

Application Number:	23/01146/HOUS
Location:	26 Hall Drive, Middleton, M24 1NE
Proposal:	Two-storey side, single-storey rear extension, front porch extension, alteration to fenestration to existing front elevation following demolition of existing single-storey front, side and rear extensions
Applicant:	Mrs Omotola Oyekunbi Gallagher
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 29.01.2024	EXT OF TIME 23.02.2024
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. 26 Hall Drive, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in Middleton. The dwelling occupies a corner plot at the junction with Colson Drive, is adjoined to no. 28 Hall Drive to the north and is adjacent to no. 24 Hall Drive to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the side curtilage of no. 1 Colson Drive. The subject property benefits from an existing front porch, a single-storey attached garage and a single-storey rear extension.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for:

- ☐ A two-storey side extension that would project approx. 3.3m from the existing side elevation, be set back approx. 0.45m from the existing front elevation and be set flush with the existing rear elevation.
- ☐ A single-storey rear extension that would project approx. 3.63m beyond the existing rear elevations with a width of approx. 6.28m and a lean-to roof with three roof lights.

- ☐ A front porch extension that would project approx. 1.31m from the existing front elevation with a lean-to roof.
- ☐ These proposals will necessitate the demolition of an existing front porch, single-storey side and single-storey rear extensions.

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)
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

Amendments were sought to reduce the width of the side extension by removing the additional projection, set back the front wall of the extension, remove the proposed bay window and alter the roof form of the front porch from dual-pitched to lean-to.

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 proposed two-storey side extension features an appropriately hipped roof which also has a lower ridge height than the original application property. However, the proposed two-storey side extension also includes a double-height bay window. This causes the elevation of the two-storey side extension to be a relatively significant feature when compared to the original dwelling. However, it is noted that this impact is somewhat negated due to the front elevation of the two-storey side extension being set back from the front elevation of the application property. On balance, it is considered that the two-storey side extension remains an overall subservient addition to the host dwelling and is therefore acceptable.

The proposed two storey side extension is over 1m from the boundary of the application property’s curtilage. Therefore, it is not necessary in this instance to consider the potential for the ‘terracing effect’ as detailed within Rochdale’s SPD.

The proposed bay window is an appropriate architectural feature when considering the presence of existing bay windows both to the application property as well as a common feature to the street scene.

The proposed design of the single-storey rear extension is acceptable, featuring appropriate fenestration and a lean-to roof complete with three roof lights.

The proposed front porch extension would be an appropriate design and scale with a lean-to roof design. Moreover it is noted that front porch extensions of a similar scale and design are common along the immediate building line.

The existing bin storage arrangements would not be affected by the proposed development and are considered acceptable by virtue of being screened from public view.

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.*”

It is noted that the adjacent dwelling, no. 24 Hall Drive, contains a dormer window on the facing side elevation which appears to be the principal window of a habitable room. The side elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension would measure approx. 13.5m to the directly facing dormer window. This would be 0.5m short of the 14m standard contained within section 4.1 of the SPD. However, it is noted that the proposed extension would be located to the north of no. 24 Hall Drive, which would negate any potential loss of light. Furthermore, amendments have been sought to reduce the width of the proposed extension in the interests of residential amenity. On balance, it is not considered that the proposed side extension would result in undue harm to the residential amenity of no. 24 Hall Drive.

The proposed two-storey side extension would measure approx. 25m to the front elevation of no. 25 Hall Drive and approx. 20m to the rear boundary of the curtilage. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in undue harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would comply with the projection standards contained within section 5.6 of the SPD and is not considered to result in an undue loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring properties.

The submitted plans confirm that all habitable rooms would be supplied with adequate material light and outlook in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden of a functional layout.

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.

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 Plans. Drg no. (00).001. Rev B
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. (00).002. Rev A
- Site Location Plan. Drg no. (00).003. Rev A
- Existing Site Block Plans. Drg no. (00).004. Rev A
- Proposed Plans. Drg no. (10).001. Rev C
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. (10).002. Rev B
- Proposed Site Block Plans. Drg no. (10).003. Rev B

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. (10).002. Rev B.

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 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