

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00776/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00776/HOUS
Location:	87 Hereford Way, Middleton, M24 2NN
Proposal:	Two-storey side extension including canopy roof over garage door, formation of pitched roof over existing porch and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing attached garage.
Applicant:	Ms Karen Szymanek
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 17.10.2024	EXT OF TIME
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

This application relates to no. 87 Hereford Way, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The application property stands amid a row of semi-detached dwellings and the topography rises gradually in an easterly direction with the result that the application property is sited on slightly lower ground than the adjacent no. 89 Hereford Way to the northeast. The host property is adjoined to no. 85 Hereford Way to the southwest and faces no. 92 Hereford Way to the southeast. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear garden of no. 24 Chelford Close. The application property benefits from an existing front porch and an attached garage along the side elevation. There is one off-street parking space to the front of the host dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension which would be set back 1m behind the principal elevation of the existing dwelling. The roof formation would be dual-pitched, with a lower ridgeline than that of the main dwellinghouse. A canopy

roof would extend over the proposed garage door, connecting with a new pitched roof over the existing front porch. Materials for the construction of the extension would be brickwork, render, roof tiles and window frames to match the existing.

Relevant History

81/D11985 - Private Garage And Front Porch – **Granted STC** (February 1981)

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. No representations were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P3 Improving Design of New Development
DM1 General Development Requirements
G6 Enhancing Green Infrastructure
T2 Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

Amendments were sought to set back the proposed extension 1m at both levels and reduce the amount of render proposed to the front elevation.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ CS Policies DM1 and P3 require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.*” In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states that development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”
- ☐ The proposed side extension would be an appropriate width and it would include a 1m set back from the main front wall with the ridgeline set down accordingly. Therefore, the proposed side extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ☐ Section 5.12 of SPD states that to avoid the ‘terracing effect’, two storey and first floor side extensions that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary of the property will not normally be permitted unless either:
 - (i) The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house; OR
 - (ii) The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house.
- ☐ The proposed side extension would incorporate a setback at ground and first floor levels of 1m and therefore it is not considered that a terracing effect would result.
- ☐ Canopy roofs and similar forward projections are a feature of the building line. Therefore, the proposed canopy roof above the garage door would be an appropriate addition that would not disrupt the surrounding pattern of development.
- ☐ The materials to be used in construction of the proposed extension are indicated to match those used in the construction of the original application dwelling.
- ☐ Section 3.12 of the SPD states that development proposals should include space for refuse bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets. The proposals include a storage area within the extension that would be capable of storing the refuse bins.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which requires that development proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.
- ☐ The proposed two storey side extension would not have any windows in the side elevation facing the shared boundary with no. 89 Hereford Way and would comfortably meet the requirements of the projection rule outlined in the SPD.
- ☐ The facing side elevation of no. 89 contains a landing window at first floor level. Therefore, the proposal would not unduly impact the light and outlook to any habitable rooms.
- ☐ The proposed front-facing bedroom window would comfortably comply with the 21m separation distance outlined in the SPD.
- ☐ While the proposed first floor window to the rear would not comply with either the 10.5m or 21m standards outlined in the SPD, it is noted that this window would only replicate an existing relationship. In any event, this window would serve a bathroom, with a condition attached to ensure the use of obscure glazing.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate that all habitable rooms would be supplied with adequate natural light and outlook, in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden of a functional layout.
- ☐ The proposed development would not result in an undue loss of amenity for neighbouring residents through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and the proposal is considered to accord with CS Policy DM1 and the SPD in respect of neighbour amenity.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ CS Policy T2 gives priority to the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live in the area affected by development. Supporting this overarching policy is the SPD which states that it is important that car parking areas are designed in such a way as to prevent parked cars dominating the street scene and to prevent cars overhanging the public highway. Ample parking within the curtilage of the host dwelling is therefore a requirement of proposals for residential extensions.
- ☐ The proposal would result in a four bedroomed house with only one off street parking space. Whilst this is less than ideal, it is not considered that this would lead to a significant increase in on street parking in the area or have a detrimental impact on the capacity of the highway network.
- ☐ As such it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan. Number 019 L01. Revision 2.
- Existing Plans & Elevations. Number 019 101. Revision 2.
- Proposed Plans & Elevations. Number 019 102. Revision 3.

And the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

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

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the proposed first floor bathroom window on the rear elevation facing northwest shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	09/10/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	15/10/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling