

Application Number:	23/00064/HOUS
Location:	14 The Medway Heywood OL10 4SP
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Margaret Miller
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	no
	Contrary to previous decision?	no
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	no

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	no
	Neighbour comments received?	no

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	no
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	no

Location

The application relates to 14 The Medway, a semi-detached two-storey property. The front of the property faces north, overlooking The Medway highway and the opposite houses numbers 5, 7 and 9 The Medway. The adjoining property, 16 Medway, is attached to the east facing elevation, whilst the west facing elevation overlooks the boundary with the adjacent property number 12 The Medway. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs on to the garden of number 18 The Medway. The wider street scene comprises houses of similar design and material, thus creating uniformity to its character.

A lawful development certificate B has been submitted alongside the application as the rear extension crosses the boundary with number 16 The Medway.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks two extensions: a two storey side extension and a rear extension.

- The side extension measures approx. 1.6m in width from the west facing side elevation. The height to eaves measures approx. 4.8m, and the max height approx. 7m. The length measures approx. 7m. The side extension would be set back approx. 0.9m from the main front wall of the house. Lastly, a ground

floor door and window and one first floor window are included in the proposals.

- 2 The rear extension measures approx. 3.5m from the rear elevation of the host property. The width measures approx. 6.7m from (and integrating with) the west facing elevation of the side extension. The extension crosses the boundary with number 16 The Medway, therefore a lawful development certificate B has been submitted by the applicants. The height to eaves measures approx. 2.2m, and the max height approx. 3.7m. The application also seeks 2 skylights in the south facing roof of the rear extension, and bi-folding doors on the rear elevation.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Highways and parking 06/02/2023:

"The only highways issue regarding this application is parking provision. The application form indicates that there would be no impact on parking provision however the extension over the existing driveway means parking will be lost. The submitted plans do not indicate where parking will be accommodated, if the applicant can provide two viable parking spaces Highways would raise no objection to this application.

The servicing of the existing and proposed properties would remain unchanged.

We would not expect any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the development."

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties, no responses were 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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 outlines that all new development must “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.” Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 requires “development to be of a high quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.”
- ❑ The use of materials is in keeping with the original host property and in keeping with the wider street scene. Whilst the differentiating materiality at first floor level would not be used on the proposed side extension, it is not considered to be so harmful as to cause concern.
- ❑ The proposed enlargements would also appear proportionate and subservient to the host property and would not feature a scale or massing which is overbearing or out of character.
- ❑ Policy 5.11 and 5.12 of the SPD outlines guidance for side extension with particular focus on avoiding the “*terracing effect*” of neighbouring semi-detached properties. It requires that “*ground and first floor*” extensions “*are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house.*” Under this proposal, the extension is set back only 0.9m from the front wall. However, this would not significantly deviate from the requirements of the SPD guidance and the proposal would still avoids the terracing effect and maintains the original semi-detached architectural design with number 16.
- ❑ The 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 5.5 and 5.6 of the SPD ensure that “*single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for*

neighbouring occupiers” by applying a “maximum standard” of “3m along a common boundary” for the depth of a single-storey rear extension. The proposed rear extension complies with policy 5.5 and 5.6 in relation to both number 12 and 16 The Medway. As number 16 has a rear extension, the rear elevation of the proposed extension would be level with the corresponding elevation of number 16. Therefore, the impact on amenity is extremely minimal and would not impact light or privacy.

- ☐ Regarding the side extension, the impact on amenity would be minimal in the absence of any side facing habitable room windows, and also as the proposal is lower in height than the host property, and set back from the front elevation. It is noted that both no.12 and the proposed side extension do include side facing windows to non-habitable rooms at first floor level which would need to be obscurely glazed via condition in order to protect no.12's privacy.
- ☐ 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 side extension results in the loss of one onsite parking space. However, as the highways consultation states that there will be no detrimental impact to road safety, the loss of a parking space at this location is not significant enough to warrant a refusal. Furthermore, the updated block plans show that if required, alterations to the front drive can accommodate 2 parking spaces.

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:

Site Location plan 23/00064
Existing floor/elevation plans: 22.2973.1
Proposed floor/elevations: 22.2973.SC1.2B
Proposed floor: 22.2973.SC1.1A
Existing block plans: 22.2973.2A

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 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 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	28/03/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	28/03/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg