

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00207/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00207/HOUS
Location:	35 Worcester Road, Middleton, M24 1PA
Proposal:	Two storey side extension following demolition of existing garage together with a single storey rear extension with flat roof and roof lantern
Applicant:	Mr Anthony Gill
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 10.05.2024	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

The application relates to no. 35 Worcester Road in Middleton. The application dwelling stands in a row of semi-detached dwellings close to a point where the road starts to curve. The dwelling stands in an elevated position behind a steep driveway and front garden.

The property is adjoined to no. 33 Worcester Road, which features a modest single storey extension to the rear adjacent to the common boundary, and stands adjacent to no. 37 Worcester Road, which is separated by a pair of side driveways. A garage stands in the rear of the curtilage of no. 37.

The property faces nos. 38 and 40 Worcester Road which stand directly across the street at a distance of 23.5m. Presently there is a distance of 15m between the application dwelling and the rear boundary shared with no. 28 Banbury Road. Due to the layout of the area, there are no directly facing dwellings to the rear. The application dwelling is constructed with a hipped roof and includes a large double height bay window feature. Presently there is an attached side garage which restricts any external access to the rear of the property.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension which would be set back 1.273m behind the principal elevation of the existing dwelling. The roof formation would be hipped, with a lower ridgeline than that of the main dwellinghouse.

The proposals also include a single storey rear extension spanning the entire width of the existing house including the proposed side extension. The rear extension would be formed with a flat roof and lay host to a large ornamental roof lantern. The rearward projection from the rear elevation of the original dwelling would be 3m. Materials for the construction of the extensions would be brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing.

Relevant History

17/00893/HOUS Two storey side and single storey rear extensions to dwelling - Resubmission of 16/01217/HOUS.
Refused September 2017 for the following reasons:

1. The secondary double height bay windows in the proposed two storey side extension are considered unsuitable for an adjoined dwelling of this type and would compete with the existing double height bay window feature, which is the defining characteristic of the architectural style of the dwelling and a common feature along the street scene. When viewed in the context of the adjoined pair of dwellings, the proposed additional double-height bay window feature is considered detrimental to the character and appearance of both properties and the street scene as a whole. As such, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in terms of design and visual appearance and is contrary to policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal would leave no outdoor access between the front and the rear of the property and due to the elevated position, bins stored to the front of the dwelling would have a significant detrimental impact on the street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to the requirements of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and is contrary to policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. Without prejudice to the above; the plans accompanying the application contain a number of errors and discrepancies, to the extent that the development proposals could not be physically constructed in accordance with the plans.

16/01217/HOUS Two storey side and single storey rear extensions to dwelling.
Refused

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

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 alter the roof pitch of the proposed side extension and remove the proposed bin store.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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, at less than half the width of the original property, and it would include a 1.273m set back from the existing 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 in excess of 1m and therefore it is not considered that a terracing effect would result.
- ☐ The proposed single storey rear extension presents no substantive issues in terms of visual appearance or design.
- ☐ The materials to be used in construction of the proposed extensions are indicated to match those used in construction of the original application property.
- ☐ Under the previous application, the lack of appropriate bin storage was considered to be unduly harmful to the character of the street scene, particularly given the elevated position of the application property. Whilst a bin store was initially proposed under the current application, it was determined that the bin store would cause the ground floor window to the front elevation to appear 'squashed'. Moreover, it became apparent during a site visit that the bins are currently stored in public view to the front of the existing garage. Similar arrangements are present throughout the street scene, with bins stored to the front of properties. Therefore, given the existing site conditions, it is not considered that a bin store would be necessary in this location.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, 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.
- ☐ Acceptable limits for residential extensions in respect of the above are quantified in the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD.
- ☐ The SPD quantifies the permitted rearward projection of extensions so that an extension to an adjoined dwelling must not project further than 3m from the common boundary point at ground floor level, except where the particular site can accommodate an increase up to the limit set by drawing a 45 degree angle across the property from a point 3m along the shared boundary from the common boundary point at which the dwellings last meet.
- ☐ There is also a similar requirement that an extension to an adjoined dwelling must not project further than 2.4m from the common boundary point at first floor level, except where the particular site can accommodate an increase up to the limit set by drawing a 30 degree angle across the property from a point

2.4m along the shared boundary from the common boundary point at which the dwellings last meet.

- ☐ The proposed two storey side extension would not have any windows in the side elevation facing the shared boundary with no. 37 Worcester Road and would comfortably meet the requirements of the projection rule outlined in the SPD.
- ☐ The single storey rear extension would project 3m from the rear elevation of the original dwelling and also from the rear of the proposed side extension. This projection would comply with the maximum projection distance recommended by the SPD for single storey rear extensions constructed along the shared boundary with a neighbouring dwelling.
- ☐ The proposed extensions would not breach any of the separation distances required by the SPD.
- ☐ 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 a loss of amenity for neighbouring residents through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and the proposal is considered to accord with Core Strategy policy DM1 and the SPD in respect of neighbour amenity.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy gives priority to the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live in the area affected by development. Supporting this overarching policy is the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' 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. It is noted that the Council's Highways and Engineering Service did not raise any objections to the similar proposal under application 16/01217/HOUS.
- ☐ As such it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the requirements of 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. Dated 01/03/2024
- Existing Plans. Drawing no. A100
- Proposed Plans. Drawing no. A101. Rev C
- Block Plans. Drawing no. A103. Rev C

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 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, 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	08/05/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	09/05/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling