

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134156/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 24 June 2022

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extensions to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 78 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX

Ward(s): Hulme Ward

Applicant: Mr J Henry, 78 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX

Agent (if any): Stephen Lamb, Steve Lamb, 11 Princes Road, Heaton Moor, Stockport, SK4 3NQ

Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 19 August 2022



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 11 August 2022

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 5 July 2022 Expired: 26 July 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 modest modern two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of red brick with a grey gable roof and an enclosed porch. The property features a recently-built two storey side and single storey rear extension. The property sits within an unusually shaped plot which includes small front and rear gardens bounded by railing-topped walls at the front and timber fencing to the sides and rear.

Description of area

The property lies on Royce Road within the Hulme ward, in close proximity to the inner ring road (Mancunian Way), Hulme Park, the shops and services along Stretford Road and MMU's Birley campus. The surrounding houses are a mixture of types, sizes and materials, with a large number of flats nearby due to its proximity to the City Centre.

Description of development

The applicant gained permission to build a two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation in 2020 (under ref 126346/FH/2020). Enforcement were alerted that the works were not being built in accordance with the approved plans and investigated (ENF/15266/21). This application is to regularise the extensions as built.

Consultations & Notification Responses

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



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):

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places

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

Issues

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

Changes to previous approval – The main change is the setback from the principle elevation was negotiated to be 1.5m, however it was built with a 1.1m setback instead. The rear extension was approved with a pitched roof but it has been built with a flat roof. The original design featured gable roof parapet detailing and stone sills to match existing and a high level window and rooflight have been included within the rear elevation at first floor.

Siting, scale and massing – The single storey rear aspect of the extension projects 3m to the rear, occupying the full width of the original house and the side extension, at 5.8m wide, leaving a minor gap to the boundary shared with the adjoining semi, No.80, and a 0.6m gap to the boundary shared with No.76. It has an eaves height of 2.55m and a max height of 2.65m to the roof lanterns. The two storey side aspect projects 3.2m to the side, with a depth of 6m and a setback from the principal elevation of 1.1m at both ground and first floor. It has a ridge set 0.5m lower than the existing roof and matching eaves. The side extension is sited 0.6m from the shared boundary at the front and rear. The dimensions of the single storey rear element wholly comply with policy DC1 and the two storey side aspect is not at risk of causing a terracing effect due to the 1.1m setback, 0.6m gap to the boundary, lowered ridge and the fact the development gap cannot be shared equally with No.70 as their gap is only approx. 1.1m to the shared boundary, therefore the scale and siting of the proposal is still considered acceptable.

Appearance and visual amenity – The materials used to construct the extensions match the existing dwellinghouse, including red brickwork, grey roof tiles and white uPVC windows. The side extension feature a gable roof with a pitch to match existing. The rear aspect features a low flat roof, containing two rooflights, and a set of bi-folding doors opening onto the garden. The front and rear elevations of the two storey side aspect would each contain windows, one for each floor. The design and appearance of the proposal is in-keeping with the original dwellinghouse and the materials are considered appropriate, pursuant to policies DM1 and SP1. In addition, of these 6 semi-detached dwellings, only the application site reasonably had the room for a two storey side extension, therefore it is likely to remain the only example on this block. It is sufficiently set back from the principal elevation and highway and has been built to read as a subservient addition, leaving a gap to the boundary fence, hence it is not considered to significantly harm the visual amenity of the house nor area.

Residential amenity – The changes to the previously approved proposal are not considered to cause any additional harm to surrounding occupiers' residential amenity, particularly given the rear element is now lower in height. One comment was received from a local resident, which queried the need for an application when the extensions had already been built. No other comments were received and the proposal as built is not considered to cause undue overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impacts for surrounding plots/residents.

Use – The original floorplans showed the addition of a 3rd bedroom and a 'snug' downstairs. However it has been noted that the property was recently put up for rent as a 4 bed house, therefore it is assumed the snug is now the 4th bedroom. For this reason a C3(a) condition has been attached to this decision.

Refuse storage – A gap of 0.6m has been retained between the extension and boundary wall, which is not quite wide enough for wheelie bins, therefore the agent included a secure bin store within the front garden on the site plan for the previous application (126346), which should have been installed prior to first occupation. The officer met a family when visiting the site who said they were renting the property short term, hence the extension has been occupied and no bin store could be seen. No site plan or bin store information was submitted with this application, however, within the submitted planning statement it states "The reduction in the recess of the two-storey extension from the line of the principle elevation does not affect parking provision and retains space for waste storage." Therefore a new condition has been attached requiring the aforementioned bin store to be installed within a month of this permission.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF, received no objections and it is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor significantly harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area, therefore the development is deemed acceptable and may remain 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. The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the guidance contained within saved Policy DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan and to Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the drawing titled 'Proposed Plans and Elevations', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 24th June 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.

2) Within 1 month of this decision, the bin store, detailed on the site plan submitted with the previous approval (received 8th June 2020 for 126346/FH/2020), shall be implemented and be in place and shall be so maintained and retained at all times thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the appearance of the street scene, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

3) 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 development shall be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)

Order 1987 as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) other than the purpose(s) of C3(a). For the avoidance of doubt, this does not preclude two unrelated people sharing a property.

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

74 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
76 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
80 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
58 Old York Street, Manchester, M15 5TH
62 Old York Street, Manchester, M15 5TH
72 Royce Road, Manchester, M15 5LX
St Wilfrids RC Primary School, St Wilfrid's Street, Manchester, M15 5BJ
Flat 5, 33 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ
Flat 4, 33 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ
Flat 6, 33 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ
31 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ
Flat 2, 33 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ
60 Old York Street, Manchester, M15 5TH
Flat 3, 33 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ
Flat 1, 33 Dearden Street, Manchester, M15 5LZ

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
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA