

Application Number:	24/00773/HOUS
Location:	1 Fenwick Drive, Middleton, M24 4SN
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension
Applicant:	Mr N. Saranut
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?	N

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

Location

This application relates to no. 1 Fenwick Drive, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the corner where Fenwick Drive meets Lowther Crescent in Middleton. The property faces the highway to the north, is adjoined by no. 3 Fenwick Drive to the west and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders no. 13a Lowther Crescent to the south. The host dwelling benefits from a modest wraparound curtilage, with a front and side garden area which is enclosed by a low-level brick wall and a rear garden enclosed by a 1.8m high fence set in approximately 3m from the rear of the footway fronting Lowther Crescent. It also benefits from two off-street parking spaces to the front/side and an original two-storey outrigger to the rear with a depth of approx. 2.77m.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey side and rear wraparound extension which would project 2.58m from the existing side elevation and 2.93m from the existing rear elevation. It would be characterised by a dual-pitched roof with a maximum height of approx. 3.72m and a height to eaves of approx. 2.75m. Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

23/01109/HOUS

Single-storey side and rear extension and alteration to existing boundary wall facing from Lowther Crescent – Refused and appeal dismissed.

Reasons for refusal:

1. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed boundary treatment would constitute an obtrusive form of development which would appear incongruous and cause undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would not be well-designed or result in a satisfactory standard of visual amenity and would be contrary to 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.
2. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed single-storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing and loss of outlook for the rear facing windows of no. 3 Fenwick Drive to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. It would also have an overbearing impact on the rear garden space of no. 3 Fenwick Drive. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed extension would result in the loss of one off-street parking space for the proposed three-bedroom property, and would potentially result in the displacement of vehicles onto the section of the carriageway close to the junction between Lowther Crescent and Fenwick Drive. The proposed parking arrangements would be detrimental to the safety of highway users and pedestrians and is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed terrace would retain an acceptable level of amenity for no. 3 Fenwick Drive and not result in a loss of privacy through undue overlooking. As such the application fails to accord with the residential amenity aims of Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

05/D45075

Erection Of 1.8M High Fence And 0.6M To 1M High Perimeter Railings (Resubmission -D43850)
Refuse

04/D43850

Erection Of 1.3M-1.8M High Boundary Fence
Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: 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 proposed extension is very similar to that previously included under refused application 23/01109/HOUS, but wrap around element has been reduced to increase the space to the neighbouring property. The previous extension was considered acceptable in its design and this proposal too is considered to include additions that would respect the form, layout and design of the existing property and surrounding street scene.

The increased boundary treatment proposed under the previous application has been removed from this application.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD 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	✓

Section 5.5 of the SPD 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);

Section 5.7 explains that, *“If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary.”*

The extension would exceed the projection limits set out in the SPD by approximately 0.2m in relation to no. 3 Fenwick Drive. Given that this is a minor transgression and that the applicant could feasibly construct an extension of greater depth closer to the common boundary, it is not considered that a refusal on the grounds of residential amenity could be justified.

Whilst concerns were raised under the previous application about the potential for a raised terrace to the rear, the applicant has confirmed that no raised terrace is proposed under the current application.

The proposal is therefore acceptable on balance in terms of residential amenity and accords with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: CS DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to “provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”

Whilst concerns were raised under the previous application regarding the loss of one off-street parking space, it was considered by the Planning Inspector that the loss of one space would not interfere with the existing parking arrangements. In any event, there are several areas of parking bays along Lowther Crescent and much of the area contains unrestricted on street parking. As such, the retention of one off-street parking space is considered acceptable, in accordance with CS 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Sheet 01 Location Plan (06.10.2023)
- Sheet 02 Block Plan (06.10.2023)
- Sheet 03 Proposed Site Plan (08.08.2024)
- Sheet 04 Existing Floor Plans (07.10.2023)
- Sheet 05 Existing Elevations (07.10.2023)
- Sheet 06 Proposed Floor Plans (08.08.2024)
- Sheet 07 Proposed Elevations (08.08.2024)

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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 be in accordance with details provided within the submitted application form unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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 proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	13/09/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	02/10/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling