

Application Number:	23/00695/HOUS
Location:	56 Hazelhurst Drive, Middleton, M24 6TL
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Applicant:	Mr Edward Sykes
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. 56 Hazelhurst Drive, a semi-detached domestic property situated within a residential area of Middleton. It is built in a mixture of beige brick and render which is painted white. It has ridged concrete roof tiles and white UPVC doors and windows.

The property is located at the turning head of a cul-de-sac, adjoined to no. 58 Hazelhurst Drive to the northwest and adjacent to no. 54 Hazelhurst Drive to the southwest. No. 54 Hazelhurst Drive is orientated 90 degrees away from the subject property.

The rear and side boundaries of the property, delineated by a solid timber fence and mature trees, are bordered by a terraced property and two groups of two-storey flats located on Hopwood Road.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension with a projection from the existing rear elevation of 3.72m and a width of 4.09m. The proposed extension would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.85m. Fenestration for the development is proposed as a window to the northwest facing rear elevation and a set of patio doors to the southeast facing side elevation. Materials for construction are proposed as brickwork, a rubber or fiberglass roof and UPVC.

The proposals also indicate the removal of two trees marked TR1 and TR2 on the site plan.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

While the trees have reasonable form, I would not consider that they meet the criteria to be specially protected. They have limited public visibility, are not prominent parts of a local sylvan landscape, and do not have identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance.

In addition, the trees are very close to the property and are currently semi-mature – meaning that there is very limited space for future growth potential, even without the proposed extension.

I would therefore not object to the removal of the trees to facilitate the development proposals.

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)

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 Case Officer regarding the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at no. 58 Hazelhurst Drive, amended plans were submitted to set the extension 0.75m from the common boundary with no. 58.

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 proposed single storey rear extension would be of a proportionate height and scale and would incorporate materials to match the existing and appropriate window detailing. Whilst the proposed flat roof would not be in-keeping with the existing roof profile, it is noted that the extension would be screened from public view and would not be unduly harmful to the visual amenities of the property.

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.

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 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 proposed extension would project 3.72m from the rear elevation of no. 58 Hazelhurst Drive and be set 0.75m from the common boundary. This is in accordance with the SPD and it is not considered that the proposed development would have an undue impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The extension would comply with the space standards set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD and is not considered to result in a significant loss of privacy or light for occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

The application property would retain a suitably sized rear garden area following the proposed works and all habitable rooms are to be supplied with adequate natural light and outlook.

In light of the above, 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.

Trees

The proposals include the removal of two trees from the rear garden of the application property, marked TR1 and TR2 on the proposed site plan. TR1 is a conifer tree of approximately 6-7m in height which is sited 1.2m from the northern corner of the extension. TR2 is an unknown tree of approximately 10m in height which is sited 2m from the eastern corner of the extension. Neither tree is protected by a TPO and no tree report has been provided.

The trees in question have limited public visibility and would not be readily accessible by the public by virtue of their siting in a private residential garden.

The trees recommended for removal constitute a relatively small proportion of the trees present in the rear garden of the applicant dwelling. Taken as a whole, the proposal would retain the majority of the trees that currently exist, with the trees recommended for removal not being of any significant ecological, cultural or historic value or any notable rarity.

In addition to the above, it is not considered that protecting the trees in question would result in any reasonable degree of additional public benefit either at present or in the future. The rear garden of the applicant dwelling is considered to be overly congested with access to direct sunlight being restricted, with the removal of trees being a suitable compromise in promoting sufficient occupier amenity and retaining the character of the host dwelling.

It is recognised that Policy G6 of the Core Strategy requires replacement planting at a ratio of 2:1. However, the LPA also recognise that the trees could be removed presently without any prior consent and in light of the congestion of the rear garden of the applicant dwelling, it is considered that such replanting may be excessive and ultimately harmful to the enjoyment of the rear garden in years to come. As such replacement planting is not considered necessary or reasonable in this instance.

The proposal is therefore acceptable, in accordance with policies P2, P3, G1, G6 and G7, 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 This permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan. Submitted on 28th June 2023
- ☐ Location Plan and Existing Site Plan. Submitted on 28th June 2023
- ☐ Amended Location Plan And Proposed Site Plan. Submitted on 12th September 2023
- ☐ Amended Existing Plans and Elevations. Submitted on 18th July 2023
- ☐ Amended Proposed Rear Elevation. Submitted on 12th September 2023
- ☐ Amended Proposed Ground Floor. Submitted on 12th September 2023
- ☐ Proposed Gable End Elevation. Submitted on 28th June 2023
- ☐ Proposed Neighbours Side Elevation. Submitted on 28th June 2023

2 Proposed Front Elevation. Submitted on 28th June 2023

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.

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, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall, except for the materials used in the construction of the roof, match the materials 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	12/09/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	14/09/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling