

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 133322/FH/2022
Date registered valid: 28 April 2022
Proposal: Erection of a part single, part two storey side and first floor rear extension to form additional living accommodation and detached single storey rear outbuilding
Address: 17 Gaddum Road, Manchester, M20 6SY
Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward
Applicant: Broadhead, 17 Gaddum Road, Manchester, M20 6SY
Agent (if any): Mr Simon Casey, BlueChip Architecture Ltd, 18 Botany Road, Winton, Manchester, M30 8JS
Case officer: Linda Marciniak
Tel: 0161 234 4636
Email: linda.marciniak@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 23 June 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: 6 May 2022 Expired: 27 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 application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling house circa early c20th situated on the north side of Gaddum Road in the Didsbury East ward. The property is of traditional construction being red brick at ground floor and render to the first surmounted by a red clay tile roof. There are gardens at the front and rear with access along the western elevation and parking to the front. The original house design has a small 2-storey outrigger at the rear.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

The surrounding area is residential comprising houses of a similar typology but with some earlier properties west of the site.

Description of development

Erection of a part single, part two storey side and first floor rear extension to form additional living accommodation and detached single storey rear outbuilding.

The extension provides a utility room and enlarged kitchen at ground floor with a study and relocated bathroom over. The outbuilding provides a gym and storage space.

The application is a resubmission of application 127611/FH/2020 which was withdrawn in November 2011 due to the design and siting of the side extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbour comments:

As the owner of [REDACTED] I have received a notification of the above planning application for 17 Gaddum and after reviewing the proposals there are a number of areas I hope you can help me understand a little more clearly.

The elevations plan shows the exterior wall to be close to the boundary and the proposed guttering to extend beyond the property border, is this accepted as standard?. My primary concern is that I am unclear how we could replicate the extension on our property if we chose to do this, presumably we would be unable to build as close to the boundary to accommodate this overhang?. If this is the case then this does not seem an equitable use of the space?

The plans suggest that the extension will be built with only a minimal recess from the front of the property, this is not reflected in the existing extensions approved on Gaddum Road and raises a couple of concerns

There will be an impact upon parking, I am aware that the plans show parking for 2 cars however would question if this is possible in reality. The extension of the dropped curb is also likely to reduce generally available parking spaces on the road.

The planned extension will extend beyond our existing bathroom window making this more enclosed and have an impact upon available light.

Policy

National Planning Policy Framework - 2021

The NPPF was revised in 2021 as the overarching policy framework for England. It sets out the Government's priorities for the Planning system and is a material consideration in the decision-making process. It places emphasis on the three strands of sustainable development and its social, environmental and economic functions.

One objective of the Framework is the need for good design in the planning of new development. The Framework states that: Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. One of the Core Planning Principles that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, underpins the decision-making process.

Core Strategy 2012 - 2027 (adopted July 2012)

Manchester Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.

Core Strategy Policy DM1 - Development Management.

Policy DM1 provides specific guidance in the Development Management decision making process and provides that:

All development should have regard to the following issues relevant to this application:-

- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise.
- Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space.
- Refuse storage and collection.
- Vehicular access and car parking.

Unitary Development Plan

The site is unallocated within the adopted Unitary Development Plan for Manchester but policy DC1 is taken into consideration:

Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks to accommodate the demand for more living space, while at the same time ensuring that the amenities of neighbours are protected, and that the overall character of the surrounding area is not harmed. It relates specifically to residential extensions and the relevant criteria from this policy include:

DC1.1 The Council will have regard to:

- a. The general character of the property
- b. The effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- c. The overall appearance of the proposal in the street scene;
- d. The effect of the loss of any on-site car-parking

DC1.2 Extension will be allowed subject to:

- a. They are not excessively large or bulky
- b. They do not create a loss of sunlight/daylight or privacy
- c. They are not out of character with the style of development in the area
- d. They would not result in the loss of off-street parking

Policy DC1.3 The Council will not normally approve:

- a. Rearward extensions greater than 3.65 metres 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).

Issues

The key issues with this application are the impact on residential and visual amenity, car parking and bin storage.

Principle

The proposal seeks to erect a 2-storey side and first floor rear extension together with a detached outbuilding. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and extant policy DC1 of the UDP provides guidance on the extension and alteration of residential properties. Whilst the principle is acceptable, there are concerns with the degree of set back across both storeys and the impact this has on visual amenity, the character of the street scene and parking and bin storage. These matters, and the impact on residential amenity are considered below.

Residential Amenity

The proposal will result in extensions to the side and rear of the property.

The two-storey side extension will be located on the gap to the boundary with No.19 on the south elevation. It is 2.1 metres wide with no side windows. The blank gable will face 2no.bathroom / WC windows at first floor and a small secondary window at ground floor on the gable of No.19, which will lead to some loss of light. As these are not habitable rooms, there is no objection against UDP policy DC1. An issue has arisen on review of the drawings and public notification concerning a slight overhang of the guttering on the 2-storey side extension over No.19's land. A notice was not served on No.19 and attempts to contact the agent by email and phone calls to discuss the issue received no response.

At the rear, the extension infills the first-floor gap between a small outrigger and the similarly infilled outrigger at No.15. The roof profile of the infill forms an apex with a triangular window at eaves level. This is above the level of the proposed bedroom windows to enable more light ingress in the morning. There are no concerns that this enlarged window will afford any intrusive overlooking given its height from floor level. As the extension joins an existing with no projection beyond, there are no shading or overbearing issues to consider. The applicant has signed Certificate B of the application form to reflect the fact the extension adjoins the party wall of No.15.

The proposed outbuilding is 4.4 metres deep x 8.5 metres long x 2.7 metres height to a flat roof. It is sited on the rear boundary which has a slightly irregular shape. At its closest, the outbuilding will sit 252mm off the boundary with No.16 Veronica Road; this gap then widens to 761mm. Although it is close to the rear garden of No.16, the height to the flat roof together with the fact that any intervening fence can be erected to 2 metres means that the building will have a low impact on the occupiers of this property.

Sufficient garden area would be retained at the rear of the site following implementation of this element of the proposal.

Visual Amenity

The extension at the side infills the 2.1-metre-wide gap. It is proportionate to the width of the original house and the roof ridge is adequately set down. There is a concern however with the siting of the extension, specifically that the 1-metre set back at first floor does not adequately mitigate any potential terracing effect should No.19 wish to carry out a similar extension, and that the 450mm set back at ground floor does not provide sufficient space to park cars without overhanging the public footpath.

Furthermore, in considering the character of the surrounding area, it is noted that where 2-storey side extensions have been approved, the set back is across both storeys, varying between 1.5 metres (No.14), 2 metres (Nos.21 and 23) and 2.5 metres (No.18). The proposal is therefore out of character with the style and pattern of development contrary to saved UDP policies DC1.1a, DC1.1c and DC1.2a and to Core Strategy policy DM1.

The agent was advised of these concerns in the previous application 127611/FH/2020 which was withdrawn. The present submission has not had regard to the Council's advice in the current submission and there has been a failure in communication to discuss these concerns with the agent in the present submission, who has not responded to email and telephone messages.

Parking

As noted above, the ground floor has been set back off the principal elevation by 450mm. Whilst this appears to be an attempt to accommodate car parking within the curtilage of the site, it is insufficient with this house type where the space forward of the principal elevation is only 3.8 metres deep and modern cars are generally longer. At the time of a site visit, the car on the driveway was overhanging onto the public footpath which has implications for pedestrian and highway safety, as well as a negative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. Any approval of the proposal could also set an unhelpful precedent with cars overhanging the pavement along the street going forwards. This can be mitigated by setting back the side extension by a minimum of 1.5 metres. As presented, the proposal makes inadequate arrangements for car parking contrary to the guidance within saved UDP policies DC1.1(a), DC1.1(d) and DC1.2(d) and Core Strategy policies T1 and DM1.

Furthermore, the proposed floor plans show 2no. cars and the bin store shoehorned onto the front garden area which necessitates removal of most of the front boundary wall. Whilst this is not ideal and has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the property in the street scene contrary to saved UDP policy DC1.1(c), these are works that the applicant could complete without recourse to an application for planning permission.

Bin Storage

Closing the gap at the side of the property removes the opportunity to store and move bins at the side or rear of the property. The proposal is for bin storage to be sited in the front garden on the boundary with No.15 as shown on the floor plans. Bins would be partially enclosed within a 3-metre x 800mm bin store which is adequate for this development.

The proximity of the bins to the front bay window of No.15 may result in a loss of residential amenity for No.15 due to odours particularly during warm weather when windows are open. However, and although not ideal, this element of the proposal can be completed without an application through the Planning system.

For the above reasons, the application is contrary to saved policies within DC1 'Residential Extensions' of the UDP and to 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: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has refused the application for the reasons outlined in the delegated report. The application received comments on public notification which have been taken into consideration in the assessment of the proposal. The Council made attempts to contact the agent by email and telephone messages to discuss the application ahead of the determination, which were not returned.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The proposed 2-storey side extension, by reason of the inadequate degree of set back at first floor, would lead to creation of a terracing effect within the street scene should a similar extension be carried out by the adjacent property. This is contrary to the style and pattern of 2-storey side extensions in close proximity to the site and would therefore have a negative impact upon the character and appearance of the property and the wider street scene, contrary to saved UDP policies DC1.1a, DC1.1c and DC1.2a and to Core Strategy policy DM1.

2) The proposed 2-storey side extension, by reason of the inadequate degree of set back at ground floor, leaves insufficient space for the acceptable parking of cars within the curtilage of the site in conflict with bin storage and leading to possible overhanging the public footpath in conflict with highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to saved UDP policies DC1.1(a), DC1.1(d) and DC1.2(d) and Core Strategy policies T1 and DM1.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

14 Veronica Road, Manchester, M20 6SU
14 Gaddum Road, Manchester, M20 6SZ
19 Gaddum Road, Manchester, M20 6SY
16 Veronica Road, Manchester, M20 6SU
16 Gaddum Road, Manchester, M20 6SZ
15 Gaddum Road, Manchester, M20 6SY
18 Veronica Road, Manchester, M20 6SU

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) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH