

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133464/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 22 April 2022

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

Address: 381 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NG

Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Muhammad Ahmad, 381 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NG

Agent (if any): Miss Aysha Utsho, 29 Croft Street, Hyde, SK14 1JA

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

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 27th June 2022

Application details

Type of application:	Full Householder Application
Development type:	Householder
Standard consultations:	No consultations have been printed and sent.
Neighbour notifications	Printed: 5 May 2022 Expired: 26 May 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 located along Kingsway in the Burnage ward area of Manchester. The property is set back from the back of footpath by approximately 16m. Amenity space lie to the front and rear with access along the side. Off road car parking is provided on the front.



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

Description of area

The surrounding area is largely residential in nature

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear 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. One letter of objection in respect of this application was received as follows:

- Object to the extension on grounds of loss of light

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- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.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

Principle

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 no previous applications relating to this site.

Residential Amenity

The application proposes the erection of a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

An objection was received by a local resident with regards to the loss of light provided by the projection along the shared boundary. Negotiations took place with the agent who amended the proposal by reducing the projection of the extension.

The extension would project off the rear wall of the property by 4.0m extending the width of the back wall up to the shared boundary with the adjoining property no. 379 Kingsway and in line with the side wall of the house. The roof would be a mono pitch sloping roof. Two windows are proposed on the rear elevation.

The property is sited to the south of the adjoining semi detached property and although there would be some overshadowing late evening, this would not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. Therefore, given that the extension is single storey, it is not anticipated that the introduction of an extension in this location would impact on the occupiers of properties either side.

The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property. The extension would not be visible from the public highway and therefore 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 proposed extension would be sited along the rear wall of the property and is considered to be comparable in size to many others found in the area. The 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 proposal is in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area and in terms of the materials, these are set to be matching brick and tile as specified in the application form. The design is detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure and would not adversely impact upon residential amenity or the character of the area.

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

The storage of refuse bins are not affected by the proposal.

Parking

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 16th June 2022 numbered 06-01-02 24-03-2022 Proposed Plans and Elevations
Received 16th June 2022 numbered 06-01-03 03-04-2022 Existing and Proposed Site Plan

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

383 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NG
32 Daneholme Road, Manchester, M19 1NY
26 Daneholme Road, Manchester, M19 1NY

274 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1QA
272 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1QA
270 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1QA
379 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1NG
30 Danholme Road, Manchester, M19 1NY
28 Danholme Road, Manchester, M19 1NY

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