

Application Number:	23/01336/HOUS
Location:	26 Moss Lane, Middleton, M24 1WX
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension with loft conversion, alterations to fenestration and front boundary wall
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Chevreau
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 02.02.2024	EXT OF TIME 28.03.2024
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 refers to no. 26 Moss Lane, a two-storey detached dwelling located in Middleton. The property faces the highway to the northeast, is adjacent to no. 28 Moss Lane to the southeast and no. 1 Elleray Road to the northwest. The subject property lies at the end of a row of architecturally similar detached dwellings and benefits from a driveway to the side and a small front lawn.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which would project 2.77m from the existing northwestern side elevation and be set back 0.35m from the existing front elevation. The extension would include a double-height bay window with a projecting roof feature.

The proposals also include a single-storey rear extension which would infill the corner of the dwelling between the proposed two-storey side extension and the existing single-storey rear extension.

In addition, the existing bay window and French doors to the rear would be removed and replaced with a single-storey rear extension with a depth of 0.75m to accommodate a set of 3m wide bi-fold doors.

Lastly, two roof lights are proposed to the main roof to serve the bedroom in the loft and the existing boundary wall to the front would be altered to accommodate an off-street parking space to the front of the dwelling. The proposed driveway would be laid with permeable tarmac and the proposals would retain some of the existing front lawn with additional landscaping also introduced.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

Initial response:

The main concern regarding this planning application is parking provision.

The proposed extension will remove the existing driveway to the side dwelling and with it access to the garage. This would leave the extended dwelling with no viable parking spaces and Council standards would require the provision of two spaces.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

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

Highways would raise no objection to this application subject to the provision of two viable off street parking bays, and we would request no specific planning conditions.

Further comments:

Extensions of this type are common on Moss Lane. As a result the on street parking issues are becoming more of an issue.

Each car parked on street creates blind spots for drivers and pedestrians alike. This problem is particularly dangerous for vulnerable young people who cannot see or be seen between vehicles.

The highways department has concerns these blind spots will lead to an incident on the highway and we therefore strongly encourage the retention of 2 parking spaces.

The applicant has however retained 1 off street parking space. Moss Lane is a traffic calmed route and the accident record reflects no trend for accidents, as a result I do not believe we could sustain this objection were it to go to appeal.

I do however have concerns about the construction traffic and damage to the footways. Please can the following condition be included in any consent given

Prior to construction commencing a dilapidation survey should take place to assess the condition of the footway. Upon completion of the development any new damage to the footway should be repaired and the footway should be left in a no worse or better state.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no representations have been received.

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 regarding the increased ridge height and lack of viable off-street parking, amended plans were submitted to remove the proposed increase in ridge height and widen the vehicular access in order to provide one off-street parking space to the front of the dwelling.

Following further concerns regarding the loss of the existing soft landscaping to the front, amended plans were submitted to setback the extension 0.35m in order to allow for an angled parking bay to the front. This also enabled most of the existing soft landscaping to be retained.

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

Whilst the side extension would not be truly subservient to the host dwelling, it is not considered that the impact on this particular dwelling would be detrimental to its overall character and appearance given the existing double height bay window and projecting roof feature which would remain the dominant features of the dwelling. Moreover, an amendment has been sought to incorporate a 0.35m setback from the existing front elevation. On balance, it is considered that the proposed development would be sufficiently in-keeping with and subservient to the host dwelling.

The side extension would be situated 0.2m from the side boundary of the site. Given that the application site is an end plot with no. 1 Elleray Road sited some 22.85m away, it is not considered that a visual terracing effect would result.

The existing bin storage arrangements would not be affected by the proposed development.

No concerns are had with the alterations to the front, with much of the existing boundary wall and landscaping remaining in situ. Moreover, the proposed site plan indicates the addition of further landscaping to the front of the parking bay, which would create a soft edge to the additional hardstanding.

The design of the proposals is therefore acceptable and in accordance with the relevant parts of Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they "do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy."

In particular, section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:

- "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."

Additionally, section 5.5 states "it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers." Section 5.6 notes the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

- "For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);

The proposed side extension would measure 22.85m to the directly facing rear elevation of no. 1 Elleray Road, 11.52m to the rear boundary of the curtilage and 20.72m to the front elevation of no. 39 Moss Lane. Whilst the level of separation would fall short of the 21m standard in relation to no. 39 Moss Lane, given that the shortfall is marginal and that the properties already share a similar relationship, it is deemed that no unacceptable loss of privacy or amenity would occur.

It is noted that the proposed side elevation facing northwest would include a window to serve the en-suite, which would directly overlook the private rear garden of no. 1 Elleray Road. In order to avoid any undue loss of privacy, a condition is

recommended to ensure that this window is fitted with obscure glazing to be retained thereafter.

The rear extension complies with the guidance contained in the SPD and would not cause any unacceptable loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties.

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

The proposals are therefore not considered to unduly impact upon the amenity of surrounding occupiers and the application is adjudged accordingly to comply with the relevant parts of Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to "provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location."

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

The existing provision of off-street parking to the side of the dwelling would be lost as a result of the proposals, leaving only one viable off-street space to the front of the dwelling.

Notwithstanding, regard has been had for the existing parking arrangements for the host property and other properties on the street scene, which comprise of similar arrangement. Moreover, Moss Lane is a traffic calmed route and the accident record reflects no trend for accidents. With this in mind, it is considered that the potential addition of one vehicle to the highway would not be detrimental to highway capacity and safety. It is noted that the Council's Highway Officer has requested a condition requiring a footway survey to be carried out. However, officers do not consider that such a condition would meet the necessary tests.

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

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. Drg no. 053ROC-100
 - Existing Site and Roof Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-101B
 - Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-102

- Existing First Floor Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-103
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 053ROC-104
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-105B
- Proposed First Floor Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-106B
- Proposed Second Floor Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-107C
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 053ROC-108D
- Street Scenes. Drg no. 053ROC-109B
- Proposed Site and Roof Plan. Drg no. 053ROC-101.1E

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 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. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the proposed first floor en-suite window on the side elevation facing northwest shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of 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	19/03/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	28.03.24	Signed: LA

Report Author Bob Melling