

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00345/HOUS**

|                                         |                                    |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b>              | 24/00345/HOUS                      |
| <b>Location:</b>                        | 31 Elm Street, Middleton, M24 2EQ  |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                        | Single-storey rear extension       |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                       | Mr Matthew Clancy                  |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>                    | Bob Melling                        |
| <b>DETERMINATION DATE</b><br>21.06.2024 | <b>EXT OF TIME</b><br>22.07.2024   |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                  | <b>Grant subject to conditions</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 by Ward Member?</b>              | <b>N</b> |

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national, sub-regional and local policies and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the Planning Officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

**Policy****National**

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

**Sub-Regional**

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

**JP-P1** Sustainable Places

**JP-P2** Heritage

**Local**

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

**G/D/1** Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

**P2** Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

**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 reduce the scale of the proposed extension in order to comply with the projection limits outlined in the Council's residential development SPD.

### **Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel**

N/A

### **Assessment**

#### **Impact on Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The proposed extension would not be visible from Elm Street and, therefore, it is not considered to affect the setting of Elm Street School, a Grade II listed building which stands opposite the application property. The Council's Conservation Officer was asked to provide comment and agreed that the proposal would not affect the setting of the listed building.

Therefore, due to its location, the proposed extension would not impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Elm Street School and would not therefore harm its significance. It is considered that the proposal would accord with policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the relevant policies contained within PfE and the NPPF.

#### **Design and Visual Amenity:** Are the following acceptable?

|                                                                             |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Impact on street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line | ✓ |
| Height and massing                                                          | ✓ |
| Facing materials and detailing                                              | ✓ |
| Roof style                                                                  | ✓ |
| Window proportions                                                          | ✓ |
| Bin storage                                                                 | ✓ |
| Impact on trees                                                             | ✓ |

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.

#### **Residential Amenity:** Are the following acceptable?

|                                                                             |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Impact on privacy, light & outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front) | ✓ |
| Light and outlook of application property                                   | ✓ |
| Remaining garden space of application property                              | ✓ |

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

**Highways and Parking:** Are the following acceptable?

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Impact on highway safety | ✓ |
| Parking provision        | ✓ |

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Existing Plans and Elevations. Dwg no. 200501/01.
- Proposed Plan and Elevations. Dwg no. 200501/02. Rev B.
- Location Plan. Dwg no. 200501/03. 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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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 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 | 27/06/2024 | Signed: BM |
| Authorisation    | 22/07/2024 | Signed: LA |

Report Author Bob Melling