

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 134148/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 12 July 2022

Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation

Address: 16 Whitechapel Street, Manchester, M20 6UB

Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Vicky Hu, 16 Whitechapel Street, Manchester, M20 6UB

Agent (if any): Mr Gooding, LDM Group, 46 LDM House, Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, M4 5AB

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 6 September 2022



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 24 August 2022

Standard consultations: Printed: 19 July 2022 Expired: 9 August 2022

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 19 July 2022 Expired: 9 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

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two storey mid-terraced cottage of red brick and grey slate with an existing (historic) single storey rear extension, a small front yard and a long rear garden.

Description of area

Whitechapel Street runs perpendicular to Wilmslow Road. It is predominantly residential in nature and characterised by period terraces and benefits from its proximity to Didsbury Village centre's shops, bars and transport links.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to demolish the existing extension in order to build a part single part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse, in the form of a larger 2nd bedroom, bathroom and kitchen.

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Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance: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 accords with the principles of these policy documents.

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a part single part two storey rear extension to provide additional living space is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The extension would be sited at the rear (north-east) of the house, projecting 4.2m at ground floor and 2.7m at first floor, with width of 4.4m. The single storey element would have a height of 3.1m and over the first floor the eaves would match existing with a ridge 1m lower than the main ridge. The roof would be hipped with a pitch to match existing. The ground floor projection beyond the 2.7m two storey would leave a gap of 1.93m to the boundary shared with No.14, with a gap of 0.18m at first floor. Both elements would be sited along the boundary shared with No.18, which features a historic (ref: F17665) 4.2m two storey rear extension sited 1.85m from the shared boundary. Although the first floor projection accords with the depth stipulated within policy DC1 (of 3.65m), the ground floor exceeds this by 0.55m. However, similar works have been carried out at No.14, 18, 20, 22 and No.26 on this terrace, and under permitted development (GPDO 2015) rear extensions are allowed up to 6m to the rear, granted they do not cause undue harm to amenity or receive objections, which in this case it does not. Normally full-width extensions are not approved for terraced dwellings, however, considering the strong local precedent, appropriate scaling and long gardens and, the siting and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable in this situation, pursuant to policies DC1 and DM1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The property is not listed nor located within a conservation area. The extension would be built of brickwork, roof slates and white uPVC windows and doors, all to match the existing house, which has been conditioned. The single storey element would feature a flat roof and a single rear-facing window for the new bathroom. The two storey element would feature a low hipped roof, a rear-facing door at ground floor and two first floor rear-facing windows, for the enlarged 2nd bedroom and ensuite. The materials will match existing, the style is in-keeping with the host building and surrounding extensions and will not be visible from the highway and thus would not feature within the street scene of Whitechapel Street. Hence, the design is considered acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity negligible.

Residential amenity – No side facing windows are proposed, therefore privacy is not deemed an issue in this case. Both adjoining neighbours have their own two storey rear extensions of similar depths. The scale would almost match that of No.14 and thus does not impact upon this property. On the other side however, No.18 has a 1st floor window facing the development, within the historic two storey rear, and a 1st floor rear bedroom window, both of which would be impacted by the proposal, in terms of a loss of light and outlook. The side/bathroom window is not original, is not for a habitable room and would be sited approx. 1.9m from the proposal, therefore this is not considered significant. The rear/bedroom window is for a habitable room, but was significantly darkened by the extension built in the 1970s, which also removed much of the view from this window given it was built up to its edge, to a depth of 4.2m. By comparison the proposal is only 2.7m in depth and when No.14's was built, it in turn impacted the bedroom window at No.20. On balance it is considered that the proposal at No.16 should not make the current situation for this window noticeably worse, given it is north-east facing and already dark. In addition to this, no comments or objections were received from local residents.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and received no objections. It is not considered that it would significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm visual amenity, hence the proposal is deemed acceptable and development may commence in accordance with the following conditions and approved drawings.

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

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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 revised drawings numbered 'PS132 Rev I', 'PS232 Rev I' and 'PS432 Rev I', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 18th August 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.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building, as specified on the submitted application form.

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 extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

West Didsbury Residents Association

23 Whitechapel Street, Manchester, M20 6UB
18 Whitechapel Street, Manchester, M20 6UB
14 Whitechapel Street, Manchester, M20 6UB
21 Whitechapel Street, Manchester, M20 6UB
2 Davenfield Grove, Manchester, M20 6UA

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 AREA