

Application Number:	23/00409/HOUS
Location:	300 Manchester New Road, Middleton, M24 1JR
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension, rear dormer, front porch, formation of one additional parking space and alterations to existing fenestration following demolition of existing conservatory, dormer and front porch. Resubmission of 22/01156/HOUS
Applicant:	Newmann / Jonisz Mab Homes Limited
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

Location

The application relates to no. 300 Manchester New Road, a semi-detached dwelling located in Middleton. The property appears two storey on the front elevation and, by virtue of the downward sloping level of the land running northwest from the site, appears three storey to the rear. The property adjoins no. 302 Manchester New Road to the southwest and is adjacent to the grounds of Alkrington Woods and Rhodes Lodges Nature Reserve to the northeast which is designated as a site of biological importance (SBI).

The house is set back 7.3m from the highway by a front driveway and small garden area with a boundary treatment consisting of a low brick wall. To the rear is a large private garden which extends approximately 19m down the steep slope to the rear boundary of the curtilage. The subject property has been variously modified since its completion. Permission has been granted and implemented for a rear conservatory, a first floor extension and a replacement porch. The property also benefits from a rear cuckoo-style dormer with a pitched roof.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension, a part two storey, part

single storey rear extension, a rear dormer, a front porch, a raised patio to the rear with steps leading to the garden, alterations to the existing fenestration and a Juliet balcony to the rear following the demolition of the existing conservatory, front porch and rear dormer.

Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

22/01156/HOUS	Two storey side and rear extension with balcony on rear elevation, hip to gable loft conversion including rear dormer following demolition of front extension and outbuildings, and alterations to front garden to form additional parking area Decision: Withdrawn
96/D33611	First Floor Rear Extension To Dwelling. Decision: Grant subject to conditions.
98/D35339	Erection Of Replacement Porch To Front Of Dwelling. Decision: Grant subject to conditions.
01/D38633	Rear Conservatory To Dwelling. Decision: Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The main concerns regarding this application are parking provision.

The application is situated on Manchester New Road which is very busy classified road (A664) which means that vehicles must be able to enter and leave the driveway in forward gear therefore adequate internal turning provision must be provided. The submitted plans do not include any internal turning facilities and the parking arrangements are below the standard expected. The submitted plans show three parking bays in an area with very limited space and the two parking bays parallel to the road would be obstructed by vehicle parked the third bay. The limited internal turning space and impractical parking arrangements would lead to difficult vehicle manoeuvres into and out onto Manchester Road which would have a detrimental impact on road safety for both pedestrians accessing the nearby bus stops and vehicles on Manchester New Road.

The current servicing arrangements would appear to be unchanged by the proposed development.

The size of the development is unlikely to have any impact on highway capacity.

At this stage Highways cannot support this application because the parking and access arrangements would have a detrimental impact on road safety.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - Comments provided for the previous application (22/01156/HOUS) are considered relevant to the current proposals.

Trees

I believe that it would be possible to construct the extensions without it resulting in the loss of notable trees to the rear, but that these trees will require some pruning to facilitate the development, and appropriate protection throughout any construction period.

I would advise that, if permission is granted to the proposals, a Tree Protection Plan should be required to be prepared and, once approved, implemented in full.

Suggested Condition –

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including demolition and all preparatory work), a scheme for the protection of the retained trees, in accordance with BS 5837:2012, including a tree protection plan(s) (TPP) and an arboricultural method statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Required prior to commencement of development to satisfy the Local Planning Authority that the trees to be retained will not be damaged during construction, and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

Bats

I would advise the applicant that bats can turn up in unexpected places. If bats are encountered at any time, work must cease and advice sought from a suitably qualified person about how best to proceed. All bats and their resting places are legally protected.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. One objection was received in response to the proposed development. The letter raised concerns over the following:

- ☐ Loss of light.
- ☐ Loss of outlook.
- ☐ Devaluation of property.

The impact of the development on light and outlook has been assessed in the 'Amenity' section of the report. Concerns regarding property value are not a material planning consideration.

Policy

National

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

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
RE/7	Recreational Management Areas
NE/2	Designated Sites of Ecological and Geological Importance

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P1	Improving image
P3	Improving design of new development
SO4	Promoting a Greener Environment
G6	Enhancing Green Infrastructure
G7	Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity
G8	Managing water resources and flood risk
G9	Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving accessibility
DM1	General development requirements

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

Amendments

Amended plans were requested to achieve the following:

- ☐ Reduce the height, depth and width of the rear dormer
- ☐ Remove the double height glazed entrance feature
- ☐ Alter the parking layout to allow for the retention of existing soft landscaping
- ☐ Include a 0.5m trellis panel atop the solid timber fence (total height of 1.8m)

These amendments were considered by the applicant and amended plans received.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host dwelling and should generally be subservient to it.

The proposed two storey side extension features an appropriately hipped roof which also has a lower ridge height than the original application property. However, the proposed two storey side extension would represent an approximate 50 percent increase in the width of the original build. This causes the elevation of the two storey side extension to be a relatively significant feature when compared to the original dwelling. Nonetheless, it is noted that this impact is somewhat negated due to the front elevation of the two storey side extension being set back from the front elevation of the application property by 0.5m. On balance, it is considered that the two storey side extension remains an overall subservient addition to the host dwelling and is therefore acceptable.

Paragraphs 5.11 - 5.13 of the SPD detail the requirements of side extensions in order to prevent the terracing effect, requiring two storey side extensions that fall

within 1m of the side boundary to be set back from the front elevation by 2m at a first floor level or 1m at both a ground floor and first floor level.

The proposed side extension is sited within 1m of the boundary and is set back less than 1m from the front elevation. However, given that the application property is situated adjacent to the Alkrington Woods Local Nature Reserve to the northwest, on balance, it is considered that the proposed side extension would not appear to create a terracing effect and the side extension is acceptable.

Given the various modifications that have been made to the property since its completion, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not appear disproportionate or overbearing, despite the large volumetric increase. The appropriate window detailing to the side and rear avoids the creation of an overwhelming expanse of brickwork and the roof design is considered to be subservient to the host dwelling.

Rochdale's SPD contains the following standards and guidance in relation to dormers:

Dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.

The following principles will apply to dormer extensions:

- (i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;*
- (ii) They should be set back from the eaves line;*
- (iii) They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
- (iv) Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (v) Dormers which wrap around the side ridges of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
- (vi) Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
- (vii) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
- (viii) Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.*

The proposed rear dormer is generally modest in size, being sited below the existing ridgeline, set in from the party/side walls and set back from the eaves of the property. The proposed materials are to match existing, which is acceptable. It is noted that the fenestration is acceptable and space standards are not applicable due to there being no directly facing principal windows beyond the rear boundary. Where it fails to comply is through the inclusion of a flat roof. However, in this instance, it can be considered acceptable where this aspect of the proposal will not have much exposure from Manchester New Road.

The rear elevation of the proposed rear extension would see the addition of two large sets of bi-fold doors and a Juliet balcony. Although non-typical for an interwar

property, it is noted that the fenestration is well-screened from public vantage points and is, on balance, not enough to warrant refusal of the entire application.

The proposed front porch would be an appropriate addition that would reflect the design of the bay window above. It is considered that this feature would enhance the appearance of the property by replacing the existing, incongruous front porch.

The existing conservatory, dormer and porch to be demolished as part of the application have no defining or significant architectural features that would warrant their incorporation into any approved scheme and therefore the demolition is acceptable.

Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states “residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets.” The development would not impact the existing bin storage arrangements to the front of the property and whilst the bins are somewhat visible from the highway, they are not considered to dominate the street scene given the slight fall in ground level towards the property and the existing boundary treatment/vegetation to the front.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and would accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 and Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (guidance) state that new developments should not have a harmful impact on residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, the guidelines state that although it is expected that most new developments will have some impact on neighbours, it is important to ensure that the impact is not so significant that it results in unacceptable harm.

Under the previous application, the Council raised objections to the proposal in respect of the impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the attached property, no. 302. However, it is considered that these concerns have been satisfied through the reduction in the depth of the single storey rear extension to 3m and the erection of a 1.8m high timber fence extending the length of the raised patio against the common boundary.

Whilst the proposed rear extension and timber fence would potentially result in some loss of light and outlook to the basement and ground floor windows of no. 302, it is considered that these windows are already significantly obscured by the existing rear extensions to both the application property and no. 302; the latter being located almost directly south of said windows.

The proposed development, including the timber fence, would project approximately 1m further rearward than the existing conservatory. However, amended plans have been received which have altered the fence so that it includes a 0.5m section of trellis atop. It is considered that the proposals would reduce the current levels of overlooking that are possible between the properties whilst mitigating against any undue loss of light or outlook. On balance, it is not considered that the proposals would result in undue harm to the neighbouring amenity beyond that which is existing when taking into consideration loss of light, outlook and privacy.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states, “planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced

dwelling(s) that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).” The submitted plans confirm that the two storey rear extension would comply with this guidance and, therefore, is not considered to result in an overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires, “21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.” The proposed two storey side extension would measure approx. 33m to the front elevation of the facing property on the opposite side of Manchester New Road. The extension would have an approximate 14m distance to the rear boundary of curtilage and would not face any residential properties. The proposed fenestration in the side elevation would face the Alkington Woods and Rhodes Lodges Nature Reserve.

The submitted plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and the retention of a sufficient garden space of a functional layout. Therefore, the proposal would be considered acceptable in this regard.

Therefore the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the application property or any neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposals would increase the provision of off-street parking available at the property to two-vehicles.

The Highways Officer has raised concerns relating to the parking and access arrangements and the impact on road safety. However, it is not considered that a highways-based refusal could be substantiated given the existing conditions at the site. The property currently benefits from one parking space with limited internal turning space due to the layout of the driveway.

The proposals would represent an improvement on the existing situation, providing an extended area of permeable paving that would accommodate two parking spaces.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Trees and Ecology

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Paragraph 174(a) of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should aim to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity. Paragraph 180(a) states that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Policy G7 (Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity) states that the Council will ensure that features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection, and no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity interest.

The application site lies adjacent to the Alkington Woods and Rhodes Lodges Nature Reserve which is designated as a Site of Biological Importance. The reserve

provides ideal habitat for foraging bats. Further to this, it is noted that there are trees within the SBI located in close proximity to the side/rear boundaries of the application property.

Whilst a tree report and bat survey have not been provided in support of the current application, consultation has been carried out with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU). They believe that it would be possible to construct the extensions without resulting in the loss of notable trees, but that these trees will require some pruning to facilitate the development, and appropriate protection throughout any construction period. Therefore, they have requested that a condition is imposed requiring the submission of a tree protection plan prior to the commencement of any works.

In addition, given the proximity to the SBI, an informative will be attached in order to prevent any negative impact towards bats.

Subject to the condition requested by GMEU the proposed development therefore complies with policies G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the NPPF in respect of biodiversity.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Site – Location and Block Plan. Drg no. 001. Rev 1
- Existing Plans and Elevations. Drg no. 002
- Proposed Plans and Elevations. Drg no. 003A. Rev 4
- Proposed Plans. Drg no. 003B. Rev 3
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan. Drg no. 004. Rev 2

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

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 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including demolition and all preparatory work), a scheme for the protection of the retained trees, in accordance with BS 5837:2012, including a tree protection plan(s) (TPP) and an arboricultural method statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Required prior to commencement of development to satisfy the Local Planning Authority that the trees to be retained will not be damaged during construction, and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

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.

Notes for Applicant:

INFORMATIVE:

Bats are mobile in their habits and can turn up in unexpected places. If bats are found or suspected at any time during the course of demolition works then works must temporarily cease and advice sought from a suitably qualified person about how best to proceed. All UK bats and their resting sites are specially protected in Law.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	24/07/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	25/07/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling