

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Mark Kilby	Date of report: 09/11/2020	Ref: 66010/GPDE
Registration: 29/09/2020	LDFC:	Expiry Date: 10/11/2020
Site Visit: 20/10/2020	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: NREQ

Proposal: Prior notification for proposed single storey rear extension

Location: 4 Harrogate Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0LT

Description

A Prior Approval application for a larger home extension to a semi-detached brick and slate two storey dwellinghouse.

The application is for a single storey flat roofed extension off the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. It would extend beyond the original rear wall by 6 metres and have a flat roof height of 3 metres. The proposal would extend along the boundary with the attached neighbour and would be set back approximately 1 metre from the boundary with the unattached neighbour. The attached neighbour has an extension off the rear elevation of 4.30 metres along the boundary with habitable room window adjacent the boundary, the unattached neighbour has a 6 metre extension set back approximately 1 metre from the boundary with the application site. Neither of the two neighbouring extensions have side windows facing the application site. The proposal would project out level with unattached extension and 1.70 metres beyond the attached extension. The proposed extension would have two windows in the rear extension facing the rear boundary and one side window facing the side wall of the unattached extension.

The rear boundary treatment is 1.50 metre high wall with a trellis above it. There are also trees and other vegetation. The side treatment is 1.80 metre high waney lap fencing.

Neither the unattached or attached neighbours at No.s 2 and 6 respectively have objected. The rear neighbour at No.1 Sedgley Avenue has objected, the objection is detailed below.

As an objection has been received, the regulations require that the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all the adjoining addresses must be assessed.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

Letter dated 2/10/20 to adjoining addresses. 1 objection received from 1 Sedgley Avenue. This address backs onto the application site. The objection is as follows:

1. The size of the extension appears to be significant, almost doubling the footprint of the entire ground floor of the property from looking at the plan.

It also appears to take up the majority of the available garden space of the property.

2. Due to the size of the extension and the proximity it will have to our rear boundary it appears that it will significantly overlook our garden which will impact our enjoyment of the same and reduce our privacy.

3. Owing to the size of the extension and the concerns mentioned in point 2 above, we are concerned that the extension could negatively impact the value of our property.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations - Not applicable.

Pre-start Conditions - Not applicable.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

Issues and Analysis

Unless a formal written objection is received from any of notified addresses as prescribed by the regulations, within the prescribed 21 days following the date of such notification prior approval will not be required as the proposed development complies with all the limitations and conditions of Part 1 Class A of the GPDO (as amended).

The dwelling is not Listed nor is it in a Conservation Area.

There is no enforcement and the proposed development would be on land wholly owned or controlled by the applicant.

Permitted Development Rights have not been removed.

The proposal would not take up more than 50% of the area of the curtilage, not including the area of the dwelling.

The proposal would not extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by more than than six metres.

The proposed development would not extend beyond a wall which forms the principal or a side elevation of the original dwelling and fronts a highway.

The overall height of the proposal would not exceed four metres and the height to the eaves would not exceed three metres.

Having regard to the above the proposal would be lawful as it falls within the limitations of Part 1 Class A to Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Report 2 - Residential Amenity - The proposed development is acceptable with regard to the attached property (No.2). It would project less 3 metres beyond their extension and the occupier of No.2 has not objected. It is not considered the proposal would cause any more significantly unacceptable levels of overshadowing or loss of sunlight to windows or the garden area than would a permitted development extension at 3 metres significantly enough so as to warrant refusal. Furthermore the occupiers have not objected.

The sole objector at No.1 Sedgley Avenue has argued the proposed extension is too big taking up nearly all of the garden space at the rear and as a result would overlook their garden space at the rear reducing their level of privacy and as a result will lower the value of the property. Whilst the amenity space at the rear will be reduced it would still retain approximately 36m² of usable amenity space which is considered acceptable. There are no minimum boundary distances laid out for single storey extensions in SPD6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties and the extension would not exceed the permitted development limit of developing over 50% of the area of the curtilage. The two rear gardens

DELEGATED REPORT

are on the same level and there is existing screening between the two garden areas which could be increased in height without the need for planning permission. The proposed extension would face the blank wall at ground floor level of the rear gable of the outrigger of No.1 Sedgley Avenue and either occupier could use the amenity space adjacent to the rear boundary, although be it not all year round, without the need for an extension. It is not considered the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of 1 Sedgley Avenue is not so severe as to warrant refusal. Property values are not a planning matter.

With regard to residential amenity the proposed development would comply with adopted UDP policy H2/3 - Extensions and SPD 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Visual Amenity - The proposal would not be visible in the street scene. Its scale and massing would be acceptable. As such there would be no detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the building or adjacent and nearby occupiers than might already exist with other nearby rear extensions.

With regard to visual amenity the proposed development would comply with adopted UDP policy H2/3 - Extensions and SPD 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.

Other Matters - As an application for Prior Approval a condition for the time limitation for the commencement of development by virtue of Section 91 of The Town and Country Planning Act cannot be imposed as this application is not an application for planning permission.

Recommendation: Prior Approval Required and Granted

Conditions and Reasons:

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
Mark Kilby	9/11/20	DM	09/11/2020