

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133697/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 16 May 2022
Proposal: Erection of a two storey side and rear extension together with a single storey front porch
Address: 52 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LJ
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr Matthew Roberts 52 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LJ
Agent (if any): Mr Barry Bradley Bradley Building Design Ltd Keepers Cottage, Lyme Park, Disley, Stockport, SK12 2NS
Case officer: Linda Marciniak
Tel: 0161 234 4636
Email: linda.marciniak@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 11 July 2022



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 07.06.2022

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 22 June 2022 Expired: 29 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

The application site is an early C20 red brick and render semi-detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of Didsbury Park. There are gardens at the front and rear with off-road parking on a long driveway and access along the side to the rear garden. The dwelling sits approximately in the middle of the plot and close to the junction with Ruabon Road to the south.

Materials also include stone mullion windows on a bay at ground and first floor and decorative timberwork to a front gable. The roof is hipped and covered in red clay tiles.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The area is residential comprising of a mixed typology of houses dating from the Victorian and later years set within medium sized garden plots. Didsbury Park is located a short distance to the north and new residential development on the former MMU campus is a short distance behind facing houses to the west.

Description of development

Erection of a two-storey side and rear extension together with a single storey front porch.

The application has been amended since first submission to include a set back at first floor and negotiations were entered into to agree an obscurely glazed window for the proposed first floor bedroom at the rear (Bedroom 4).

The proposal creates an enlarged rear dining room and WC at ground floor, enlarges and reconfigures the existing 4no. first-floor bedrooms and bathroom, and introduces a study.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbour Notifications – A total of 7no. neighbouring occupiers were notified of the application. The following responses were received:

1st Notification

Objection 1

I would like to register our concern at the proposed extension to 52 Didsbury Park. The proposed east facing rear elevation includes three windows at first floor level. We understand, from the plans, that these would be bedroom windows and therefore of clear glass. They would closely overlook our property at [REDACTED]. In the existing building there is a window at the north end of this elevation which is part of a previous extension. This window did overlook our property but this has been nullified by the growth of screening trees. The two additional windows would not be screened and would therefore give an unrestricted view into our garden, lounge, kitchen and utility room and therefore constitute a considerable invasion of privacy.

Objection 2

I have the following objections:

- 1) The proposed rear extension will lead to the two first two properties on Ruabon Road being significantly over looked.
- 2) This rear double extension will from the rear of my house look like a stark brick wall blocking view and possibly light.
- 3) From what I can gather from the plans it is proposed to move the kitchen, the nosiest part of a house next to one of my main living rooms which I am unhappy about.

2nd Notification – Revised scheme

The revised plans appear to have no obvious amendments.

- 1) The proposed extensions would lead to the properties at 1 and 3 Ruabon Road being very overlooked.
- 2) This in turn would lead to my view being blocked by a very extended brick wall at the rear of my house. This may block sunlight and will block view from my rear windows.

Issues

The application is assessed under the following policies within the Development Plan for Manchester which are material to the application:

Saved UDP policy DC1 – ‘Residential Extensions’

Core Strategy policies SP1 – ‘Spatial Principles’, DM1 – ‘Development Management’ and EN19 – ‘Waste’

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 UDP relate specifically to residential extensions and set out criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable subject to satisfactory impacts on residential and visual amenity.

Development in this application proposes a scale of development that is acceptable in principle, subject to satisfactory compliance with policies that protect residential and visual amenity and make adequate arrangements for car parking and bin storage. The application was amended as described in the Description of Development section above.

Residential Amenity

The proposal will have an acceptable impact on residential amenity. Development comes off the original side elevation by 1.9 metres leaving a gap of 1 metre along most of the length of the side elevation, narrowing to 700mm going towards the rear. The extension would run parallel to the boundary shared with No.54. This property has been extended over both storeys at the side, sitting on the boundary with the site. There are 2no. obscurely glazed windows at ground floor on this property. As no side windows are proposed on the application extension, there is no risk of overlooking. Likewise, as the windows at No.54 are secondary obscurely glazed, any overshadowing will not be so significant as to warrant a refusal.

At the rear, development extends beyond the rear boundary by 900mm over both storeys, and to the north side by 2.2 metres. In considering the effects on No.50, the adjoining half of the semi first, the small scale of rearward projection and the fact the application site is orientated north of this property, means that there will be no adverse impact on existing and future occupiers.

The impacts on No.54 again will be acceptable as the extension at No.54 projects rearwards along the boundary by 1.75 metres. Any shading from the modest rearward extension will therefore be over the blank extended gable of this property.

An overlooking issue has arisen from the internal reconfiguration to re-provide bedroom 4 on the rear elevation, close to the boundary with No.50. The overlooking issue arises from the fact of a facing bedroom window on a 2-storey rear extension at No.1 Ruabon Road. The orientation, 11.7 metre separation distance and relationship due to the angle inwards at the rear of No.1 means that the new window at the application site would give rise to intrusive overlooking. As a compromise, it is proposed to attach a condition to any approval to obscurely glaze this window which is appended below as Condition 4. This requires that details of a scheme to obscurely glaze the window be submitted and approved by the City Council and to remain in situ in perpetuity.

Additional light and ventilation can be gained from a rooflight on the hips of the roof over should the applicant wish to in future. With the condition in situ, it is considered that the overlooking concerns have been adequately mitigated.

Concerns about blocking light to houses at Nos.1 and 2 Ruabon Road are not considered to arise given that these properties are south of the site and the 11.7 metre gap is more than adequate to avoid any overshadowing. Likewise, concerns about the loss of a view are not valid grounds for recommending refusal of an application.

Visual Amenity

The application will have an acceptable impact on visual amenity. The extension is sited in the most logical position at the side and rear to make the best use of external space and internal constraints, without any significant loss of amenity such as the modest size rear garden, most of which is retained.

It is designed to fit the aesthetic of the original dwelling being adequately set down off the original roof ridge and set back 1.3 metres off the principal elevation at first floor to appear subservient. Terracing will be further avoided by the 1 metre gap seen from the front which creates a clear sense of separation from No.54.

The extension is composed entirely of brick which will distinguish it as an add-on but includes features which respond to the design of the original such as brick banding and stone window cills which will tie it together. The roof profile incorporates the original hip, and the chimney has been relocated over the extended roof which retains the character of the original dwelling.

The porch brings the original side door to the front elevation as at No.54. It has a footprint of 2.2 metres W x 1.1 metre D with an overhanging monolith roof supported on 2no. timber columns. The materials are reclaimed brick and tile to match the existing. Condition 3 is appended for materials to match for the avoidance of doubt and to secure the quality of the final build.

Overall, the extension will have a positive impact on the character of the original dwelling and impact in the street scene. There are no conflicts with policies DC1, DM1 and SP1 and the application is therefore recommended for approval.

Bin Storage / Parking

As a 1 metre gap is retained at the side, and a parking area over 9.5 metres is retained forwards of the proposed porch, there will be no loss of amenity and parking space at the property, in accordance with Core Strategy policies DM1 and EN19.

Conclusion

The application is assessed as having acceptable impacts on residential and visual amenity, parking and bin storage. Subject the recommended conditions below, the proposal is in accordance with saved UDP policy DC1 and Core Strategy policies DM1, SP1 and EN19. Concerns with the proposal were addressed by the applicant and agent and appropriate conditions applied at the end of this report.

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

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in this delegated report. Concerns were raised by a neighbour to do with overlooking from a rear bedroom window which has been addressed through a condition for obscure glazing.

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 the 6th of May 2022 or as stated:

Application form

Location Plan

Block Plan

Existing Plans and Elevations 2065/1

Proposed Plans and Elevations Ref: 2065/2/A received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 21st of June 2022

Proposed Section 2065/3

Proposed South Side Elevation 2064/4

Photos

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans pursuant to policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

3) The materials to be used on external elevations shall match those on the external elevations of the existing building in colour, size and texture.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity pursuant to policy DM1 of the adopted Manchester Core Strategy.

4) Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawing 2065/2/A received on the 21st of June 2022, prior to the installation of the first-floor rear bedroom window for bedroom 4, and the first-floor rear bathroom window, a scheme for obscurely glazing the windows to a specification of no less than Level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The

approved details shall be submitted prior to the first use of the extensions hereby approved and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking in accordance with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved UDP policy DC1.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

4 Welton Avenue, Manchester, M20 5LA
1 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LB
50 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LJ
2 Welton Avenue, Manchester, M20 5LA
54 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LJ
17 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LH
15 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LH

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