

Application Number:	22/01182/HOUS
Location:	289 Manchester New Road Middleton M24 1NR
Proposal:	Part two-storey, part single storey rear and side extensions including demolition of existing single storey side/rear extension together with a rear dormer
Applicant:	Mrs Noreen Kauser
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

The application relates to no.289 Manchester New Road, a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located in South Middleton. The dwelling is north-west facing on to the highway and occupies a corner plot on the junction between Manchester New Road and Moss Lane. No.291 Manchester New Road adjoins no.289 to the south and the application property shares a common boundary with the side boundary of curtilage of no.2A Moss Lane. The front elevation of the dwelling faces Alkrington Woods Local Nature Reserve on the opposite side of the highway. No.289 Manchester New Road is typical of the surrounding properties on Manchester New Road, which consist of dwellings in 1930s style housing.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation and 3.9m from the side elevation of the original build. The proposed side enlargement would be set back 1m at both a ground and first floor level from the existing front elevation. The two storey side and rear enlargement would have a hipped roof form to match the existing roof, an eaves height to match existing and the ridgeline would sit 0.32m below that of the original build. The single storey enlargement would have a lean-to roof with a height to eaves of 2.72m and a maximum height of 3.71m. The side and rear extension would replace the existing single storey side and rear extension.

A rear dormer with a flat roof is proposed to the existing roof slope. This would be set 0.61m below the existing ridgeline and 0.38m away from the existing eaves. It would have a width of 5.85m.

The proposed development will be constructed with materials to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

None applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The application will result in the removal of the existing garage therefore there would be an impact on the parking arrangements for this property. For the size of the extended dwelling the application should include two standard parking spaces.

Manchester New Road is a classified road and therefore vehicles entering and leaving the dwelling must be able to do so in forward gear therefore there must be adequate internal turning area for a standard sized car.

The proposed development would have no detrimental impact on highway capacity.

If the applicant can provide two off street parking spaces and adequate internal vehicular turning space Highways would raise no objection to this application.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties and 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

- ❑ Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 126 and 130 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.
- ❑ Additionally, paragraph 134 of the NPPF states:
"Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes".
- ❑ Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. The proposed extension is set sufficiently below the existing ridgeline and is set back 1m at both a ground and first floor level from the existing front elevation. Therefore, it is considered to be a subservient addition.
- ❑ Paragraphs 5.11 - 5.13 of the SPD details the requirements of side extensions in order to prevent the terracing effect, requiring two storey side extensions that fall within 1m of the side boundary to be set back from the front elevation by 2m at a first floor level or 1m at both a ground floor and first floor level. Given that the proposed side extension is sited approximately 3.29m away from the side boundary and set back 1m from the existing front elevation, it is considered that the proposed extension would not give rise to a terracing effect.
- ❑ Paragraphs 5.14 – 5.15 of the SPD outline the guidance for side extensions to dwellings on a corner plot. Given that the extension would be sited approximately 3.29m to the side boundary, it is considered that the development would maintain sufficient space between the boundary. The absence of a strong building line offers further mitigation. Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to harm the overall character and openness of the street.
- ❑ Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway. Therefore it is important that they are carefully designed and sited. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.
- ❑ Section 5.17 of the SPD offers the following principles that should apply in the determination of applications that include rear dormers:

- (i) *They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;*
- (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
- (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
- (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side ridges of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
- (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
- (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
- (viii) *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed*

☐ In respect of the above points, the proposed dormer does not exceed the existing ridge height of the dwelling. It is set back from both the eaves line and the side walls of the house. Whilst the flat roof design is not ideal, it is acknowledged that there would be limited public vantage points from which the dormer could be viewed. Therefore it is considered that the proposed dormer would not cause undue harm to the character of the street scene.

☐ Whilst it is noted that the overall proposal would feature a large scale, it would not appear overbearing or out of character with the surrounding area. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would respect the visual amenity of the host dwelling and locality.

Summary

☐ In view of the above assessment, 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

☐ The proposal would adhere to the separation distances contained within section 4.1(i) of the SPD. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for surrounding occupiers.

☐ The part single storey rear extension is in accordance with the requirements of section 5.6 of the SPD as it is an attached property eligible for a 3m extension.

☐ The part two storey rear extension is in accordance with section 5.9 of the SPD.

- ☐ The proposal accords with the requirements of paragraphs 4.1(ii) and 4.1(iii) and would not unduly encroach the habitable room windows of surrounding occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden with a functional layout.
- ☐ In light of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and would provide a satisfactory standard of occupier amenity for all future occupiers in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'
- ☐ It is noted that the proposed development would not provide two off street parking spaces and adequate internal vehicular turning space. No parking plan is provided. Whilst the proposal would not adhere to the requirements of Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS, it is not considered that the reduction to one parking space would not result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, and would be in accordance with 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
- Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Site Plan. Drg no. 1902/1
- Proposed Floor Plans and Site Plan. Drg no. 1902/2
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 1902/4
- Proposed Second Floor Plan. Drg no. 1902/3

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 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	18/10/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	10/11/2022	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling