

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00428/HOUS**

|                                         |                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b>              | 24/00428/HOUS                                              |
| <b>Location:</b>                        | 218 Hollin Lane, Middleton, M24 5LE                        |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                        | Erection of first floor side extension and detached garage |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                       | Susan Pedley                                               |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>                    | Bob Melling                                                |
| <b>DETERMINATION DATE</b><br>27.06.2024 | <b>EXT OF TIME</b>                                         |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                  | <b>Refuse</b>                                              |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>N</b> |

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

**Location**

The application property is located on the corner of Hollin Lane and Whalley Road. It is an end terrace property that is orientated west towards the highway (Hollin Lane), which is also a fairly busy through road. It is bordered by no. 220 to the north, and Whalley Road to the south. The rear of the property (east) backs onto a service alley and then more semi-detached houses.

**Description of Proposal**

The application proposes the erection of a first floor side extension and a detached garage within the rear garden. The extension would be setback 0.45m from the existing front wall at first floor level and would be set flush with the existing side/rear elevations.

The detached, L-shape garage would have a footprint of 54.3m<sup>2</sup> and dual-pitched roof with a maximum height of 4.23m. It would be positioned at the bottom of the rear garden and access to the garage would be provide via the existing vehicle access gate from the unadopted road to the rear.

Materials for construction are proposed to match those used in the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.

## **Relevant History**

**19/01443/HOUS** – Two storey front, side and rear extensions with new front porch - Refused:

- 1) By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed extension would erode the building line formed by the front of the properties on Whalley Road erode the space available at the junction, to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the street scene. In addition, as a result of its considerable size, height and forward projection, the proposed extension would appear as a prominent and incongruous addition to the host dwelling and unbalance the symmetry of the attached terrace. As such, the proposed development would constitute poor design and fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**20/00327/HOUS** - Two storey rear and single storey front and side extensions – Granted subject to conditions.

## **Township/Member comments**

N/A

## **Consultee responses**

Highways And Engineering  
No objections.

## **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

## **Policy**

### **National**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - December 2023  
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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>P3</b>         | Improving Design of New Development |
| <b>DM1</b>        | General Development Requirements    |
| <b>T2</b>         | Improving Accessibility             |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | Schedule of Parking Standards       |

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

### Amendments

N/A

### 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." In addition, paragraphs 131 and 135 of the NPPF state that "good design is a key aspect of sustainable development" and that "planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping."

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 development proposals should be "in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it."

Paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 of the SPD states that "extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension."

Factors that will be taken into account when determining what constitutes 'sufficient space' include the presence of a strong building line and any overriding need to protect it, the proximity of neighbouring buildings, and the space surrounding other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site and the contribution this space makes to the overall character of the street scene."

The existing single-storey side extension, which has been built approximately 0.22m wider than approved under application ref: 20/00327/HOUS, has resulted in the loss of the previous boundary fence. The existing extension has been constructed on the boundary line, which has eroded the separation with the public highway, leaving a

dominant and unsightly expanse of brickwork which abuts the pavement. The proposal would significantly increase the existing massing by adding an additional storey, leading to a further erosion of space whilst intensifying the feeling of a hard edge to the public realm.

There is also an overriding need to protect the existing building line formed by the front of the properties on Whalley Road which would be broken significantly with the building of the proposed extension. It is situated in a prominent position on the road meaning the poor design would be more visually intrusive and prominent.

It is noted that there is a large apartment development on the opposite corner to the application property, which has a four storey block on the northern corner. However this development was approved in 2005, which was before the publication of the NPPF, the Rochdale Core Strategy and the SPD. It is also noted that this development has some regard for maintaining the amenity of the street scene, as the open style railings and soft landscaping set the building back from the footpath and lessen the feeling of a hard edge.

The proposed detached garage would be a considerable scale and would result in a 15.5m expanse of featureless brick wall set against the boundary fence. The proposed garage would further contribute to the massing of built development along the boundary with Whalley Road, and would be a prominent feature within the street scene.

Whilst it is acknowledged that nos. 220 and 222 Hollin Lane benefit from large garages of a similar scale and position, the garage proposed under the current application would be larger and much more prominent within the street scene given its location on a corner plot.

Ultimately, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

#### **Amenity: DM1 and SPD**

The residential properties to the front, side and rear are located at least 21m from application property. Therefore, the minimum distance requirements of section 4.1 of the SPD are satisfied.

It is not considered that the proposed garage would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for any neighbouring properties.

A satisfactory rear amenity space is retained for the purposes of sitting out and drying cloths.

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 proposed garage would remove the existing off-street parking space within the rear garden, which is accessed from the unadopted alleyway. The submitted plans indicate that the proposed garage could accommodate three cars, however, when considering the size of the garage and the access arrangements, it is not considered that the garage could feasibly accommodate three cars.

Whilst the proposed parking arrangements are less than ideal, it should be noted that no objections have been received from the Highways Authority.

As such, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in terms of parking and highways impacts and the application duly accords with policies DM1 and T2 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

**Recommendation: Refuse**

- 1) By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed first floor extension would erode the building line formed by the front of the properties on Whalley Road and further erode the space available at the junction, to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the street scene. In addition, as a result of its considerable scale, the proposed detached garage would appear as a prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Article 35 Statement**

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

**INFORMATIVE:**

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision notice relates to the following drawings:

- Site Location Plan. Dwg no. 72\_01
- Existing Ground Floor Plan. Dwg no. 72\_02
- Existing First Floor Plan. Dwg no. 72\_03
- Existing Elevations. Dwg no. 72\_04
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Dwg no. 72\_05
- Proposed First Floor Plan. Dwg no. 72\_06
- Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. 72\_07
- Proposed Garage Plan and Elevations. Dwg no. 72\_08
- Existing Block Plan. Dwg no. 72\_09
- Proposed Block Plan. Dwg no. 72\_10

|                  | Date       | Officer    |
|------------------|------------|------------|
| Report Completed | 06/06/2024 | Signed: BM |
| Authorisation    | 24/06/2024 | Signed: RC |

Report Author Bob Melling