APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01120/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01120/HOUS
Location:	9 Elleray Road Middleton M24 1NY
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr GLEN LITTLEWOOD
Case Officer:	Elizabeth Maw
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 site is 9 Elleray Road. It is a semi-detached house within an established residential area and surrounded by housing. The property sits within an established row of semi-detached houses. The site is allocated as being within the Defined Urban Area in the Rochdale UDP.

The property is built in red brick with red pantiles on its hipped roof. At the rear is an enclosed private garden.

The adjoining neighbour has a single storey extension to the rear. The neighbour at No7 has a two storey side extension, which has been built up to the boundary of the application site. Beyond the rear garden boundary is gardens of residential properties.

Description of Proposal

The proposal is for a two storey side and single storey rear extension.

Relevant History

None relevant.

Township/Member comments

None received

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

The application was advertised by sending neighbour notification letters. No observations have been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

There was an error with the submitted location and block plan, which has now been rectified and amended plans have been received.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

The proposal includes a two storey side extension. The proposed extension is less than half the width of the original dwelling and set back from the front elevation. The design and fenestration matches the existing property.

The property is within a row of semi-detached houses with a strong build line. The gaps between the semi-detached houses help retain the character of semi-detached housing along the row. Increasingly, there is pressure to infill those gaps with extensions. Side extensions need to be carefully considered or a terracing effect can occur over time, which can lead to a detriment to the character of the street.

To ensure a terracing effect does not occur, a two storey extension must be set back from the principal elevation. The Rochdale SPD states that a side extension should be set back by 1m. This proposal shows a set back of 1.6m. The roof is not stepped down however the extent of the set back of the extension is considered sufficient to prevent a terracing effect.

The rear extension is well designed and concealed from public view.

The extensions do not overdevelop the plot.

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 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.

<u>Two storey side extension</u>

The proposed two storey side extension would be in line with the rear wall of the original dwelling house and it would stand alongside a two storey extension of a neighbouring property. The neighbours gable end is blank. The neighbours house is relatively in line with the host dwelling. As such, there would be no material impact to residential amenity, such as overshadowing or overlooking as the extension and the two storey extension next door would stand side by side. The rear elevation of the proposed extension has a window at first floor although this would not materially overlook the neighbours garden any further than the existing dwelling does. Housing to the rear would not be detrimentally affected.

<u>Single storey rear extension</u>

The Rochdale SPD for housing design provides guidance on house extensions. This guidance document generally supports single storey rear extensions that have a projection of up to 3m alongside the common boundary.

The proposed single storey extension will extend across the full width of the existing dwelling and the new two storey extension. The projection is 3.2m. It is stepped in marginally from the side boundaries.

The adjoining neighbour at No5 would not be materially affected due to the fact they have an existing single storey rear extension. The neighbour at No7 would see a change to their living conditions as there would now be a 3.2m long extension close

to their garden boundary. This will result in some overshadowing. However, the extension is in line with SPD guidance and not considered to create a level of overshadowing that would be detrimental to living conditions.

In conclusion, 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 proposed off street parking would be unaffected by the proposals because existing parking is at the front of the property. The proposal is therefore 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. This permission relates to the following plans:-

   Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 202008.1 (received by the Local Planning Authority on 04.11.2020)

   and the development shall be carried out in complete 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	05.11.2020	Signed: Elizabeth Maw
Authorisation	5.11.2020	Signed: KN

Report Author Elizabeth Maw