

Application Number:	23/00195/HOUS
Location:	44 Bonscale Crescent, Middleton, M24 5LY
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension and front porch.
Applicant:	Maloudis
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?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application refers to no. 44 Bonscale Crescent, a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling that forms part of an extensive housing development built in the second half of the twentieth century. The dwelling faces north on to the highway, adjoining no. 46 Bonscale Crescent to the east and adjacent to no. 42 to the west. The property benefits from a sufficiently sized rear garden bounded by hedging of between 2-3m in height with parking to the front.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey rear extension and a front porch extension. The two storey rear extension would project 2.4m from the existing rear elevation with a height to eaves to match existing and a ridgeline set lower than existing. The extension would feature a dual-pitched, gable-style roof, a set of bi-fold doors and two first floor windows to the rear elevation.

The submitted plans also indicate the erection of a front porch with a lean-to roof. The ground area of the porch would measure 2.74m² with a maximum height above ground level of 3m. It would be set approximately 4m from the boundary of the dwellinghouse with the highway.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The only highway issue arising from this application is parking provision.

Although the proposed extensions would have little impact on the existing parking provision the size of the extended dwelling would require the provision of two off street parking spaces. If these spaces can be provided Highways would support this application.

The servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties. 1 objection was received in response to the proposed development.

The letter raised concerns over the following:

- ❑ The proposed 2m high boundary wall would result in the loss of the shared privet hedge to the detriment of the natural habitat and enjoyment of green space.
- ❑ The removal of the privet hedge would be contrary to the initiatives to tackle global warming.
- ❑ The proposed wall would result in a loss of outlook and less pleasant view.
- ❑ The existing privet hedge should be protected.

Officer's response: The proposed boundary wall has been removed from the submitted plans and, therefore, does not form a consideration under this application.

- ❑ The two storey rear extension is excessively large and would result in an undue loss of light to neighbouring properties and gardens.
- ❑ The extension does not appear subservient to the original property.

Officer's response: These concerns are addressed in the 'design' and 'amenity' sections of the Officer's report.

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

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

Following concerns raised by the Officer in respect of the design of the front porch and impact of the rear extension on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, amended plans were submitted to remove the proposed boundary wall, reduce the projection of the rear extension to 2.4m, reduce the height of the front porch to 3m and alter the roof design of the front porch to a lean-to roof design.

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 SPD states that extensions should be in-keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The subject property forms part of a wider estate of architecturally similar dwellings with pebbledash walls, tiled roofs and a mixture of white and brown uPVC fenestration. The dwellings have simplistic facades with canopies above the front doorways. Front porches are not a common characteristic, however there are several properties in the street scene that have constructed a front porch with a lean-to roof.

The proposed two storey rear extension would be of an appropriate scale and set in slightly from the existing side walls. It would feature a dual-pitched, gable-style roof with a ridgeline set approximately 0.25m lower than the existing. This is considered to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling.

Whilst the use of off-white render would not match the existing pebbledash, it is considered that the contrast would be minimal and not unduly harmful subject to the provision of a detailed specification regarding the colour, type and texture of the render. To ensure a satisfactory standard of design, a condition is attached to ensure a detailed material specification for the render is provided prior to above ground construction works.

Whilst it is acknowledge that front porches are not a common characteristic of the wider estate, including the adjoining terrace, it is considered that the proposed front porch would be of an appropriate scale and design that would not appear overbearing in its context. Further to this, it should be noted that the front porch, as amended, would constitute permitted development due to compliance with Class D

of the General Permitted Development Order (GDPO). On this basis, a design-based refusal would not seem reasonable or justifiable.

In light of the above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states that planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey extensions 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 dwellings. The proposed rear extension would project 2.4m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling and would not exceed the 30 degree line in respect of nos. 42 and 46 Bonscale Crescent. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an undue loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed fenestration to the rear would measure approximately 14m to the opposing boundary of curtilage. This is in compliance with the Council's minimum space standards and it is not considered that the proposed fenestration would result in an undue loss of privacy or visual intrusion for the neighbouring occupiers.

The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

The proposed porch would also result in no undue harm to the neighbours. The scale would not result in any harmful overshadowing and its forwards facing fenestration would protect privacy.

In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The Highways Authority was consulted on the application due to the proposed increase in bedrooms. Highways have raised no objections to the application but due to the increased number of bedrooms they have requested that maximum parking provision, i.e. 2 spaces, be provided.

In respect of the above, the existing parking arrangements would not be impacted by the proposed development and while it is recognised that Highway Services have requested the provision of two of street parking spaces, it must also be recognised that this is a maximum parking standard and should therefore not be a necessary for all development. When looking at the particulars of this site there is no evidence to suggest that the existing parking arrangements do not work effectively, on a street that comprises a mix of on and off street parking provision. As such, while the current application may result in additional car ownership for the property there is no reason to suspect that the parking requirements associated with this would result in harm to

highway safety. As such, the existing parking arrangements are considered to be acceptable and the application would accord with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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 Plan. Drg no. 10
 - Existing Block Plan. Drg no. 11. Rev B
 - Proposed Block Plan. Drg no. 12. Rev B
 - Existing Floor Plans. Drg no. 21
 - Proposed Floor Plans. Drg no. 22. Rev A
 - Existing Elevations Front & Rear. Drg no. 31.01
 - Proposed Elevations Front & Rear. Drg no. 32.01. Rev A
 - Existing Side Elevations. Drg no. 31.02
 - Proposed Side Elevations. Drg no. 32.02. Rev Aand 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. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance 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	05/05/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	10/05/2023	Signed: RC

