Fenestration elements situated on the two storey rear are proposed along the rear elevation overlooking the rear hardstanding area and given the distance to the northern shared boundary with no. 2 Balliol Road it is not deemed that the neighbouring property would experience significant loss of privacy or overlooking implications.

Overall, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable and will have a detrimental impact upon the existing property and the character of the general area in terms of visual amenity.

Siting, Scale and Massing

The size and footprint of the proposed two storey side extension and dormer are believed to provide a bulky and over large structure within a prominent position of the streetscene and is therefore considered that the proposal would be out of character with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. The proposal not satisfactory and is considered not to accord with the principles policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 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: Refusal

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance a solution that was acceptable to both the Local Planning Authority and the applicant/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 proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, bulk and appearance would form an overly dominant and visually obtrusive feature on the corner of Greenhill Road and Balliol Street and would fail to be subservient to the original dwelling house as a result of the roof profile. The proposal would have unduly harmful impact on the general character and appearance of the local area which would detrimental to visual amenity and contrary to the provisions of policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and the NPPF.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

86 Crescent Road, Manchester, M8 9NT
84 Crescent Road, Manchester, M8 9NT
4 Balliol Street, Manchester, M8 0WS
2 Balliol Street, Manchester, M8 0WS
91 Greenhill Road, Manchester, M8 0NS

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 - Not Affected
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA