

Application Number:	23/00205/HOUS
Location:	119 Mellalieu Street, Middleton, M24 5SB
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension and front porch extension
Applicant:	Mr Krzysztof Lingowski
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. 119 Mellalieu Street, a two-storey, terraced 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. 117 Mellalieu Street to the east and adjacent to no. 121 to the west. The property benefits from a sufficiently sized rear garden with parking to the front, where the ground levels fall slightly between the highway and subject property.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension that would project 3.5m from the existing rear elevation, with a height to eaves of approx. 2.4m and a maximum height of approx. 3.2m. It would feature a window on the side elevation, 3.8m wide bi-fold doors on the rear elevation and a lean-to roof with 3 roof lights. The remaining side elevation (east) would be blank.

The submitted plans also indicate the erection of a front porch with a dual-pitched roof. The ground area of the porch would measure approx. 2.5m² with a maximum height above ground level of approx. 3.1m. It would be set approx. 9m from the boundary of the dwellinghouse with the highway.

The development proposes roof tiles and brickwork to match existing, with timber cladding proposed to the walls of the front porch.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

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

The letter raised concern with the proposed front porch being 'out of keeping' with the existing street scene. This concern is discussed in the 'design' section 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 effect of the rear extension on the residential amenity of the attached occupiers and the design of the front porch extension, amended plans were submitted to reduce the projection of the proposed rear extension by 0.5m and to change the materials of the front porch to brick to match existing and to change the roof design from dual-pitched to lean-to.

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.

The rows of terraced dwellings in the street scene share a high degree of uniformity in respect of their architectural simplicity and materiality. Front porch extensions are not a common characteristic along the street, although nos. 116 and 118 Mellalieu Street have built UPVC-framed front porches with tiled roofs.

However, it is considered that the proposed front porch would be of an appropriate scale and design that would not appear overbearing in its context. The porch would be constructed in brickwork to match existing and include a tiled, lean-to roof with a similar pitch to the main roof of the dwelling. The lean to roof style would also compliment the front canopies which are seen at a number of properties along the street, albeit the porch would clearly be larger in scale and enclosed.

Further to this, given the setback of the property from the highway and the fall in ground levels from the highway to the application property, it is considered that the proposed porch would not appear unduly prominent within its context.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be of a proportionate height and scale and would be in-keeping with the design language of the host dwelling. It would incorporate materials to match existing and appropriate window detailing.

On balance, the scale and design of the proposal is therefore 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.

In respect of the proposed single storey rear extension, Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD states "for attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)." Paragraph 5.7 states 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 application property is set significantly further back than the adjacent property (no. 121). Therefore, the proposed rear extension is not considered to have an undue impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 121 beyond that which is existing.

In respect of the attached occupiers (no. 117) the plans were amended to reduce the impact of the development on the amenity of the attached occupiers. The rear extension would project 3.5m beyond the rear elevation of no. 117 and would be set 0.3m from the side boundary. This would result in an approximate 0.17m exceedance of the guidance set out in the SPD.

However, given that this exceedance is minor and that no. 117 has an internal alleyway that creates an increased separation distance between the common boundary and rear facing principal windows, on balance, it is considered that the development would not result in undue harm to the neighbouring amenity

Whilst the proposed rear extension features a window on the west-facing side elevation situated approx. 1.9m from the common boundary with no. 121, this window would measure approx. 10m to the rear elevation of the adjacent property and views shared would be at oblique angles. Further, this window would not be the principal outlook and source of light for the proposed living room, which includes south-facing bi-fold doors. Therefore, the proposed fenestration is considered acceptable and would not result in an undue loss of privacy 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.

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.

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. L001
 - Existing Site Plan. Drg no. L100
 - Existing Floor Plans. Drg no. L200rev1
 - Existing Elevations. Drg no. L300
 - Proposed Site Plan. Drg no. L101rev1
 - Proposed Floor Plans. Drg no. L200rev3
 - Proposed Elevations. Drg no. L301rev3

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.

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	11/05/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	11/05/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling