

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133255/FH/2022

Date registered valid: 18 March 2022

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation

Address: 60 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JE

Ward(s): Burnage Ward

Applicant: Mr Imran Afzal 60 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JE

Agent (if any): Mr Zeeshan Ulhaque XHAN Consulting 129 Centurion House , Manchester , M3 3WR

Case officer: Janet Lawless
Tel: 0161 234 4535
Email: janet.lawless@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 29 July 2022

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 10th May 2022

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 13 June 2022 Expired: 27 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 property that is the subject of this householder application is identified as 60 Shawbrook Road it is located within the Burnage ward of the City. It is a 2 storey traditional red brick dwellinghouse. It has an original outrigger on the rear which occupies half the width of the property. There are bay windows to the front of the property and a small porch. There are gardens to the front and rear with the rear being of a good size, the front boundary comprises of a low brick wall with railings on top and double metal gates that provide access for an in curtilage parking space. There is an open green to the side of the property at the front which then turns the corner into Westdale Gardens. The existing outrigger is located on the side of the property closest to the common boundary with number 2 Westdale gardens. The rear boundaries comprise of timber panel fences and established tree and shrub planting.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not Applicable

Description of area

The area is predominantly residential comprising of properties of a similar age and size to the proposal site. There is a small commercial parade at the top of the road on Errwood Road. The area has typically wide grassed verges with established tree planting as a buffer between the houses and the highway.

Description of development

The application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing outrigger together with a rear flat roof dormer. The extension was originally proposed at 6m rearward projection with a flat roof, this has now been reduced to 4.8m which is the same rearward projection as other previously approved developments within the area. The

flat roof has been replaced by a mono-pitch roof, which reduces the height as it projects rearwards into the garden. The proposed dormer roof extension would be 32.4 cubic metres which is well below the 50 cubic m that represent permitted development. There are no windows proposed in the side elevations of either extension, with the windows being proposed in the rear elevation overlooking the applicants own garden. Bi fold doors are proposed to serve the kitchen diner, together with 2 Velux style roof lights and three small Velux roof lights in the front elevation to provide additional natural light to the loft conversion. The materials to be used would match those of the existing property, being brick with slate roof.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents were informed- 2 representations have been received these were received following consultation on the original scheme. There were concerns that the extension would be overbearing and result in feeling hemmed in, the proposed extension was too high and too long at 6 m and would be monolithic due to the flat roof. The scale would also result in the loss of daylight and overshadowing to our garden reducing daylight and natural sunlight / heat through our French windows. The loft extension would be located within 150mm of the common boundary and there is no fire break internally.

The comments were relayed to the applicant who has reduced the rearward projection by 1.2 m and the flat roof has been replaced with a mono-pitch roof reducing the height as the extension projects rearwards, with the height at the eaves being 2.25m. The materials will match those of the existing property.

Issues

Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) - The Core Strategy was adopted on the 11th July 2012 and replaces a large number of policies in Manchester's Unitary Development Plan.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester (1995) - The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester was adopted in 1995 and has largely been replaced with the policies contained within the Core Strategy. However, there are a number of policies that are extant.

The relevant Core Strategy policies for this application are as follows:

SP1 - Spatial Principles

DM1 - Development Management 1

The relevant UDP policies for this application are:

DC 1.1 - 1.6 - Residential Extensions

The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - The NPPF sets out broad national policies on themes such as housing, historic environment, town centres, design, climate change and the Green Belt.

Central to the broad policy direction contained within the NPPF is the notion of sustainable development; development which effectively balances economic, social and environmental factors.

In particular NPPF states that in terms of design:

124. The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

And,

127. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

130. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used).

Principle -The principle of extending a residential property in an established residential area to create additional living accommodation is considered acceptable, however, matters that will require consideration, in order to assess the acceptability of any proposal are siting, scale and massing, design and appearance.

Further consideration will be given as to whether the proposal has any impact on surrounding residential amenity in particular the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Siting, Scale and Massing - The single storey rear extension will occupy the full width of the house, however part of the footprint is currently occupied by the existing original outrigger. Therefore, the extension is only really increased in width by the amount of the infill extension. The rear dormer is set in 150mm off the common boundary and is modest in size and appearance and would be incorporated into a hip to gable extension. The Velux windows proposed within the roof space to the front slope would not require planning permission and the dormer at the rear will be set within the extended roof space.

It is considered that the scale and mass of the proposed extensions are satisfactory and are considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design and Appearance - The design is simplistic and will match the character of the existing dwellinghouse. As observed on site there are other examples of single storey rear extensions and 2 storey extensions within the very immediate area, Neither the dormer or single storey rear extensions would be readily viewed from within the street scene and therefore the extension is considered to be in keeping character of the property and the street.

In terms of its design and appearance the proposal is considered to be in accordance with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity - Overall the proposal is not considered to result in a detrimental impact upon the level of amenity currently enjoyed by the neighbouring properties. The dormer extension would afford no greater view across neighbouring gardens than the current windows in the rear elevation, and the single storey extension has been reduced and retains subservience when viewed in the context of the host property and neighbouring developments, it would be similar in height to the existing outrigger roof with a sloping mono-pitch roof. There are no windows proposed in the side elevations with the windows either being Velux roof lights or purely looking out over the applicants own garden. The extension has been set in slightly (200mm) from the common boundary with number 58 Shawbrook Road and any issues regarding the footings and the fire wall within the loft together with drains would be a matter for building regulations. It is considered that the proposal will not result in a loss of amenity on the neighbouring properties whilst allowing sufficient amenity space for the occupiers and future occupiers of the property.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policies DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Waste- The proposals would have no impact upon the current waste management system in place which would be retained post development.

Parking- The proposal would have no impact upon the current level of parking for the property, in curtilage space would still be available post development.

Comments on residents objection-It is not considered that the dormer and hip to gable extension would result in overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy as the dormer is no higher than the existing roof. There would be no greater view afforded from the windows in the rear elevation of the dormer than that currently afforded from the windows in the existing rear elevation.

There is no dormer extension in the front slope of the property with only the insertion of 3 small Velux rooflights which do not require planning permission. The works to the rear will not be highly visible from within the street scene (other than the hip to gable extension which could be undertaken as permitted development) and as such will not result in a detrimental impact upon the character of the property itself, nor of the area within which it is located.

The proposed rear extension is set in slightly off the common boundary. Any issues re the foundations are dealt with by either building regulations, or through other means under the party wall act, both of which sit outside of the remit of the planning process.

It is considered that there would be no greater loss of privacy from the introduction of the bi-fold doors in the rear elevation than the existing patio doors, as these are physically set in further from the boundary with number 58 Shawbrook Road than the existing patio doors, this would result in no greater loss of privacy than the residents being within their garden. Given the reduction in height and the slope of the extension roof, it is not considered that the proposal would be so overbearing, incur any great loss of light or reduce the levels of privacy so as to merit a refusal.

Following the reduced scheme and a further neighbour consultation, there were no additional representations received.

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 agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. In this case no significant issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the application has been determined in line with both national and local policies. Appropriate conditions have been attached to the permission granted.

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:

102- Proposed Floor Plans

104- Proposed Elevations

106- Proposed Site Plan

107- Location Plan

All received in Drawing Pack received 10th June 2022.

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 of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, including patching in and mortar, as stated on the Householder 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.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the elevations of the extension hereby approved other than those shown on the approved plans.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to saved policies DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policy DM1 and SP1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework: The Manchester Core Strategy policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

58 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JE
4 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
10 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
53 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JF
8 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
6 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
2 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
12 Westdale Gardens, Manchester, M19 1JD
51 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JF
49 Shawbrook Road, Manchester, M19 1JF

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
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH