

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
126912/FH/2020	21st May 2020	17th December 2020	Crumpsall Ward

Proposal Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a velux window and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

Location 1C Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4WN

Applicant Mr S Benjamin , 1C Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4WN,

Agent Mr Kevin Maloney, Blueprint CAD Ltd, 3 Ridgeway, Lowton, Warrington, WA3 2QL

Executive Summary

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a roof light and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

The proposal includes at ground floor level the addition of a kitchen, hallway, WC and morning room. The first floor includes two bedrooms and a utility room and the roof space includes two bedrooms and a shower room.

Objections: 7 objections were received to the original submission. Following receipt of a revised scheme 9 objections were received. Overall 24 properties were consulted and 5 objections were received from two addresses and an objection letter from a planning consultant was also received on behalf of a resident. Main concerns relate to the impact of the proposal on the Crumpsall Lane Conservation area. The proposal would be detrimental the amenity and visual amenity of area and for the occupiers of the surrounding properties. Re-notification with local residents was carried out following receipt of a tree report and an amended plan from the applicant, as a result of the re notification six objection letters from 4 different households were received from residents that had previously objected to the proposal, and an objection letter from a planning consultant on behalf of a local resident was also received.

Principle: The proposed development is an extension to a residential dwelling; this is considered acceptable in principle as many people prefer to extend their homes rather than move in order to meet the changing residential needs of families. However, consideration must be given to the proposal's appearance, impact on the visual amenity of the area and impact on the neighbouring properties' residential amenity. The scheme submitted is now considered acceptable and in accordance with Saved UDP policy DC1 and DC18 and Core Strategy Policies SP1 and DM1 due to the reasons mentioned below.

Key Issues:

- The visual impact of the proposal in relation to the street scene and on the Crumpsall Lane Conservation area.
- The impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed scheme has been amended since the application was originally submitted in order to overcome concerns in relation to the impact on the character of the street scene, the Conservation Area and the neighbouring occupiers. The proposed extensions are now subservient to the appearance of the main house with the impact on the character of the Conservation Area being acceptable.

The proposal would allow a house to be extended in a way to improve the accommodation to meet the needs of a family.

A full report is attached below for Members consideration.

Introduction

This application was placed before the Planning and Highways Committee on the 22 October 2020 and at that meeting the Committee deferred deliberation in order to allow Members to undertake a site visit due to concerns relating to the impact of the proposed extensions on the street scene due to a potential terracing effect as well as to examine the impact on the conservation area. Concerns relating to whether there would be adequate access to the rear of the house for bin storage were also raised. The site visit was deferred due to the submission of an Arboricultural report from the applicant.

Description

This Planning Application relates to 1C Ardern Road, Crumpsall. 1C Ardern Road is a semi-detached dwellinghouse of modern brick construction, situated in the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area, on land formerly part of the curtilage of another house. The Application property backs onto Town Green Court. Planning Permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a roof light window and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

The existing off-road parking provision would not be affected by the proposal. The front elevation of the two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling house. Pedestrian access remains from the front to the rear of the property. Two obscurely glazed windows proposed would be inserted within the side elevation of the proposed side extension. The proposal includes at ground floor level the addition of a kitchen, hallway, WC and morning room. The first floor includes two bedrooms and a utility room and the second floor includes two bedrooms and a shower room.

Planning History

There has been one previous planning application approved at the site referenced 097756/FH/2011/N1: for the erection of single storey side extension and loft

conversion with rear dormer to form additional living accommodation. Only the single storey side extension has been implemented.

Proposal

The proposed scheme has been amended since the original submission. The details of the proposal are as follows:

The single storey rear extension abuts the shared boundary with the neighbouring property, the common boundary is formed by a fence. The extension projects from the rear elevation of the original dwelling house by 4m in length and has a total height of 2.9m. The single storey rear extension includes a roof lantern and a window facing the garden. A patio door would be inserted to access the garden from the side elevation of the extension.

The two storey side extension measures 2.9m in width. The first floor front elevation has a setback of 1m from the front elevation of the main house. The two storey side extension has a gap that diminishes in distance from the common boundary of the neighbouring property which is divided by a fence. The distance from the common boundary and the proposed gable is 1096mm metre reducing to 0650mm, the narrowing occurs from front to back. Two windows would be inserted on the rear elevation of the two storey extension facing the rear garden of the application site. Two obscurely glazed windows would be inserted into the side elevation at ground and first floor level.

The rear dormer window extension sits within the original roof space and measures 5 metres in width. The dormer does not project above the ridge line and is pulled in away from the side edge of the original roof. The front dormer is smaller and measures 2.7m in width. The dormers would be clad with tiles which would match the existing roof. A Velux window would be inserted next to the dormer extension on the front roof elevation.

Further, alterations to the front elevation of the property includes the creation of a porch that would replace the existing door canopy. The tiled canopy in situ above the bay window would continue across the front elevation of the proposed side extension.

No front boundary alterations are proposed as part of this proposal. The front garden area would be block paved including a small part of the lawn area to create additional parking space. The proposal includes block paving the rear amenity space and the creation of a boundary wall.

The proposal set out above has been amended from the original proposal. As initial concerns were raised in relation to the proposal as the extension did not appear subservient to the host building and the following amendments were made:

- The first floor front elevation was set back by 1 metre.
- The single storey rear extension was reduced by 2m in projection.
- One of the front dormers were removed and replaced by a Velux window.
- The rear dormer was reduced to fit within the original roof space by 2744mm in length.
- The roof height of the two storey side extension was lowered.

Consultations

The application was advertised in the local press as affecting the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area and a site notice was erected close to the site.

The Head of Environmental Health was consulted and raised no objections to the proposal and confirmed the positioning and the size of bins provided are acceptable. Neighbourhood Services (Tree Section) were consulted and raised no objection to the proposal subject to careful construction methods being used whilst the development is implemented. In addition, they also recommend that the appointed arboricultural consultant should supervise the excavation element and ensure that adequate protection is in place to ensure root protection. An appropriate condition has been attached to ensure that this is the case..

The occupiers of the surrounding properties were notified and the original proposal received nine letters of objections.

The objectors raised concerns regarding the following issues:

- The side extension would lead to a significant loss of light and would be detrimental to privacy for the occupiers of the surrounding properties.
- The proposal in terms of its design and appearance would be out of character with the Crumpsall Lane conservation area.
- The front dormers specifically would be out of style and detract from within the street scene and within the conservation area.
- The design scale and magnitude of the proposed extension would be disproportionately large and out of keeping with the character of the host building and the area in general.
- The supporting information relating to the conservation area does not contain an accurate assessment of the character of the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area.
- The proposal is considered to be overdevelopment due to the amount of bedrooms created.
- The existing side foundations may not be adequate to support a two-storey extension and the rear boundary wall is robust enough to retain the land that slopes.
- The construction work may undermine the integrity of a Horse Chestnut Tree which lies within the curtilage of the property known as Town Green Court.
- The planning application should be determined by elected member's not council officials.
- The extension may be used for other purposes other than a residential dwelling house.

An objection letter was received from a planning consultant relating to the original and the revised proposal, on behalf of a local resident. The representation included an analysis of planning policy outlining why the proposal was considered contrary to policy. The overarching issues raised related to the detrimental impact the proposal would have in terms of visual and residential amenity within the area. The key issues raised are as follows:

- The heritage statement has not been updated since the revised scheme was submitted and the statement does not demonstrate how the proposals would reinforce or enhance local character, nor does it demonstrate how the proposal complies with policy that is contained within the Core strategy for Manchester or the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.
- No information has been provided detailing how the proposal would impact on nearby trees, specifically in relation to the rear boundary wall.
- The extension would detract from the character and appearance of the original house, the street scene and the Conservation Area by reason of the siting, design and size.
- The front dormer would be unduly dominant and the front porch would project prominently forward of the existing building line.
- The extant permission for the rear dormer is smaller in size.
- The siting, length and scale of the proposed rear and side extension would cause shadowing, loss of light, diminish the outlook and be visually intrusive for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
- Permitted development right should not be considered as a material consideration when determining proposals in a Conservation Areas.
- The front dormer would be detrimental to the privacy of the opposite properties.
- Insufficient gap between boundaries which would result in very little scope to erect a two storey side extension without encroaching on the neighbouring property.
- The extension is excessively large and bulky.

Since the amended scheme was submitted local residents were re-notified of the revised proposal and seven objection letters were received.

The comments contained within these letters were consistent with the previous concerns raised, which related to the proposal having a detrimental impact on the conservation area and the street scene, quality of appearance of the extension in relation to the host building and the detrimental impact on the amenity for the occupiers of the surrounding buildings, concerns regarding the use of the building, construction methods and impact on nearby trees.

Three letters of objection have been sent to Members from local residents who have already objected to the planning application during the statutory notification process. One of these objections contains possible reasons for refusal of the application. The comments are summarised below:

- There are fundamental points of conflict with the Council's planning policy and guidelines which should have led to the refusal of the application;

- The proposal would result in harm to the street scene, the conservation area, nearby trees and neighbouring occupiers which has not been resolved by the amended proposal;
- The officer's report finds some harm to the conservation area. No public benefits which outweigh the harm have been identified. Where there is harm then the character and appearance of the conservation area cannot either be preserved or enhanced. This should lead to the refusal of the application;
- Neither the applicant nor officers have attempted to assess what the significance of the heritage asset is or how the proposed development would impact on that significance. In the absence of that information, the Committee would be unable reach the conclusion that the impact of the development on the conservation area is acceptable;
- There is no expert evidence which demonstrates the proposed development would not harm nearby trees;
- The two storey side extension would close the gap that currently provides visual separation between the two pair of semi-detached houses and allows views through to the trees and spaces to the rear of the Victorian Villas;
- No justification for the departure from Council policy and guidelines with regards to side extensions;
- Neighbouring properties would suffer significant loss of light, over shadowing and over bearing dominance from the single storey rear extension. There is no justification from the departure from Council policy;
- As a result of all the people living in the houses there would be too many cars going up and down the road and parking in what is a very narrow road;
- The design of the external doorway is very not very efficient and the gap to the side boundary would be too narrow. It wouldn't allow a pushchair to go down the side of the house;
- This application would turn a 3 bedroom semi-detached house into a 6 bedroom house with 3 storeys with a flat roof with no rear garden;
- 3 extensions carried out at the property would breach planning policy. The rearward extension is 4 metres (beyond 3.65 metres permitted by policy) and the side extension would leave a gap of 0.65 metres when the policy requires 1.52 metres;
- The front and rear dormers would create a flat roofed third storey. Council policy does not permit dormers in conservation areas. There is no explanation for this in the officers report;
- There is no explanation as to how the extensions would enhance the conservation area. All the benefits are private with all the harm borne by the neighbours;

Further notification took place following the receipt of a tree report and an amended plan from the applicant, the plan indicated a further reduction of hard land scaping within the rear garden. Furthermore, two additional properties to the rear of the site were included into the notification process. As a result of the further notification exercise six objection letters from 4 different households were received from residents that had previously objected to the proposal. However, new issues were raised which are as follows:

- Excavation of the footing of the extension would damage the boundary fence, trees and garden fixings.

- The drainage and sewerage systems, and waste receptacles may not be adequate for a six bedroom house.

A tree report was commissioned by a local resident and the findings are summarised below:

- The revised design goes some way to avoid damage to the tree root system, however, given the proposed build overlap of the root protection area (RPA) and necessary contractor activity within the limited available space, damage to the tree root system is still anticipated.
- The removal of some trees to facilitate building works would be appropriate in some circumstances. However, the Horse Chestnut Tree falls into a Category B, which are of moderate quality and their retention is desirable.
- The Local Authority needs to consider if the needs and benefits of the home improvement proposals outweigh the amenity benefits provided by the tree and whether the tree is worthy of a tree preservation order given its visibly position.
- The tree owners consent, would be required to remove the tree and should the tree be damaged by any construction work the tree owner, within a few years, would likely be burdened with tree maintenance costs to mitigate tree risk hazards brought about by construction damage.
- The Horse Chestnut Tree is the end tree of a row of 5 and is a dominant shelter tree; its removal could predispose the remaining sheltered trees to exposure and possible wind throw.

One further letter was received from a planning consultant representing one of the residents, which did not raise any additional concerns that had not already been raised previously. However, the letter emphasised again the importance of protecting the horse chestnut tree on the adjacent site from damage as a result of the development. The letter also included an analysis of the evolution of the Crumpsall Lane conservation area over time and commentary how modern buildings including the application site have been incorporated into the conservation area. Furthermore, a tree survey was commissioned by a local resident which was assessed by the city council's arboriculturist.

Ward Members

Councillor Sir Richard Leese – Raised no objection to the proposed extensions. He considers that the development does not have a detrimental impact on the character of the conservation area.

Policies

Section 72 of the Listed Building Act - Provides that in the exercise of the power to determine planning applications for land or buildings within a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - This Framework came into effect on 27th March 2012 and was amended and updated in February 2019. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

The Framework has been related to the proposed development, with particular emphasis given to the following:

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraphs 184 through 202 relate to Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

Paragraph 184 states these assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Paragraph 185 refers to the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.

Paragraph 192 says that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 193 says that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 201 states that not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 195 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 196, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

It is acknowledged within the NPPF which is set out above, that development needs to take place within areas of special control such as conservation areas, to ensure development makes positive contribution to conserve heritage assets and in turn can make a positive contribution to sustainable communities including their economic vitality. The impact of the development to extend a dwelling house accords with Paragraph 184 and 192, which states that conservation areas should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. The proposed extension allows the occupier to extend their home without causing significant harm to the character of the conservation area. Therefore, it is considered that the development makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 185 refers to the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation. Therefore, this proposal accords with the policy 184 and 202 of the NPPF.

Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places - States that 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 (paragraph 124).

Paragraph 127 further states that planning decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development;
- b) Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping;
- c) Are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

The proposed development has been appropriately related to the existing house and neighbouring housing. It is not considered that the development would impact upon neighbouring houses due to their juxtaposition and arrangement of space between them. It is considered that the quality of design has been appropriately related to the existing house and conservation area to thereby accord with chapter 12.

Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Paragraph 189 - States that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

In this case, it is considered that the development suitably reflects the composition of the existing house to thereby maintain its relationship to the surrounding conservation area.

Planning Practice Guidance - On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched this planning practice guidance web-based resource. The PPG seeks to both simplify and clarify planning guidance easier and simpler. It is intended to be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and is relevant to key planning issues of significance to applicants and local authorities. In considering this application consideration has been given to the following aspects of the NPPG:

- i. Consultation and pre-decision matters (ID:15); ii. Design (ID:26) - Good quality design is considered to be an integral part of sustainable development; iii. Health and well-being (ID:53).

In this case, appropriate neighbour and statutory consultation had been undertaken. The design is satisfactorily related to the original house. The proposed extension would not unduly harm residential amenity. The above sections of PPG would therefore be satisfactorily responded to.

Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy - The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ('the Core Strategy') was adopted by the Council on 11th July 2012.

Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents.'

Policy SP 1 Spatial Principles - States the key spatial principles which will guide the strategic development of Manchester to 2027. The key areas of policy SP1, pertinent to this application, are:

- i. The creation of neighbourhoods of choice, providing high quality and diverse housing around district centres which meet local needs, all in a distinct environment.
- ii. The development should make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including:
 - a. Creating well designed places that enhance or create character.
 - b. Making a positive contribution to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents
 - c. Considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income.
 - d. Protect and enhance the built and natural environment.

It is considered that the appearance of the development would present an acceptable design, it would be appropriate to the character of housing in the conservation area, improve the quality of the existing accommodation to meet changing household needs and maintain existing levels of residential amenity within the area. It would thereby accord with policy SP1.

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) - States that all development in Manchester will be expected to follow the seven principles of urban design, as identified in national planning guidance and listed above and have regard to the strategic character area in which the development is located. In this case, it is considered that the quality of the proposed design would respond positively to the existing built form and achieves a cohesive design response that relates strongly to the character and proportions of the host building. The development would thereby accords with policy EN1.

Policy EN3 (Heritage) - Is relevant to the consideration of the proposed development its location within the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area. In such circumstances, policy EN3 requires that new developments is designed to enhance the historic environment, the character, setting and accessibility of areas and buildings of acknowledged importance. Policy EN3 has been related to the relationship of the proposed extension and alterations to the building, including its height, proportions and siting, to the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area. It is

considered that the development would result in a modest extension with design features, including the composition of the extension would contribute positively to the surrounding context.

Policy EN15- Biodiversity and Geological Conservation- The Council will seek to maintain or enhance sites of biodiversity throughout the City.

Particular consideration will be given to the Council's objective to protect trees. There are no trees within the curtilage of the application site that would be detrimentally affected as a result of the extension. Other trees outside the application site are a sufficient distance away from the proposed works not to be detrimentally impacted by the proposed works. Therefore, the proposal accords with the policy EN15.

Policy EN19 Waste - Relates to waste management and requires that consideration is given to consideration of the submitted details relating to the applicant's proposals for the provision of a waste management plan to demonstrate how: ii. How the sustainable waste management needs of the end user will be met. The existing waste storage arrangements in the rear yard would be retained to secure compliance with policy EN19.

Policy DM 1 Development Management - Discusses a range of issues that all development should have regard to. The following specific issues are relevant to the consideration of this application:

- i. The impact of the development on the character of the surrounding area;
- ii. Effects on amenity, including privacy;
- iii. Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space;
- iv. Refuse storage and collection;
- v. Vehicular access and car parking.

It is considered that the development would be appropriately related to its context in terms of design, potential impact on residential amenity and retained arrangements for waste storage. Policy DM1 would thereby be accorded with.

Saved Unitary Development Plan - The following policies are considered to be relevant:

Policy DC1 - Residential Extensions

Policy DC1.1 - States that 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.

Policy DC1.2 - States that 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 streetscene 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.

Policy DC1.3 - Sets out the circumstances whereby, notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve planning permission for residential extensions. The relevant aspects in this case are the extent of rearward extensions and the potential impact on privacy. It states, amongst other things, that the Council will not usually approve rearward extensions greater than 3.65 metres in length.

Policy DC1.4- In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

- a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;
- b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;
- c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved. As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

It is considered that the proposed development would be a proportionate addition to a family house given the capacity of the site and the maintenance of distinctive spaces between houses. Incorporation of matching brickwork is considered to be a positive feature and, it is considered, that a coherent and satisfactory design has been brought forward to secure compliance with saved policy DC1.

Policy DC18 (Conservation Areas) - States that the City Council will give particularly careful consideration to development proposals within conservation areas. It states that:

- a. The Council will seek to preserve and enhance the character of its designated conservation areas by carefully considering the following issues:
 - i. The relationship of new structures to neighbouring buildings and spaces;
 - ii. The effect of major changes to the appearance of existing buildings;
 - iii. The desirability of retaining existing features, such as boundary walls, gardens, trees, (including street trees).

Policy CC5 – states, ‘ the Council will act to maintain and improve areas of recognised townscape value, and will encourage the conservation and refurbishment of buildings of character and quality, especially:- a) within the general area of

Crumpsall Lane and Seymour Road; b) in the Crumpsall Green area. Reason: To conserve the distinctive character of these areas.

It is considered that the proposed development responds positively to policy SP1 and DM1 of the core strategy and policy DC18 and CC5 of the unitary development plan for Manchester, in that it would improve the living environment for the resident and thereby their well-being and continued occupation of the house. It is not considered that the development would undermine the residential character of the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area due to the scale of the development, the quality of the proposed design and proposed materials.

ISSUES

Design and Appearance

The submitted application proposes to erect a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a Velux window and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

The 2-storey side extension is flush at ground floor level and set back by 1m at first floor level and the roof ridge line is set down. A gap of between 0.650m and 1.096m would be retained to the side boundary with 1B Ardern Road. The single storey rear extension would project 4 metres and runs along the shared boundary with the neighbouring property No. 1D Ardern Road. The front and rear dormer windows would be constructed out of roof tiles and glazing, the tiles would match the existing roof tiles. The canopy above the bay window would continue along the front elevation and a porch would demark the front entrance. There are no changes proposed to the front boundary treatment. However, a block paved area would replace an existing concrete flagged driveway. The existing lawn shall be reduced in size to allow for block paving. The rear garden area has no landscaping or lawn. The proposal includes hard landscaping and a boundary wall to be erected in the rear garden area.

The proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the character of the property by the use of similar design references and materials to match the existing dwelling. It would appear subservient to the original house and the 1metre set back is sufficient to off-set the creation of a terracing effect and this set back together with the gap to the side boundary would retain a sense of space. The front dormer consists of a flat roof and sits comfortable between the ridge and the front of the roof.

Opposite to the application site there is a row of mews houses which have flat roofs. Three properties to the south west of the site also incorporate small dormer type window designs similar in appearance to the proposed front dormers. The proposal is therefore in keeping with other properties within the wider area and it is considered that the introduction of a front dormer window would not form an unduly intrusive feature within the street scene and would not be detrimental to the character of the area in general or to the character of the Conservation Area.

As a result of concerns raised, the scheme has been revised including the removal of a front dormer window and a reduction in size of the front and rear dormers, the two-storey side and single storey rear extension have also been reduced in size. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policy DM1, which states, all development should have regard to: Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail, Impact on surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable and would not have any adverse impact on the character of the street scene.



(Image 1) Building at Junction of Middleton Road and Ardern Road west of the site



(Image 2) Mews Housing opposite the application site.



(Image 3) Building at the Junction of Middleton Road and Ardern Road south west of the site.



(Image 4) The application site viewed in conjunction with properties on Holland Road.

Impact on the character of the conservation area

The Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area consists of a variety of types of tenure, design and age of residential dwellings: three storey mews houses face the application site (Image 2) and on the same side of Ardern Road lies a variety of different house designs some of which are clad in timber and painted black and white in colour. Moving toward the junction with Middleton Road on the right side of the junction lies an Edwardian Villa that has been extended by the introduction of a large flat roof extension (Image 1). West of the site at the junction of Ardern Road and Middleton Road there is a modern apartment building that has a large proportion of the elevation facing Ardern Road (Image 3). The application site lies within a row

of modern dwelling houses that can be seen in conjunction with period properties that lie on the junction with Holland Road (Image 4).

The character of this part of the conservation area contains various recent and more modern additions and interventions. The proposed extensions are not out of keeping with the context and overriding character. It is considered that the development in terms of its design, appearance and height, scale and massing would not undermine the character of the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area due to the scale of the development, the layout, the quality of the proposed design and the proposed materials are be considered to be acceptable. On balance, it is considered that the proposed development would cause the lower end of less than substantial harm to the conservation area and therefore would be in accordance with, relevant policies and the tests within the NPPF with public benefits outweighing any harm.

Paragraph 201 of the NPPF states that not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. It is considered that the host building makes a small contribution to the character of the conservation area. The main body of the application property is visible in the main from the front of the property, whilst the rear is set into the site with limited views between the houses.

Paragraph 192 of the NPPF 2019 states that the following should be taken into account when determining applications that affect heritage assets.

a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

The proposed development involves replacing an already existing side extension which is a fairly recent addition to the conservation area. It is not considered that the host building makes a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area. Therefore, extending the dwelling house is considered to cause the lower end of less than substantial harm to the character of the conservation area. The proposal would also allow a small family dwelling to be enlarged to create improved accommodation.

b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality;
By allowing the occupier of the dwelling house to extend the property to provide for their growing needs helps contributes to creating more sustainable communities.

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The proposed development has been amended to allow the extension to be subservient to the host property by reducing the size, scale and massing of the extension and therefore the amended proposal is considered to be in keeping with the character of the conservation area by making a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 197 states, the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly and indirectly affect non

designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. As stated above, it is considered that the proposed works would have less than substantial harm on the character of the conservation area with the host building only having a very limited contribution to that character. The public benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh any limited harm.

The heritage statement that accompanied the proposal was proportionate to the development proposed. The Council considers that the threshold for information is low in order not to impose an unnecessary burden on householders. The Heritage Statement submitted is commensurate to the scale of development and is deemed to be acceptable. Furthermore, there was sufficient information on the drawings to be able to properly assess the impacts of the proposal.

Paragraph 196 states, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The character of this part of the conservation area contains various recent and more modern additions and interventions. The proposed extensions are not out of keeping with the context and overriding character of the conservation area given that the application site is in a row of modern properties and there are gaps and spaces consistent with the character and layout of the conservation area which help preserve the characteristics of the area. Therefore, the proposal makes a small contribution.

It is considered that the proposal would be low level of less than substantial harm. This low level of harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. The objectors to the proposal state that all the benefits are private. However, Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states 'these benefits can be economic, social and/or environmental. In this instance, the extension and alterations would result in a sympathetic addition to the property with matching materials and details which correspond with the character of the area and other properties in the street scene. There is an opportunity to improve the boundary treatment at the property which would be of public benefit to the conservation area as a whole. It is considered that the appearance of the extension, including the modifications to ensure the extension is subservient, would outweigh any harm to the conservation area as a whole.

The layout of the proposal

The area has varying types of boundary treatments that define the curtilage of the gardens. The application site lies within a row of four modern type properties that are situated on similar size plots. Each property has different boundary treatments that face Ardern Road and have different proportion of hard and soft landscaping treatments that are highly visible when viewed from within the street scene. The mews properties facing the application site comprise predominantly of hard landscaping to the front of the properties. The majority of the properties within the area have off street car parking provision.

The proposed alterations to the front garden are considered to be minimal and the introduction of block paving results in an improved aesthetic in comparison to the concrete flags that are currently in situ. The proposed single storey rear extension would not compromise the layout of the rear amenity space. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with policy DM1, which states, all development should have regard to: Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail, Impact on surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable and will not have any adverse impact on the character of the street scene.

Impact on Residential Amenity

With reference to potential impacts from the two-storey side extension, the neighbouring property has a single storey garage along the common boundary and a gap would be maintained between the proposed extension and the boundary fence. The length of the side extension is similar in length of the neighbouring property and would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of both properties. It is not considered that the extension would result in any undue loss of light or overbearing appearance to the immediately adjoining house or to other neighbouring houses. The two-storey side extension maintains a 1.096m gap to the boundary at its widest point which fronts the road and tapers to 0.65 metres at its narrowest at the rear elevation. Therefore, the widest gap at the front of the side elevation, combined with the 1 metre set back at first floor creates a sense of subservience and provides a sense of space between the extension and the neighbouring plot. This is in line with the objectives of saved policy DC1 which encourages a gap to the boundary, ensuring that the development gap can be shared and ensuring extensions are subservient.

The rear dormer is set back from the edge of the roof and the bedroom window is positioned as such that no additional overlooking would occur and the distance from the boundary of the neighbouring property 1B Ardern Road is approximately 8 metres away and given the relationship to the neighbouring properties would be appropriate and similar to that of existing windows within the application property. The front dormer bedroom window is over 21 metres away from the closest property on the opposite side of Ardern Road and would not result in any undue loss of privacy. It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable, in terms of the adopted Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, including policies DC1, and Manchester's Core Strategy, including policy DM1.

With reference to the proposed single storey rear extension this would project 4m from the rear elevation of the main house. This has been reduced in size. It is considered that this would not result in any undue loss of light or overbearing appearance to the occupiers of the adjoining property.

A condition shall be applied to any approval regarding no further windows in any of the elevations and to obscurely glaze the ground floor cloak room and the first-floor washer dryer room window would be inserted on the side elevation facing no.1B Ardern Road.

It must be noted that planning permission has previously been granted for a rear dormer window extension at the application property and single storey rear

extensions can be erected up to 3m in length without the need for planning permission or prior approval in most circumstances.

With reference to concerns that the application property may be used for other uses other than residential the applicant has confirmed that the use would be for a family house and a condition is recommended which limits the use of the dwelling to a C3a use.

Amenity Space

The development would result in a very small loss of some private amenity space at the rear but sufficient space would be retained to serve the size of the plot which is otherwise of a good size. Therefore, this proposal is compliant with policy DC 1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy for Manchester.

Car Parking

Off street car parking is provided at the property and would be unaffected by the proposal. Therefore, the proposal is compliant with policy DC 1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and DM 1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy for Manchester.

Bin Storage

Waste and recycling bins would continue to be stored at the rear of the dwelling and the gap to the side of the extension would retain access to the rear garden. The applicant has provided further details of how access for the bins would operate. The amended plan demonstrates as a result of the two storey side extension maintains a 1.096m gap to the boundary at its widest point which fronts the road and tapers to 0.650 metres at its narrowest at the rear elevation. Therefore, there is space to manoeuvre waste receptacles between the front and rear of the dwelling house. Furthermore, the adequacy in terms of the size of the waste bins have been assessed by environmental health, and they have confirmed that the size and amount of bins provided are considered to be acceptable for a domestic scale property. Therefore, the proposal is compliant with policy DC 1 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and DM 1, SP1 and EN19 of the Core Strategy for Manchester.

Boundary Treatment

The boundary treatment to the front of the property remains the same and the revised floor plans provided omit the boundary wall from rear garden area which no longer includes changes in ground levels removing the need to excavate beyond the foundation of the extension. The rear garden now comprises of grass and paving around the extension. Furthermore, a boundary treatment condition would be attached to the consent controlling the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable in terms of the visual amenity of the area.

Trees

No trees would be removed to erect the extension. However, concerns have been raised regarding potential detrimental impact on a horse chestnut tree on the adjacent site. A revised plan showing an alternative layout, including the removal of the proposed wall and confirmation excluding any excavation of the rear garden to modify the ground level has been provided. The revised plan identifies the location of the closest tree identified as Horse Chestnut Tree. The city arboriculture department has confirmed that given the rear garden wall and excavation of the garden has been omitted from the proposal, they support the proposal subject to any tree roots being affected as a result of the extension shall be protected in accordance with BS 5837. Furthermore, the applicant in response to these concerns confirmed that they would appoint a qualified structural engineer to inspect the foundations and pay particular attention to any nearby tree roots in order to protect the adjacent trees during construction and an appropriately worded condition is proposed requiring tree protection details together with a method statement. The applicant in addition to the amended layout, also provided an arboricultural report. As stated above a local resident also commissioned and submitted an arboricultural report Both of these reports were assessed by the city councils arboriculturist who made the following comments:

The tree identified in each tree report in the curtilage of Towngreen Court referred to as T1 and T5: whilst the rooting of this tree is identified in both reports in accordance with BS5837. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, this is an indicative area only and can vary considerably dependant on ground conditions. Therefore, the proposal to hand-dig only in this area is considered an acceptable approach and can avoid unnecessary damage to roots encountered within the proposed building line. The extent of disturbance in this particular case is also considered acceptable and should be well below 20% maximum.

In conclusion, the arboriculturist does not object to the proposal from an arboricultural perspective subject to careful construction methods being used and pilings being used if deemed necessary. In addition, also recommend that an arboricultural consultant be appointed to supervise the excavation element and ensure that adequate protection is in place to ensure root protection. Therefore, if the proposal is carried out in accordance with the suggested measures, it is considered that the proposal would not be detrimental to the integrity of the tree and therefore compliant with policy.

Landscaping

The front garden currently comprises of a lawn and concrete flags. The proposal would seek to improve the appearance of the hard landscaping by replacing the concrete flags with block paving. The block paving is permeable and a condition has been attached to the consent. The hard landscaping would be increased in size by removing a small grassed area in the front garden in order to create additional space for car parking. This arrangement still allows for a small area of lawn within the front garden. The original proposal in the rear garden comprised solely of the hard landscaping. However, a revised scheme has been submitted which includes the removal of the previously proposed boundary wall around the curtilage of the rear garden. The current proposal comprises of grassed lawn area and flags around the

extension to create a patio area, including bin storage. It is considered that this proposal in terms of its appearance is considered to be acceptable as it does not visually detract from the overall character of the conservation area. A condition is proposed requiring full details of any boundary treatment to be agreed and this is particularly relevant for new frontage boundary treatment.

Construction

Issues raised relating to the adequacy and impact of foundations, drainage including water and foul drainage would be dealt with by building regulations.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions are considered, on balance, to be acceptable and appropriate in this context within the street scene and within the character of the conservation area.

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 the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee 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 of the application 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 proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. In this instance officers have worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner by requesting further information relating to the scheme and appropriate conditions to the approval have also been attached.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 126912/FH/2020 held by planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are held by the Planning Division.

The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:

Highway Services

A map showing the neighbours notified of the application is attached at the end of the report.

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Relevant Contact Officer :

Janine Renshaw-Livesey

Telephone number: 0161 234 4555

Email: janine.renshaw-livesey@manchester.gov.uk

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:

Proposed Elevation Rev B, stamped as received on the 17 September 2020, The Location Plan, stamped as received on the 22 May 2020 and the revised plan titled, 'Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans', Rev F, Stamped as received on the 19 November 2020.

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 external facing materials to be used on the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing buildings in terms of type, colour, texture and scale.

Reason - To ensure that 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 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.

(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 drawings, Proposed Elevation Rev B, stamped as received on the 17 September 2020, The Location Plan, stamped as received on the 22 May 2020 and the revised plan titled, 'Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans', Rev F, Stamped as received on the 19 November 2020.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity pursuant to policy SP1 and DM1 Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

(5) The ground floor toilet and cloak facility, the first floor en suite and washer/ dryer room the second floor shower room on drawing titled , ' Proposed Elevation Rev B, stamped as received on the 17 September 2020, The Location Plan, stamped as received on the 22 May 2020. and the Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans Rev F, Stamped as received on the 19 November 2020, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent properties from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

(6) 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 part of the development shall be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) other than the purpose(s) of C3(a). For the avoidance of doubt, this does not preclude two unrelated people sharing a property.

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity, to safeguard the character of the area and to maintain the sustainability of the local community through provision of accommodation that is suitable for people living as families pursuant to policies DM1 and H11 of the Core Strategy for Manchester and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

(7) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located in order to comply with saved policy E3.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of

the Core Strategy.

(8) Prior to the installation of the proposed driveways and car parking areas hereby approved, a drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained in situ thereafter.

Reason - To prevent the increased risk of flooding, improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system pursuant to policy EN17 of the Core Strategy.

(9) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment with Tree Protection Measures by Godwins Arboricultural Limited, stamped as received on the 19 November 2020 by the city council as local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt this includes a plan identifying the location of trees affected by the development together with how the extension will be constructed to prevent damage or loss to the trees and their root systems. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed method statement. All tree work should be carried out by a competent contractor in accordance with British Standard BS 3998 "Recommendations for Tree Work".

Reason - In order to agree a suitable method for working in close proximity to trees in order to prevent damage or loss pursuant to policies SP1, EN9 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

