

11 Princes Road  
Heaton Moor  
Stockport  
SK4 3NQ  
01614326464  
07923015503

[steveandsallylamb@btinternet.com](mailto:steveandsallylamb@btinternet.com)

Manchester City Council  
Planning Department  
PO Box 532  
Manchester M60 2LA

22<sup>nd</sup> June 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Application to retain a two-storey side and single-storey rear extension at  
78 Royce Road, Manchester M15 5LX**



Front elevation as extended

I enclose a retrospective application to retain a the side and rear extensions shown above and below.



Rear elevation as extended

The property is a two-storey semi-detached town house, of recent construction and is part of the Hulme regeneration housing development. The house fronts Royce Road within a row of three pairs of semi-detached houses and a three story apartment block between Old York Street and Dearden Street. The property has a small front garden, a rear garden and off-street parking is provided communally to the rear.



Street Scene showing property from the junction with Old York Street

The property is in a highly sustainable location, close to retail and service facilities. It is also close to a high frequency bus routes, giving excellent accessibility to Central Manchester and to the wider conurbation.

The extensions have been constructed following the grant of permission (ref:126346/FH/2020) dated 12<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

The completed development varies slightly from the approved plans in the following respects:

- a recess of the front elevation of the two storey extension behind the principle elevation by 1100cm compared to the approved distance of 1500cm.
- Omission of a roof parapet to side gable of the two-storey extension
- Omission of reconstituted stone cills to front windows
- High level window and roof light to the rear elevation of the two-storey extension
- Flat roof to the single-storey rear extension

This application seeks approval of the above amendments, with the exception of the reconstituted stone cills, which it is proposed to incorporate.

With regard to the elements for which approval is now sought, the following justification is provided.

The Council's **Core Strategy** sets out general Development Management guidance under **Policy DM1**. The saved **UDP City Wide Development Control Policies** are as follows:

#### *1. RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS DC1.1*

*In determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:*

- a. the general character of the property;*
- b. the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;*
- c. the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;*
- d. the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene;*
- e. the effect of the loss of any on-site car parking.*

*DC1.2 Extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:*

- a. 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);*
- b. they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;*
- c. 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;*

*d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.*

*DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:*

- a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;*
- b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;*
- c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;*
- d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows;*
- e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).*

The principle of the extensions has already been accepted and the only question therefore relates to the appropriateness of the varied design details.

The extensions as now proposed do not have any material adverse impact on the amenity of its immediate residential neighbours, through overlooking or overshadowing.

The omission of the parapet feature to the gable, reinforces the subservience of the extension to the host building, which is a feature sought within the Council's policy guidance.

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.

The 1100cm recess provides a significant set-back which ensures the visual subservience of the extension in accordance with the Council's policy.

In terms of the wider visual impact, the front extension appears harmonious in scale, appearance and the use of materials.

The revised design of the extensions is wholly in accord with the Council's policies and are therefore acceptable in planning terms.

It is therefore requested that permission is granted to retain the extensions as now applied for.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me; otherwise I look forward to your determination.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Lamb DipTP MRTPI  
Planning Consultant