

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 17/11/2023	Ref: 70174/GPDE
Registration: 21/09/2023	LDFC: 09/11/2023	Expiry Date: 02/11/2023
Site Visit: 16/11/2023	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 approval for proposed single storey rear extension

Location: 11 Newlands Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 3BU

Description

A Prior Approval application for a large home extension to a semi detached, brick and tile built two storey dwellinghouse. The dwelling has an existing single storey side/rear extension that is shown to be removed on the submitted plans. The application is for a single storey, flat roofed extension with parapet wall off the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would extend beyond the original rear wall by 5 metres, and would have an overall height of 3 metres.

1 objection received, this objection has been 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

Neighbour letters sent 18/10/2023. Objection received in relation to:

- Myself and my husband feel 3.1m high for a single storey extension is excessive, the maximum should be 2.5m.
- We have spent a lot of money renovating and our kitchen seating would be looking at this very high wall.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

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.

Second Report Post Objection

Visual Amenity

SPD 6 and UDP Policy H2/3 seek to achieve a high standard of design that compliments the original building, and does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of neighbouring properties and the general street scene.

The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the dwelling and as such would not impact on the character of the streetscene. Single storey extensions are common features to the rear of the properties and as such is considered to be in keeping the residential character of the locality. The proposed windows and doors are suitably aligned, and the use of matching materials is appropriate.

The proposed extension would not overwhelm the original dwelling, and a suitable area of amenity space would be retained for the host dwelling.

The proposed extension is therefore considered to comply with UDP Policy H2/r and SPD 6.

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension would project more than 3 metres beyond the rear of No. 9, and would intercept a 45 degree line as taken from the midpoint of the adjacent patio doors and a 25 degree line as taken on the rising plane. As such an assessment needs to be made in relation to the location of the extension and the orientation of the sun.

It should also be noted that the proposed extension, at 3 metres in height would fall within the heights permissible under permitted development and this is a material planning consideration. The applicant could for instance still construct a flat roof extension that projects 3 metres, with a maximum eaves height of 3 metres, and an overall height of 4 metres in any event and as such the assessment needs to be whether the additional 2 metres in projection would have a detrimental impact in terms of the path of the sun and residential amenity of the attached property.

The proposed extension would be located to the east of the attached property which currently has a north facing habitable room window adjacent to the boundary . As such the proposal would have a limited impact on the early morning sun received by the patio door windows however this window would be largely unaffected for the majority of the day with the sun moving to the front of the properties. When considering what could be constructed outside of the prior approval/planning application process in any event, and the limited impact the proposal would have in relation to it's orientation to the sun it is not considered that an additional 2 metres in projection would have such a significant detrimental impact on this window to warrant a refusal of the application. An adequate amount of amenity space for No. 9 would be retained that would not be adjacent to an extension.

The dwelling at No. 13 has an existing single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would not project more than 3 metres beyond the rear of No.13 as extended.

No side windows are shown on the submitted plans. The proposed rear windows would be screened by the existing rear boundary treatments.

As such, it is considered that the proposal complies with the intentions of UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6 in terms of residential amenity.

Response to neighbours

The height of the proposed extension has been amended to 3 metres which is within the remit of permitted development. An assessment on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties in relation to UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD 6 has been made within the main body of the report.

Recommendation: Prior Approval Required & Granted

Conditions and Reasons:

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP 17/11/2023			