

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134403/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 3 August 2022

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

Address: 7 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW

Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Mr and Mrs P McKenna 7 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW

Agent (if any): Damian Riley Cube Architecture and Design Commercial House ,
Clarence Avenue, Trafford Park, Manchester, M17 1QS

Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: **28th September 2022**

Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Date of site visit:	21 September 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

Description of site/building

The site relates to a two storey semi detached property in the Burnage ward area of Manchester. The property features a garden to the front and rear with access along the side.



Listed building:	Not applicable
Conservation area:	Not applicable
Tree Preservation Order:	Not applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential in character.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension together with single storey front porch



Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. No comments, objections or representations in respect of this application were received.

Policy and Issues

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 accords with the principles of this policy document.

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

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 believed that there are no factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposal is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History

There have been no previous planning applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension together with single storey front porch

The extension would be set back slightly from the front wall of the property extending rearwards along the shared boundary with no. 5 Orville Drive measuring a width of 3.0m and retaining a gap to the shared boundary measuring approximately 1.0m. The proposal would wrap around the property extending across the rear wall and up to the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property no. 9. Orville Drive. The projection beyond the rear wall would measure 3.6m.

The roof would be hipped with the inclusion of three roof lights on the rear. A bay window is proposed on the front elevation. A window and door are proposed on the side elevation with a window and bi folding doors proposed on the rear. It is considered that although there is a window proposed on the side, this is to accommodate a toilet room. Furthermore, given that the neighbouring property has a garage along the shared boundary, the introduction of a window in this location would not lead to overlooking or loss of privacy.

The applicant proposes the erection of a front porch which includes a canopy. The proposed porch would occupy a relatively small space at the front of the property with a projection of 1.5m to a width of 2.7m and a maximum height of 3.7m to ridge with a dual pitch roof. The canopy would be situated above the bay window adjoining the porch.

The porch would be sited approximately 4m from the boundary shared with No.5 Orville Drive and would be significantly set back from the public highway. It is considered that this is an acceptable addition to the property and would not provide an impact within the street scene or upon the occupiers of surrounding properties.

The proposal would be visible from the public highway and therefore would feature within the street scene. It is noted that some houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended, rear extensions and rear conservatories are particularly popular. However, the character of the area has been retained. Therefore, the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered comparable in terms of size and its position to others found in the immediate area, therefore it is felt that the proposal can be acceptably accommodated at the application property.

The proposal complies with The National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy policies SP1, DM1, EN1 and Saved Policies DC1 Unitary Development Plan.

Siting, scale and massing

The proposal has been sited and designed to ensure that it is subservient to the original dwelling house. The size and footprint of the proposed extension is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties. It is therefore considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extension is satisfactory and 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 and Appearance

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 which is considered acceptable and detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure. The design of the

proposal would be an acceptable addition to the property and in terms of the proposed materials it is intended to use matching materials as specified in the application form.

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.

Waste management

The extension maintains a gap to the boundary that would allow the storage of bins at the rear of the property.

Parking

Parking is unaffected by this proposal as off road parking would be available on the front drive.

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 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

Positive and proactive working 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. The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the policies within the Development Plan

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:

Received on 18th July 2022 numbered AS796-05 Proposed Site Plan

Received on 3rd August 2022 numbered AS796-03 B Proposed Plans and Elevations

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 hereby permitted shall match those as specified on the application form in type, size, colour and texture.

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 structure, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

11 Lynton Drive, Manchester, M19 2LQ
8 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW
9 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW
6 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW
13 Lynton Drive, Manchester, M19 2LQ
9 Lynton Drive, Manchester, M19 2LQ
5 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW
10 Orville Drive, Manchester, M19 2JW

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