



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 August 2021

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/21/3275906

15-19 Cranbourne Road, Chorlton Cum Hardy, Manchester, M21 8AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Chapel Properties against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 125220/FO/2019, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
 - The development proposed was described in the planning application as the refurbishment and reconfiguration of house at 15 Cranbourne Road, and refurbishment and reconfiguration of 6 existing flats in 17 and 19 Cranbourne Road, addition of 3 new flats to the converted 17 and 19 Cranbourne Road basements. Including the extension of 17 and 19 Cranbourne Road and the formation of lightwells to all 3 properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of a 3 storey rear extension to 17 and 19 Cranbourne Road, installation of lightwells to front and rear of 15, 17, 19 Cranbourne Road together with associated elevational alterations in order to create 2 additional self-contained flats (8 flats in total), erection of bike and binstore and creation of 3 car parking spaces in the rear at 15-19 Cranbourne Road, Chorlton Cum Hardy, Manchester, M21 8AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 125220/FO/2019, dated 18 October 2019, subject to the conditions attached to the Schedule to this decision letter.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed development was revised during the application process as detailed in the decision section above. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Chapel Properties against Manchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the adequacy of car parking and its effect on highway safety, and

- the effects of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings

Reasons

Adequacy of parking arrangements

5. The appeal site comprises three existing 3-storey plus basement properties forming part of a Victorian terrace within a highly sustainable residential area of mature and relatively densely laid out properties located close to the Chorlton District Centre. No.15 is arranged as a four-bedroom family dwellinghouse with No's. 17 and 19 each having been previously converted to accommodate three single bedroom flats each. The basements to each of the three properties is presently used for storage. No off-street parking is available for present occupiers despite the presence of a narrow side access that accommodates existing bin storage facilities.
6. The proposed development would see significant enhancement of the existing properties through the provision of eight flats in total consisting of four 2-bed and four 1-bed flats and a retained 5-bedroom house. A rear extension is proposed to facilitate this provision and improve the standard of living accommodation over and above existing arrangements together with limited private garden areas, balcony or inset Juliette balcony and a communal garden area. The Council does not appear to oppose the design aspects of the appeal scheme or the effects of the proposed development on neighbouring properties or the amount of outdoor amenity space provision and I have no reason to disagree with those assessments.
7. Three parking spaces would be provided alongside the communal garden area to the rear. Undeniably, the immediate area appears to be subject to parking stress and this view is echoed by local residents in their submissions. The Council explains that the demographics in this area would indicate that car ownership levels would likely to be relatively high and that three off-street spaces would be insufficient and add to on-street parking congestion. The Council points to the refurbishment of No's.3-13 nearby with the uptake of all 15 spaces at the rear of those flats, which demonstrates the level of car ownership in the area. The Council suggests that the additional 2-bed units would have the potential to be occupied by two related individuals each having their own vehicles and that the 4x1-bed flats should not be discounted from any calculation as they would be occupied by persons from higher income groups who would be likely to be car owners.
8. My attention has been drawn to the Council's guidance on parking requirements as set out in its Manchester Residential Quality Guidance 2016, which seeks 100% car parking provision in new apartment developments with a caveat that a reduced provision may be tolerated where secure cycle parking in excess of 50% provision relative to apartment provision is attained. Clearly, this provision is met given that two new/additional apartments would be created. Moreover, 9-no. cycle spaces within a bike storage shed would sit alongside the three bay parking spaces to the rear.
9. The Council acknowledges that the appeal site lies within a highly sustainable location close to the District Centre and one which is well served by an efficient public transport provision. This in my view suggests that occupiers of flats in this area would not necessarily be reliant upon the private car as there would

be a degree of choice on the part of individual occupiers. Future occupiers would be aware that they might not have access to the car parking spaces on site and that car parking in the immediate vicinity of the site is problematic. They may very well may choose to rent or buy with this knowledge in mind. These factors add to the acceptability of the appeal scheme proposals and I am satisfied that the parking requirements generated by this development would not materially add to localised parking stress.

10. I have given the fall-back position significant weight, given that the resulting development would offer reasonable standards of accommodation comparable to what is proposed in the appeal scheme. I am also satisfied that the proposed development would not be significantly more harmful than the fall-back scheme. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the fall-back could not be implemented, and I am satisfied that should this appeal fail it would be likely that the alternative scheme of refurbishment has a realistic prospect of being carried out under permitted development. The demands for parking would be the same in either proposal but that there would be no control over whether the off-street parking facilities would be provided should the fall-back scheme be implemented.
11. I note that the Highway Authority has raised objections on the grounds of local highway conditions. Given my findings however, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety whilst the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe. In this way, there would be no conflict with the approach to such matters as advocated in paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
12. Taking all these matters into account, I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect in relation to car parking and highway safety. This is because of the appeal site's very sustainable location, the additional car parking provision that would be proposed over and above the required Design Guide standards, the likelihood of not all occupiers of the property needing to have access to a private car, the availability of cycle parking facilities at the site and the genuine fall-back position that exists in this case.
13. I find no conflict with Policies DM1, SP1 and T2 of the Manchester Core Strategy (MCS), or with Saved Policies of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which collectively, set out to ensure that new developments do not give rise to vehicle access and parking issues, are suitably located thereby reducing the need to travel and in the case of flat developments do contribute to existing on-street parking problems.

Living conditions – existing occupiers

14. The Council claims that the appeal proposal would give rise to noise and disturbance by virtue of the increased activity level associated with a more intensive use of No's.17 and 19 on the site and considers that this would lead to unacceptable living conditions for existing residents. Moreover, it is also claimed that the proposed car parking area for three cars would result in noise and disturbance.
15. Whilst I appreciate that the influx of additional residents into the area would undoubtedly lead to additional comings and goings, I consider that due to the size of the properties, they would likely be occupied by single people or couples

and therefore the noise and disturbance associated with this level of occupancy would be unlikely to be significant, particularly in the context of this busy, District Centre location. I note that no objections were raised from Environmental Health officers and from my own observations at the site visit, the ambience of the area to the rear of existing properties has already altered to a large degree by virtue of the car parking area associated with No's. 3-13 Cranbourne Road, which is almost directly adjacent.

16. In conclusion, I have found that in regard to noise and disturbance the appeal proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DM1 and SP1 of the MCS and with Saved UDP Policy DC26. These policies seek to ensure amongst other things, that new developments make a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of existing residents and in particular, do not unacceptably impact on levels of amenity through increased noise.

Other Matters

17. Despite views to the contrary, given the separation distances and positioning from the proposed development to neighbouring residential properties, particularly on High Lane and the reduced height and massing of the appeal scheme, would ensure that no unacceptable impacts would result in terms of outlook or overlooking for neighbouring occupiers. In concluding that no unreasonable impacts on privacy would occur, I am also cognizant of both the relationship of properties in this area and the location of the site at the edge of a busy District Centre where development tends to be closer knit.
18. It has been put to me that the proposal may give rise to security issues and increased crime. However, there no evidence before me that this will be a reality; indeed, there will be increased surveillance from windows and balconies associated with the proposed development.
19. I note the contention by some local residents that the applicant may not have a right of access to the proposed car parking area. This is a legal matter between the parties and falls outside my jurisdiction.

Conditions

20. The Council has suggested a list of conditions that have been assessed against the advice contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have included one that identifies the approved drawings to provide certainty. A condition is also attached that requires the use of suitable matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance.
21. To safeguard amenity and public health, conditions are attached relating to the acceptable storage and disposal of refuse and the satisfactory treatment of any ground contamination that may be revealed during the course of development activity and works.
22. Conditions are also included requiring the layout and surfacing of the parking area and the provision of bike storage facilities and electric car charging points in order to achieve policy compliant off-street car parking provision and to promote sustainable modes of travel.

Conclusion

23. In conclusion, I have found that the appeal proposal would not have a detrimental impact on highways safety matters, nor would it cause harm to the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers due to noise and disturbance.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE TO THE DECISION

List of Conditions

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents and drawings received as stated: Application form 21 October 2019 Location Plan 21 Oct 2019 137-PL-OS1 Existing Site Plans 10 Jun 2020 PL- GLS1 REV A Proposed Site Plans 10 Jun 2020 PL- GL1 REV B Existing & Proposed Front Elevations 10 Jun 2020 PL- EL1 REV A Existing & Proposed Rear Elevations 10 Jun 2020 PL- EL2 REV A Existing & Proposed West Elevations 10 Jun 2020 PL- EL4 REV A Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Plan 10 Jun 2020 PL- GA1 REV A Existing & Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan 10 Jun 2020 PL- GA2 REV A Existing & Proposed First Floor Plan 10 Jun 2020 PL- GA3 REV A Existing & Proposed Second Floor Plan 10 Jun 2020 PL- GA4 REV A Existing & Proposed Alley Elevations 10 Jun 2020 PL- EL3 REV A Existing & Proposed Existing and Proposed Roof Plan 10 Jun 2020 PL-GA5 REV A Existing & Proposed Bike Shed and Bin Store 10 Jun 2020 PL-AD1 REV B Design & Access Statement prepared by Simon James 21 Oct 2019 Residential Dwelling Units Supplementary Information 21 Oct 2019 Waste Management Proforma 10 Jun 2020 REV A Bin Store Details and Location 26 Aug 2020 137-PL-AD2 Rev B Bin Store Details 26 Aug 2020 137-PL-AD3 Rev B Parking Statement prepared by CBO Transport (Document Ref: CBO-0610-001) dated 28 Jan 2020, received on the 7 Feb 2020. Bramhall Town Planning Statement dated 3 Sep 2020 (Doc Ref:196/CC), received 6 Sep 2020 MCC Street Check: Cranbourne Road Rear Alley Adoption Letter and Plan 6 Sep 2020.
3. The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture.
4. The scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse, including the provision of internal and external segregated waste collection and recycling, bin store as shown on revised plans 137-PL-AD2 Rev B and 137-PL-AD3 Rev B and the management arrangements for presenting waste containers to the collection location, as set out in the email from the agent dated the 26th of August 2020, shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation and at all times thereafter.
5. In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas are encountered on the site at any time before the development is occupied during the watching brief, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until a report detailing what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Remediation Strategy) and is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed Remediation Strategy. If no contamination is found, then a post-completion report shall be submitted to the local planning authority upon completion of the development or first occupation of any of the dwellings whichever is sooner to evidence this.
6. The car parking indicated on the approved plans, shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the

development hereby approved. The car parking shall then be available at all times whilst the site is occupied.

7. The bike storage indicated on the plan (Ref: 137-PL-AD1 Rev B) received on the 10th of June 2020, shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved. The approved storage space and bicycle parking stands shall then be retained and permanently reserved for bicycle parking at all times whilst the site is occupied.
8. Prior to the first occupation of the use of the development hereby approved, electric car charging points for each parking space shall be installed in accordance with a scheme that has had the prior consent in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any dwelling and made available and thereafter retained for as long as the development is in place.

