

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00892/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00892/HOUS
Location:	40 Kirkstall Road, Middleton, M24 6EX
Proposal:	Extension to front elevation to form garage and car parking space within front garden
Applicant:	Mr Peter Featherstone
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 18.11.2024	EXT OF TIME N/A
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

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. 40 Kirkstall Road, a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The dwelling faces the highway to the northwest and adjoins no. 38 Kirkstall Road to the southwest and no. 42 Kirkstall Road to the northeast. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear gardens of no. 34 Kirkstall Road and nos. 22-24 Kingswood Road.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey front extension which would measure 4.4 metres by 2 metres, with an eaves height of approximately 2.75 metres and a ridge height of 3.71 metres. It would be characterised by a lean-to roof and constructed in materials to match those used in the exterior of the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would comprise a small front porch and an integral garage. The garage would have internal dimensions of approximately 5 metres (l) by 2.66 metres (w), extending into the dwelling and reducing the size of the existing kitchen. The existing front lawn would be paved over to form one off-street parking space.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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) – December 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires new development to be “visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping” in addition to ensuring that development is “sympathetic to local character.” Paragraph 139 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 such as design guides and codes.”

PfE Policy JP-P1 requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identity that: “Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.”

CS Policies DM1 and P3 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 surrounding street scene is characterised by terraced dwellings of a simple front elevation design. The adjoining building line has remained relatively unchanged with a high degree of uniformity through its built forms. While three dwellings along the building line have constructed front porches, these are modest additions to the front elevation that would likely constitute permitted development. Extensions to the front elevation are not a characteristic of dwellings along the building line and this contributes to the sense of symmetry and the cohesive character of development in this location. In this respect, there is a balanced form and regular rhythm of development to the street.

The proposed front extension comprises a substantial and disproportionate enlargement to the host dwelling that would stand wholly at odds with the character of the street scene, disrupting the regular rhythm of development. This harm would be exacerbated by the re-positioning of the front door and the addition of a garage door to the front elevation. The resultant arrangement of fenestration would conflict with the overriding pattern of development.

It is noted that no. 30 Kirkstall Road was granted planning permission for a front porch in 2005 (application ref: 05/D44973) and it was considered that the porch would not create an overly dominant feature within the street scene. The approved

porch has a ground area of 4.08 square metres, which is significantly smaller than the extension proposed under the current application (8.80 square metres).

Taken as a whole, the proposed development fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of design and constitutes adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

CS Policy DM1 states development proposals should ensure they “do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”

Section 5.5 of the SPD states “it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.” In particular, Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

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

For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”

It is noted that although the above guidance generally relates to single-storey rear extensions, it can also be applied to projections to the front of the dwelling and is assessed as such below.

The front extension would comply with the above guidance and is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to “provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”

The proposals would retain the existing provision of one off-street parking space to the front of the host dwelling. Therefore, the parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with CS Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason -

1. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed front extension would constitute a disproportionate and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling. The front extension would dominate the original build and would have a prominence which would harmfully alter the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan
- Existing Plans. Dwg no. 32
- Proposed Plans. Dwg no. 32 B

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	30/10/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	05/11/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling