

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00505/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00505/HOUS
Location:	48 Phyllis Street, Middleton, M24 2AQ
Proposal:	Single-storey front extension, two-storey side extension and two storey rear extension including application of render.
Applicant:	Mrs Syed
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 11.07.2025	EXT OF TIME 01.08.2025
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?	Y

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

Location

The application refers to no. 48 Phyllis Street, a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of East Middleton. The application property faces northeast towards the highway, adjoins no. 46 Phyllis Street to the northwest and is adjacent to no. 50 to the southeast. To the front, the house is set back some 6m from the highway where there is a small front garden and area of hardstanding. To the rear, the ground levels slope down in a southwesterly direction where the subject property shares a common boundary with nos. 7 Easton Close and 14 Chilton Drive.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension, a two storey rear extension and a single storey front extension. The proposed single storey front and two storey side extensions would have the same dimensions as the extensions approved under applications 23/00305/HOUS and 24/00742/ANM except for slight reductions in the length and width of the side extension. The proposed two storey rear extension approved under application 23/00595/CPL has been built 0.15m closer to the common boundary with no. 46 Phyllis Street, meaning it no longer complies with the permitted development criteria. Furthermore, the use of render would also require planning permission. A bin store is proposed to the front of the side extension and two roof lights are also to be installed. It should be noted that all of the existing

brickwork is to be retained, and the gable end of the proposed side extension has been constructed using matching brickwork. However, white render is to be applied to all remaining walls of the proposed side and rear extensions.

Relevant History

<u>87/D20693</u>	Two Storey Rear Extension To Dwellinghouse Grant subject to conditions
<u>20/01127/HOUS</u>	Two storey and single storey side and rear extension Withdrawn
<u>21/01772/HOUS</u>	Two-storey rear extension - Resubmission of 20/01127/HOUS Withdrawn
<u>22/01608/HOUS</u>	Two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension including canopy Withdrawn
<u>23/00305/HOUS</u>	Two storey side extension, front elevation bay window and canopy. Grant subject to conditions
<u>23/00595/CPL</u>	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed two storey rear extension including alterations to the soil and vent pipe and an addition to the roof Grant
<u>24/00742/ANM</u>	Non-material amendment to planning permission 23/00305/HOUS for enlargement of proposed front extension to enclose the full width of the canopy over the front door Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and one objection was received. The letter raised the following concerns:

- Breach of permitted development and deviations from approved plans.

Officer's response: The current application has been submitted to regularise the unauthorised works. The current application must be assessed on its own merits.

- The use of render will be visually harmful and out of character with surrounding properties and street scene.
- Front extension is not in-keeping and is more intrusive.

Officer's response: These matters will be addressed in the 'Design' section.

- Loss of privacy as a result of proposed roof lights.

Officer's response: This matter will be addressed in the 'Amenity' section.

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
T2 Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

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

Amendments

An amendment has been sought to remove the proposed render from the front extension and instead use brick slips to match the original brickwork.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identity that: 'Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.'

Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 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 development proposals should be 'in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.'

It should be noted that the only material difference between the front and side extensions proposed under the current application and approved under applications 23/00305/HOUS and 24/00742/ANM is the use of white render to the front and rear walls of the side extension. The single storey front extension would be finished using brick slips to match the original brickwork and the front and side elevations of the two storey side extension would be finished in render, rather than the matching materials previously approved. While the use of render is not ideal, it is not considered to be a substantive reason to refuse planning permission given the setback of the side extension from the front elevation and the use of matching brickwork elsewhere.

No concerns are had regarding the design of the proposed rear extension, which is an appropriate scale in keeping with the host dwelling. While the walls of the rear extension would be rendered, it is noted that the rear extension is obscured from public view.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance 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 front and side extensions would not be larger than the extensions approved under applications 23/00305/HOUS and 24/00742/ANM. Furthermore, other than the two roof lights identified on the plans, no additional windows are proposed. The proposed roof lights would be over 2m above the first floor level and therefore it is not considered that the roof lights would unduly harm the levels of privacy enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed rear extension would comply with the SPD projection limit (Section 5.9) for two-storey rear extensions and is not considered to result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties.

It is noted that the proposed extension would measure only 7.68m to the rear boundary of the curtilage. While this would fall short of the minimum 10.5m SPD standard (Section 4.1), it is considered that there are circumstances in this instance that allow for a relaxation of the guidance, as per Section 4.3 of the SPD. For the extension to meet the permitted development criteria, it would need to be reduced in width by 0.15m in order to ensure a minimum separation of 2m to the side boundary shared with the attached property. However, it is not considered that reducing the width of the extension by 0.15m would materially improve the relationship between the extension and the neighbouring properties. The extension complies with SPD guidance in relation to nos. 46 and 50 Phyllis Street and although it does not comply with the minimum separation distances with regards to no. 7 Easton Close, it is not considered that the as-built extension would result in any material harm to the occupiers of no. 7 beyond that caused by the extension approved under application 23/00595/CPL.

Additionally, it was noted during a site visit that views from the proposed rear bedroom window towards no. 7 Easton Close are restricted by the existing boundary fence and vegetation within the rear garden of no. 7, the significant difference in ground levels and the fact that no. 7 is at an oblique angle to the extension.

In light of the above, it is not considered that the proposed rear extension would unduly harm the living conditions of any neighbouring occupiers.

The application property would retain a suitable rear garden space and all habitable rooms would be supplied with adequate natural light.

The proposal is therefore acceptable on balance in terms of residential amenity and accords with CS policy DM1, PfE policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

CS policy DM1 requires development proposals to 'provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.'

While the side extension removes the existing side access to the garage, it is noted that the Council's parking standards for this type of residential dwelling excludes garages. Further, the existing side access is 2.3m in width, which would not meet the minimum width for a car parking space outlined in Section 3.15 of the SPD.

The development retains the existing area of hard standing to the front which has the capacity for one off-street parking space.

Therefore, the provision of one off-street parking space is deemed acceptable and is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. This permission relates to the following plans:

Location Plan. Dwg no. (02)001. Rev A
Existing Plans & Elevations. Dwg no. (02)300
Proposed Plans. Dwg no. (02)301
Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. (02)302. Rev B

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with drawing (02)302 revision B unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. The extension hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the bin store has been installed in accordance with the details shown on drawing (02)301. The bin store shall be retained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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	28/07/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	01/08/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling