

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01265/HOUS

Application Number:	23/01265/HOUS
Location:	94 Mainway, Middleton, M24 1PP
Proposal:	Part two-storey, part single-storey side extension, two-storey front extension, two-storey rear extension including Juliet balcony, alterations to existing roof, alterations to existing fenestration and the installation of 1100mm high vehicular access gates to front boundary.
Applicant:	Mr Agana
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 08.02.2024	EXT OF TIME 21.02.2024
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. 94 Mainway, a two-storey, detached dwelling located on an architecturally diverse street in Alkrington. The dwelling faces the highway to the north, is adjacent to no. 96 Mainway to the east and no. 92 Mainway to the west. The host dwelling benefits from an existing single-storey rear extension with a flat roof and a single-storey outrigger to the side which comprises an attached garage.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for:

- ② A two-storey front extension that would project approx. 1.2m from the existing front elevation with a dual-pitched, gable-style roof. The extension would have a maximum height of 6.9m and be finished in render.
- ② A part two-storey, part single-storey side/rear extension that would be set back approx. 0.6m from the existing principal elevation with the ridgeline set

down accordingly. It would project approx. 4.9m from the existing side elevation at ground floor level and 2.4m at first floor level. It would be constructed in materials to match existing.

- ② A two-storey rear extension, including a Juliet balcony, that would project approx. 3m beyond the rear elevation of the original build with a width to the rear of approx. 12.9m. It would be constructed in brickwork to match existing to the side elevations with a rendered finish to the proposed rear elevation.
- ② The application also proposed to raise the existing half hip roof structure atop the original dwelling to form a fully pitched roof, several alterations to the existing fenestration and the formation of a 1.1m high sliding vehicular access gate to replace the existing swing gates.
- ② A detailed specification for the proposed render has not been provided.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The submitted plans would not seem to change the existing parking layout which in terms of numbers meets the Council standards for the proposed extension to the dwelling.

The servicing arrangements for the extended dwelling would seem to remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways would raise no objection to this application, and we would request no specific planning conditions.

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 regarding the design of the proposed development, amended plans have been received to achieve the following:

- ☐ Alter the original roof design of the dwelling to ensure synthesis between the main roof and the roofs of the proposed extensions;
- ☐ Reduce the amount of glazing in the proposed front extension;
- ☐ Reduce the width of the side extension at first floor level by approx. 2.5m; and
- ☐ Set down the ridgeline of the proposed side extension.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*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.*” In addition, section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”

The subject property occupies a mid-plot position and is part of a wider ribbon development of low density housing comprised of detached and semi-detached properties. There is a low degree of architectural uniformity along Mainway with properties having been constructed at various points in the mid-to-late twentieth century. Moreover, properties in the street scene have been variously modified to produce contrasting built forms and styles.

The proposed side extension would be set back from the main front wall, with the ridgeline set down accordingly. It would maintain the existing width at ground floor level with a modest sideward projection at first floor level. It would include appropriate window detailing and would read as a subservient addition to the host property. Moreover, it would retain a sufficient visual break with the adjacent property.

The proposed front gable feature would undoubtedly appear as a contemporary intervention with its use of bespoke glazing. However in the context of the street scene, where front gable projections are widely visible, it is not considered that this would represent an incongruous addition to the host property. It would be set down from the main ridgeline, which creates a degree of subservience, and would have a similar pitch to the main roof.

The removal of the half hip roof design is not considered to result in undue harm to the character of the host dwelling or street scene where the majority of neighbouring properties have gable roofs.

The proposed rear extension is of an appropriate scale and design with its ridgeline set down to denote a degree of subservience to the host property. Whilst the inclusion of a flat roof form is not in-keeping with the original roof design, it is noted that this aspect is relatively minor with limited public exposure.

Rear access would be retained via the western side passageway, allowing the storage of bins to the rear of the property and out of public view.

The proposed use of brickwork and roof tiles to match existing is considered acceptable. No concerns are had regarding the proposed use of render on the front extension or rear elevation, with render seen as a common feature within the locality and with a condition attached to ensure the use of an appropriate colour and render type.

Lastly, the proposed replacement vehicular access gate would be of an appropriate height and design.

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

DM1 (c) of the Core Strategy outlines that development should not *“adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*

In particular, section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:

- ② *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*

Additionally, section 5.6 states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

- ② *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*

Section 5.7 explains that:

- ② *“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.”*

In respect of two storey rear extensions, section 5.9 states that:

- ② *“Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

Section 5.10 explains that:

- 2 “Where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the 2.4m distance will be taken from a point 3m along the common boundary from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”

The submitted plans confirm the proposed extensions would comply with the projection standards outlined in the SPD. Moreover, the facing properties on the northern side of Mainway measure some 49m away, while the facing properties to the rear measure some 30m away. Furthermore, the proposed fenestration to the rear would measure 19.8m to the rear boundary of the curtilage.

The proposed east-facing side elevation would include an obscurely glazed window at first floor level, with a condition attached to ensure that the obscure glazing is retained in perpetuity.

Whilst the proposals would undoubtedly result in some loss of light and outlook to several windows on the side elevation of no. 96 Mainway, it is noted that none of these windows are the principal source of light or outlook for any habitable rooms. Additionally, the width of the side extension has been reduced by 2.5m at first floor level, which would significantly reduce the impact on the neighbouring side elevation.

Taken as a whole, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an undue impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties, in accordance with the SPD.

The proposals indicate that all habitable rooms would receive sufficient natural light and that a sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

In view of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed development accords with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The existing off-street parking arrangements would not be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, the proposals would be in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Council's Core Strategy, which requires a maximum of 2 car parking spaces for a dwelling of this size.

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:

- Existing Plan. Drg no. 2021-010-001
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 2021-010-002
- Proposed Plans. Drg no. 2021-010-003. Rev C. Received on 08/02/2024
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 2021-010-004. Rev D. Received on 08/02/2024

- Existing Location plan and front wall elevations. Drg no. 2021-010-005

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 be as specified on drawing no. 2021-010-004. Rev D.

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.

4. Notwithstanding any description of materials in drawing no. 2021-010-004. Rev D, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of the render to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the render. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the proposed first floor window on the side elevation facing east shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy 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	12/02/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	20/02/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling