

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 132503/FH/2021
Date registered valid: 15 December 2021
Proposal: Erection of a two storey side and rear extension, together with hip to gable extension and rear dormer to form additional living accommodation following demolition of existing garage
Address: 11 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
Ward(s): Rusholme Ward
Applicant: Mr Mohammad Sarwar, 11 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
Agent (if any): Mrs Dawn Winterbottom, Plans Drawn, 4 Swallow Close, Stalybridge, SK15 3LU
Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 29 July 2022



Satellite image of No's 9 and 11 Park Crescent

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 January 2022

Standard consultations: Printed: 21 December 2021 Expired: 11 January 2022

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 21 December 2021 Expired: 11 January 2022

Site notice: Posted: 13 January 2022 Expired: 3 February 2022

Press advert: Published: 11 January 2022 Expired: 1 February 2022

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Victoria Park Conservation Area 1972

Tree Preservation Order: No TPOs but hedging and small trees affected

The application relates to a two storey, semi-detached C3 dwellinghouse of red brick with a clay hipped roof. The property features a brick, upvc and tile porch to the front and a single storey side and rear extension with garage attached. The plot includes a large driveway to the front, shared with No.9, and a garden to the rear containing a dilapidated static caravan. The boundary at the front includes a railing topped brick wall and to the side lies a long well-kept hedge along the border with the hotel's carpark.

Description of area

Park Crescent is a landscaped roundabout within Victoria Park conservation area, around which the area is predominantly residential in nature. To the east lies the Park Crescent Hotel (formerly Crescent Gate Hotel) and to the south lies the Victoria Park Hotel, the latter of which is grade II listed. A short walk away lies Rusholme District Centre (also known as the Curry Mile). Other dwellings surrounding the crescent include three storey blocks of flats (Hamilton Lodge, social housing) and several other pairs of 1920's dwellinghouses.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking permission to build a two storey side and rear extension, along with a hip to gable roof alteration and two pitched-roof rear dormers, to form additional living accommodation. Similar has been applied for previously several times (see planning history below), once approved in 2016 but with a different design and no roof works which expired as it wasn't implemented.



(Front of No.9 and No.11 from Park Crescent)



(Rear view of No.11)

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 (via letters and site notice) – No comments received.

Rusholme, Fallowfield & Moss Side Civic Society – No comments received

Planning history

- 055369/FH/CENTL1/98 - First floor bathroom extension at side of house – approved (in 1998)
- 111080/FH/2016/S1 - Erection of two-storey rear extension, two-storey side extensions to form additional living accommodation – refused (in 2016)
- 112359/FH/2016/S1 - Erection of a two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation – approved (in 2016)
- 114030/FH/2016 - Erection of a single-storey building to form home office – approved (in 2016)
- 124781/FH/2019 - Erection of a 2 storey side and rear extension and a hip to gable extension with dormer extension – withdrawn (in 2019)
- 127540/LE/2020 – Raise gable wall – invalid (due to wrong forms/app type in 2020)
- 128094/FH/2020 - Erection of a two storey side and rear extensions together with rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation – withdrawn (in 2020)

Policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP, 1995) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 - Residential Extensions
- Policy DC18 - Conservation Areas

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027, policies of relevance:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- Policy EN3 – Heritage

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021)

- Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal conflicts with the principles of these policy documents.

Issues

Principle – Extending a residential property, via two storey side and rear extensions, a hip to gable and a rear dormer, in order to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse is normally acceptable in principle, given the provisions of saved UDP policy DC1. However, consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale, design, appearance and impact upon both residential and visual amenity, as well as its impact upon the character of the conservation area within which it sits.

Siting, scale and massing – The two storey rear extension would have a projection of 3.65m and would occupy the full width of the property up to the boundary with No.9. It would have an eaves height to match existing and a ridge set 1.6m lower than existing. The two storey side extension would have a width of 2.8m, a depth of 11.3m (3.65m beyond the original rear), which would be flush with the principle elevation and leave a gap to the boundary of 0.1m at the front, tapering to 3.4m at the rear. The eaves would match existing, whilst the gable roof with a pitch to match existing would be set 0.48m lower than the main ridge. Over the various revisions the roof over the two storey side was an issue and it previously included a 1m setback. In the latest revision the negotiated setback was removed and an unusual 1m deep dual-pitched element was added. Due to the siting away from the side boundary and the curved nature of this street, the side extension would not lead to a future terracing effect should No.13 build similarly (it is worth noting a two storey side was recently refused for the hotel under reference 130954/FO/2021, due to unacceptable scale, its impacts upon visual and residential amenity and harm to the conservation area). To the rear, the two pitched roof dormers would project from the original roof and proposed hip extension, occupying the majority of the rear slope. The hip to gable alteration would increase the roof space by approx. 12.8 cubic metres and the rear dormers would increase the volume by <17.2 cubic metres, with an overall increase of <30 cubic metres. This would normally fall within Permitted Development, however as it lies within a conservation area and the dormers and hip to gable both adjoin the side and rear extension roofs, it could not be built under PD. Dormers should not interfere with other additions or extensions and the scale of these dormers, in an area with very few dormers, is inappropriate. The agent was asked to utilise small, pitched dormer windows within a meeting, but the resulting design fails to replicate this feedback. The agent was also asked to hip the main rear projection to match that of No.9's proposal and to tie in with the side/rear corner, however the design has been left with one gable and one hip. The resulting extensions and roof additions when taken together form a bulky and mismatched scheme which is not appropriately sited or scaled, contrary to policies DM1 and EN3 of the Core Strategy and policies DC1 and DC18 of the UDP.

Inaccuracies – The submitted drawings, which were the 6th set of plans received for this application, are littered with inaccuracies, which makes it difficult to accurately describe the proposals. Some of the feedback provided during the lengthy negotiations was taken on board by the agent, and other parts of the discussions were not. The resulting plans are still unacceptable but also unclear. The errors include the following:

- The existing front elevation shows a first floor bay window which does not exist.
- The proposed loft plan and proposed rear elevation do not match in terms of dormer and window placement.
- On proposed side elevation (A) the rear gable should be visible above the rear hip.
- The loft plan shows a flat or mono-pitched roof to the smaller two storey side element, whereas the side elevation (A) shows it as being dual-pitched.
- The loft plan shows the ridgeline of the hipped roof over the first floor rear/side projection much shorter than on side elevation (A).
- The rooflights in the front slope are shown with differing sizes and positions on the loft plan and front elevation.
- The latest site plan shows a previous revision of the extensions, but also shows a bin store which is too small to house 4 bins and doesn't make any reference to the lost trees and hedging or changes to boundary treatment.

Refuse – The agent was asked to provide details of a bin store following the loss of access to the rear. A bin store was indicated on the site plan but no other details were forthcoming. The indicated store would be too small to house 4 bins and the design and materials are unknown. These details would be required due to the store sitting on the driveway in full view of the street, within a conservation area.



View of trees within No.11's rear garden

Trees, landscaping and boundary treatment – It was noted that in order to build the side and rear extensions, 2-3 small trees would be removed from the rear garden and hedging removed from the boundary with the hotel's driveway/carpark at the front. The agent was asked to provide a site plan showing the location of these trees, details of their removal and details of any replacement planting and replacement boundary treatment if proposed. No such details were received.

Design and impact upon conservation area – Within a conservation area it is particularly important to design house extensions which are in-keeping with the style of the host dwelling, constructed of appropriate, quality materials and which contribute positively to the street scene. Although side and rear extensions exist within Victoria Park, there is no real precedent for dormers and hip to gable alterations in this area. The only example in the vicinity of the application site is the two storey side and single storey rear extension, hip to gable and small rear dormer visible at No.1 Kent Road West (085065/FH/2007/N2), south of the crescent, which was approved in 2008 and thus predates both the Core Strategy and NPPF. According to the application form, the materials proposed for the extensions include red brick, grey tiles and upvc. Within the brief, poorly written heritage statement it states materials to match existing would be used. The current roof covering is not grey, it is red, like the rest of these semis, therefore it is not entirely clear whether the property is to be re-roofed or not. On the proposed elevations the dormers are annotated as featuring 'vertical tile' to the cheeks/face. The design, asymmetrical siting and bulky scale of the dormers is unacceptable for a property within Victoria Park conservation area and although sited at the rear, there would be views of them from between the houses along Crescent Range (see streetview below). From the front, the flush two storey side extension and odd 1m deep dual-pitched element create an incongruous feature within the street scene, lacking subservience, to the detriment of visual amenity. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states: "any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear

and convincing justification.” Due to the poor design of the extensions and additions proposed, the works would have a harmful effect on both the street scene of Park Crescent and upon the character of the wider conservation area. It is considered the proposed works cause less than significant harm to the designated heritage asset, being Victoria Park Conservation Area, and is contrary to policies EN3 of the Core Strategy, DC18 of the UDP and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.



Streetview image showing view of No.11's roof from Crescent Grange

Residential amenity – Due to the siting, orientation and distance between buildings, the proposals would be unlikely to negatively impact upon occupiers of to hotel at No.13, as the hotel is set significantly further back within its plot than No.11. The two storey side extension would leave a gap of 0.1m to their boundary and tapers to 2.1m by the point it comes level with No.13's garage. On the opposite side, the works would have a significant impact upon No.9. No.9 and No.11's applications were applied for at the same time via the same agent, by applicants who knew each other and who attended the negotiation meeting together. The plans show the two storey rear element is to be built together along the boundary line. It is worth noting however that, although they were asked to apply on a joint application and chose not to, this could have caused issues in future should, for instance, No.11 build without No.9, as the 3.65m deep, two storey wall along the boundary would be significantly overbearing for occupiers of No.9, causing a loss of light and outlook, contrary to policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy.

Conclusion – Extensive negotiations took place during the course of this application and the agent and applicant were afforded ample opportunity to take the detailed feedback given during the meeting, and through many emails, on board. Unfortunately an acceptable scheme has not been reached in this case. For the reasons explored above, it is considered that the proposal is of an unacceptable design and scale and the resultant dwelling has a bulky and incongruous appearance which unduly impacts the adjoining property and does not follow the pattern of development expected within Victoria Park. Policy DC1 states that the alteration and extension of residential properties may be required to accommodate changing household needs, however, the proposals are considered to negatively impact upon the street scene and cause less than significant harm to the conservation area, thus acting against the principles set out in the aforementioned policies. The proposal therefore cannot be supported by the City Council. The

agent was informed of the decision to be taken and no further plans or information were submitted.

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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the agent and applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the agent during the course of the planning application, but these concerns have not been sufficiently addressed. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and therefore cannot be supported by the City Council.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposed two storey extensions and roof alterations, by reason of their scale, massing and design, would form overly dominant and incongruous features within the street scene as well as harm the character of the conservation area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies SP1, EN3 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, extant policies DC1 and DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2) The applicant/agent has failed to provide accurate floorplans and elevational drawings of the proposed development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies EN1, SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Rusholme, Fallowfield & Moss Side Civic Society

9 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
6 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
14 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
10 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
7 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
8 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
Flat 6, Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
Flat 4, Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
Flat 1, Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
12 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
2 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
Park Crescent Hotel, 13 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE
Flat 5, Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
Flat 3, Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
Flat 2, Hamilton Lodge, Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5QU
4 Crescent Range, Manchester, M14 5RW
16 Park Crescent, Manchester, M14 5RE

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
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Conservation Area - Victoria Park Conservation Area 1972
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH