

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0164
Location: 53 Whalley Road, Middleton, Manchester, M24 6ET
Proposal: Two storey rear extension with pitched roof and the application of white render following demolition of existing conservatory
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Luke Rigby

SITE

The application site consists of a two-storey mid-terrace residential dwelling located to the south of Whalley Road in a predominantly residential area of Middleton. The existing dwelling is constructed of facing brick with a pitched roof.

To the rear of the application site is an open field. The dwelling benefits from an existing conservatory.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a two-storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory.

RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

None relevant.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local Guidance

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

P3 Improving Design of New Development

DM1 General Development Requirements

T2 Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: In accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, notification letters were sent to immediate neighbours.

ASSESSMENT

Design, character and appearance

The application proposes the demolition of the existing conservatory to the rear elevation and the construction of a two-storey rear extension with gabled roof. The extension is considered to appear as a subservient and in proportion addition to the existing dwelling.

Whilst it is acknowledged that it would feature a 'stepped' appearance, this is not considered to appear significantly incongruous or out of character having regard to the siting to the rear of the dwelling. Whilst there is a large field to the rear, there is sufficient vegetative screening to beyond the rear boundary which would screen much of the development from view.

Whilst the comments received regarding the development being out of character, excessive, and disruptive to the built character of the terrace are acknowledged, this is not considered to be the case. As discussed, the proposed extension would be sited to the rear of the dwelling therefore its impact on the wider street scene would be mitigated to an acceptable level. Whilst it would be visible from the adjoining field to the rear this is mitigated to an acceptable level by vegetative screening on the field itself. It is therefore not considered to appear significantly incongruous or out of character in this instance.

The application proposes white render. Whilst it is acknowledged that this would be a departure from the materials used in the external appearance of the existing dwelling, this is not considered to appear significantly incongruous; there is a dwelling adjacent to the application site which is rendered in white.

As such it is considered that the proposed extension and alterations would be acceptable, in accordance with CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Residential amenity

Paragraph 5.9 of the Housing SPD states that permission will not normally be granted where a two-storey development intrudes into a 30-degree line drawn at 2.4m along the common boundary from the neighbouring dwelling, however notes that an increased projection may be allowable if offset from the boundary and not intruding into this 30-degree visibility zone.

The proposed extension would project approximately 2.7m from the rear elevation of No. 51 but would be offset from the boundary and would therefore not intrude into this 30-degree visibility zone. It is therefore not considered to appear overbearing or overshadowing, nor is it likely to restrict the amount of light received into the rear of No. 51.

The proposed extension would extend approximately 3.487m from the rear of the existing dwelling along the boundary with No. 55. It is acknowledged, however, that there is an alleyway between the two dwellings and No. 55 is set back slightly in its plot than the application dwelling. As a result, the proposal would not intrude into a 30-degree visibility zone when measured at a point 2.4m along the boundary and is therefore not considered to appear significantly overbearing or overshadowing.

Concerns have been raised regarding the development blocking views. The right to a view is not enshrined in planning legislation and therefore does not fall to be considered; impact on outlook, however does. The proposed development is not considered significantly detrimental on outlook, having regard to the above. All neighbouring dwellings would continue to benefit from adequate outlook as a result of the development.

It is noted that all habitable rooms within the application property would continue to receive an adequate amount of natural light and that a sufficient garden space would be retained.

As such, it is considered proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of both the occupiers of the application property and the neighbouring properties, in accordance with CS policy DM1, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Highways and parking

The application property would retain two off-street parking spaces, and would have no unacceptable impacts upon highway safety in accordance with CS Policy T2 and CS Appendix 5.

Other Considerations

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the development on the structure of neighbouring dwellings the impact on property values. Whilst acknowledged, these are not material considerations in the determination of this application.

Concerns have been raised regarding disruption during construction. Such disruptions are a necessary byproduct of development and are largely transient.

The representations received regarding the developments impact on shared drainage are acknowledged. Grant of planning permission does not infer, nor override, the need to gain separate consents in relation to drainage such as those from Building Control. The quantum of development in this instance does not necessitate further assessment of drainage.

Conclusion

Subject to the conditions set out below and taking into account the provisions of the development plan and all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

2 No. objections received which can be summarised as follows:

Concerns regarding impact on property values.

Concerns regarding impact on structural integrity of neighbouring dwellings

The development would be noisy and disruptive during development.

The proposed extension would block sunlight and daylight to neighbouring dwellings during some parts of the day.

The dwellings in the terrace benefit from a consistent building line and built form which the development would not be in keeping with

The proposal is excessive in this context.

The proposal would be overbearing and overshadowing for neighbouring dwellings

The proposed development would disrupt the sense of openness from neighbouring dwellings

Concerns regarding drainage from the increased run off

The points raised in respect of a loss of sunlight, an overbearing impact, the proposal being excessive or being out of character are addressed within the assessment below. Other matters raised do not form a material planning consideration.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application, and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;

advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and

foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 This permission relates to the following plans and documents: -

DWG No. PP-14719412v1 (Site Location Plan)
DWG No. 1063-10A (Proposed Elevations)
DWG No. 1063-08 (Proposed First Floor Plans)
DWG No. 1063-07 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan)
DWG No. 1063-09 (Proposed Roof Plan)

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Unitary Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall be those specified on the application form or approved plan 1063-10A.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.