

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133823/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 20 May 2022

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

Address: 70 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Holden, 70 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS

Agent (if any): Mr Dixey, DSquare Architects, 2 Poplar Avenue, Altrincham, WA14 1LF

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

Recommendation: Refuse

Date of recommendation: 23 August 2022



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 4 July 2022

Standard consultations: Printed: 30 May 2022 Expired: 20 June 2022

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 30 May 2022 Expired: 20 June 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 red brick and white render, with a red hipped roof and front and rear bay windows. The property has not previously been extended. The plot includes a driveway and garden to the front and a larger garden to the rear.

Description of area

Springdale Gardens is residential in nature and located between Grenfell and Dene Road in Didsbury. The road as whole is mixed in character, but the southern section is uniform in appearance and spacing, consisting of pairs of identical red brick and white render semi-detached family dwellinghouses.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – No comments received.

West Didsbury Residents Association – No comments 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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 conflicts with the principles of these policy documents.



Issues

Principle – Extending a residential property, via a two storey side and single storey extension, in order to provide additional living accommodation is normally acceptable in principle given the provisions of saved UDP policy DC1. However, consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale, design, appearance and impact upon visual and residential amenity. Due to the siting of the extension adjacent to the existing extension at No.72, it is unlikely to have a significant impact on the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and it did not receive any objections.

Siting, scale and design – The two storey extension would project 1m to the side, occupying the full depth of the property at 6.7m at first floor, to come flush with the rear elevation. It would feature a setback of 0.25m from the principle elevation, with an eaves height to match existing and a ridge height set 0.1m lower than existing. At ground floor the extension would wrap round the rear, with a total width of 3.65m, a rearward depth of 2.5m, an eaves height of 2.6m and a ridge height of 3.4m. The extension would be sited 0.8m from the boundary shared with No.72 at first and ground floor. The width of the side extension is acceptable, given it is far below half

that of the original frontage and considered proportionate. Similarly, the small single storey rear is acceptable given its depth is far below the limit set out in policy DC1 (of 3.65m) and is sited away from the shared boundaries. However, given the proximity to the shared boundary and existence of a flush two storey extension at No.72, the proposal poses a risk of terracing.

Terracing and impact upon visual amenity – Originally the two storey side element was proposed to come flush with the principle elevation, with a continuous ridgeline, to replicate the extension at No.72. However, the latter was approved in 2010 (092812/FH/2010/S2) and therefore pre-dates Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan (2012). Within this, policy DM1 states:

All development should have regard to the following specific issues...:

- *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.*

And policy SP1 states:

Extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria; 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 the original buildings); they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy; they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details.

The applicant was therefore asked to include a 1m setback, which was deemed to effectively avoid a terracing effect when taken with the 0.8m gap to the shared boundary. The agent provided a 0.25m setback instead, which is not sufficient to avoid a terracing effect, as it would sit just 25cm further back than No.72's extension with a gap of just 1.6m in between the two properties at first floor. When viewed at an oblique angle, such as from either ends of the street, this gap would not be easily discernible (see images below).



Although there are 8 other two storey side extensions along this street (for this house type) those which are flush are historic:

No.19 (071576/FH/2004/S2) – **Flush**, but pre-dates Core Strategy and NPPF and neighbour is sited 10m+ away

No.23 (083435/FH/2007/S2) – **Flush**, but pre-dates Core Strategy and NPPF

No.39 (030730, 1988) - **Flush**, but pre-dates Core Strategy and is located on a corner

No.41 (053736/FH/SOUTH1/98) – **Flush**, but pre-dates Core Strategy and NPPF and neighbour is sited 10m+ away

No.40 (106863/FH/2014/S2) – 0.22m setback but located on splayed plot

No.42 (127157/FH/2020) – 1.1m setback and located on a corner
No.72 (092812/FH/2010/S2) – **Flush**, but pre-dates Core Strategy and NPPF
No.74 (089429/FH/2009/S2) – 1.5m setback

Two storey side extensions are a fairly common feature in this area of Didsbury, hence a precedence has long been set, however, no other properties on this section of Springdale Gardens have such a small gap between them. The street scene is fairly uniform in appearance and the character has not been significantly altered by the modern additions and the spacing between houses has largely been retained. This proposal would cause harm to the street scene by filling the space between No.70 and No.72 to a degree which would constitute a terracing effect when viewed from the east or west, to the detriment of visual amenity and contrary to the residential development policies contained within the Core Strategy as well as saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Conclusion – For the reason explored above, it is considered that the proposal is of an unacceptable design and scale and the resultant dwelling would form a terrace-like feature within a street of semi-detached houses, to the detriment of the street scene and the semi. The applicant was informed of the above concerns and asked to make changes to the proposal, however the changes submitted were not sufficient. Policy DC1 states that the alteration and extension of residential properties may be required to accommodate changing household needs, however, this proposal is considered to cause undue harm to the character of the semi-detached property and the visual amenity of the area, thus acting against the principles set out in the aforementioned policies, hence the proposal cannot be supported by the City Council. The applicant was notified of the decision to refuse and has chosen not to make any further amendments to the design.

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Significant

issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and a satisfactory resolution has not been reached.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The two-storey side extension, by reason of its scale, siting and relationship to the shared common boundary with No.72 Springdale Gardens, fails to provide an adequate setback at first floor, thus leading to a terracing effect and detracting from the character of the original property and the street scene and therefore is contrary to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, the National Planning Policy Framework and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

West Didsbury Residents Association

68 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS
27 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS
31 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS
52 Dene Road, Manchester, M20 2SU
50 Dene Road, Manchester, M20 2SU
48 Dene Road, Manchester, M20 2SU
72 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS
29 Springdale Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SS

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