

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134099/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 20 June 2022
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension to provide additional living accommodation
Address: 2 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Maqbool Ahmed, 2 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN
Agent (if any): Mr Anwar Ul-Haq, 33 Moorton Avenue, Manchester, M19 2NQ
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 15th August 2022



Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application	
Development type:	Householder	
Date of site visit:	2 August 2022	
Standard consultations:	Printed: 6 July 2022	Expired: 27 July 2022
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 6 July 2022	Expired: 27 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	

This is a two-storey semi detached dwelling located within a small cull de sac in the Didsbury East ward area of Manchester. The property has hardstanding situated to both the front and rear of the property. The property has undergone several enlargements in previous years. Off road car parking is located at the front of the property.



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 single storey rear kitchen extension to provide additional living accommodation.

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

MCC Flood Risk Management – Attach condition

Policy and 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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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 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 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.

History

There have been three planning applications relating to this site as follows:

075138/FH/2005/S2 -Application Approved - 25.05.2005 - Erection of two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation

077423/FH/2005/S2 -Application Approved - 16.12.2005 -Erection of a first floor extension to rear to form additional living accommodation

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking consent for the erection of a single storey extension to form additional living accommodation. There have been previous enlargements to the property at the side and rear comprising two storey extensions.

The extension would project off the rear wall measuring 2.6m extending across the rear of the property by 5.4m up to the shared boundary with no. 4 Malgam Drive and retaining a minimum gap of 1.0m to the rear boundaries of properties along Moresby Drive. The roof would be flat with the inclusion of two roof lights. No windows are proposed on the rear or the side facing the adjoining semi detached property, however a door would be located on the side elevation facing the rear boundaries of properties along Riverton Road. It is considered that, given the distance to the rear of these boundaries together with the existing boundary treatment, it is not anticipated that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy given by this door.

It is considered that the introduction of a rear extension would not provide visual harm to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area especially given that the property to the rear of the site has existing extensions and the adjoining semi also has additions to the rear. Although the extension would adjoin an existing previously built extension, the overall footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property. Although the single storey element of the proposal exceeds City Council's saved Policy DC1 of 3.65 metres, there has been no objection from the adjoining properties.

The extension would not be visible from the public highway and would not feature within the street scene, however, the character of the property would be retained and therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

On balance, the extension is considered can be acceptably accommodated at the application property and is considered that the proposal would not interfere with the existing characteristics of the area.

The proposal therefore 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

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 sides and rear and 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.

Refuse

Refuse is not affected by this proposal.

Parking

Existing car parking arrangements are not affected by this proposal.

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. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application.

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 20th June 2022 numbered 2021/05/01 P3 Proposed Plans

Received on 20th June 2022 numbered 2021/05/02 P3 Proposed Elevations and Sections

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.

4) No development shall commence until the flood risk assessment (dated 28th January 2022) has been updated and re-submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt, as per the government standing advice, the assessment must include the following updates:

- Provide a plan showing the finished floor levels (FFLs). FFLs should take into consideration predicted flood levels and should be set to an appropriate level, this may be either no lower than existing internal FFLs of the adjoining dwelling or 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level. All levels should be in mAOD.

- If you cannot raise FFLs 300 mm above the estimated flood level, you should demonstrate flood resilience and resistance measures in your design. Use the following guidance: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice#extra-flood-resistance-and-resilience-measures>

- Consideration of flood safety measures (such as signing up for EA flood warnings) where required.

Reason: To ensure that the development is not at an increased risk of flooding (from various sources) and that the appropriate flood resilience and resistance measures have been implemented on site where required.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

MCC Flood Risk Management

1 Moresby Drive, Manchester, M20 5GL
40 Riverton Road, Manchester, M20 5GH
34 Riverton Road, Manchester, M20 5GH
6 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN
3 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN
42 Riverton Road, Manchester, M20 5GH
38 Riverton Road, Manchester, M20 5GH
36 Riverton Road, Manchester, M20 5GH
5 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN
4 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN
1 Malgam Drive, Manchester, M20 5GN

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
Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -
Historic Landfill Site 250m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA