

Application Number:	22/01337/HOUS
Location:	89 Kingsway Middleton M24 1HW
Proposal:	Single Storey Rear and Side Extension
Applicant:	Nicola Whitby
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

This application relates to no.89 Kingsway, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling in Middleton. The property is south facing towards the highway and faces a small parcel of green space between Kingsway and Cheltenham Green. The applicant dwelling is directly adjoined to no.87 Kingsway to the west and is adjacent to no.91 Kingsway to the east. The property benefits from a sufficiently sized rear garden and off-street parking to the front and side.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey side and rear extension. The extension would project 1.45m from the existing side elevation and 3m from the rear elevation. The extension would have a maximum height of 3.54m and a height to eaves of 2.61m. Materials for the construction of the extension would be brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing, with black uPVC windows.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The only highway issues arising from this application is parking provision. The application form indicates that the proposed development would have no impact on parking provision however it is apparent from the submitted plans that the proposed side extension would sever access to the existing garage and reduce the driveway length.

Council standards would require that for the size of the extended dwelling that two car parking spaces should be provided, we would therefore ask that the applicant provides two viable off street parking places as part of the development proposals.

The servicing arrangements would remain unchanged if the development was approved.

We do not envisage that there would be a detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the development.

Representations

Letters were sent to all surrounding neighbours and 2 representations were received in objection to the application.

A summary of the comments in the objections:

- Only rear extensions have been permitted in this area, not side extensions

Officer's response: The Council assesses each application on its merits.

- The side extension will render the garden and garage inaccessible

Officer's response: The submitted plans indicate that a gap of 1.25m will be left between the side enlargement and common boundary.

- The side extension will leave inadequate space for 2 off-street parking spaces
- Parking on the road would be dangerous given primary school in close vicinity and bus stop

Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'Highways and Parking' section of the report.

- Risk of 'terracing effect' and harm to character of street scene

Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'Design' section of the report.

- Impact on access to neighbouring property.

Officer's response: The plans indicate that the extension is to be wholly within the curtilage of the application property. Any impact on neighbouring access is a matter to be resolved between the neighbouring parties.

- Loss of light, outlook and privacy to kitchen window and rear-facing windows.

Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'Amenity' section of the report.

- Storage of bins.

Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'Design' section of the report.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires *“development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.”* Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all new development must *“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.”*
- ❑ The application site is a two storey semi-detached property situated in a residential area in Middleton. The immediate street scene is characterised by a consistent architectural design, materiality, massing and scale. The properties located within the immediate street scene are two storey in height and feature a hipped roof design. It is also noted that the dwellings are built in brown brick with a bay and canopy feature to the front.
- ❑ The application relates to a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed development would be constructed in a material palette in keeping with the host property and sympathetic to the wider street scene. The side extension would be set back 3.56m from the principal elevation and the proposed enlargements would incorporate a lean-to roof design coherent with the current roof form. The enlargement 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.
- ❑ Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states *“residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid dominating residential streets.”* The proposed extension would retain a 1.25m gap between the front

and rear curtilage allowing for the bins to be stored out of view of the street in accordance with the SPD.

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

Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact and Privacy

- ☐ DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale 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.”*
- ☐ 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).”* The proposed rear enlargement would surpass the rear elevations of nos. 87 and 91 Kingsway by 3m and would accord with the SPD guidance. Furthermore, given that no.87 benefits from an existing single storey rear extension and that there would be a reasonable separation distance between the proposed rear extension and the rear habitable room windows of no.91, the proposed enlargement is not considered to result in an undue loss of light or outlook to the occupiers of nos. 87 and 91 Kingsway.
- ☐ The proposed single storey side and rear extension would contain an obscurely glazed window to the front elevation, an obscurely glazed utility room window to the side elevation, glazed patio doors to the rear elevation and two rooflights on the rear roof slope. The patio doors measure 17m to the rear boundary of curtilage. Given that there are no facing properties to the front or rear, and that the proposed utility window facing no.91 would be obscurely glazed, it is considered that the neighbouring amenity would not be harmed by this additional fenestration.

Occupier Amenity

- ☐ 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.

Summary

- ☐ In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would accord 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.”

- ☐ The proposed development would reduce the space currently designated as drive way and no proposed parking plan is provided. Highway Services have also commented on the application and while they have advised that the development would not negatively impact on highway safety, they have requested that two off street parking spaces be provided. In this regard, the extension would reduce the driveway length to approximately 9.3m, with approximately 5.8m depth of this having full width. The width of the driveway would then reduce for the final 3.5m to approximately 2.75m in width (note this is an existing width where the driveway runs adjacent the house). It is recognised that this would be slightly below the standard length for two parking spaces (4.8m x 2 = 9.6m). Nonetheless, it is not considered that any undue harm to highway safety would arise as a result of this reduction.
- ☐ The parking standards set out in Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS, has a maximum parking provision of two parking spaces per dwelling. This however is a maximum provision and should not be seen as a standard requirement for all properties. In the case of this dwelling, it would be left with off street parking provision for at least one car and sufficient on street parking is available within close vicinity of the site. As such, it is not considered that the proposals would have any unacceptable impacts on highway safety and the application is acceptable in this regard, in accordance with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy 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:
 - Location Plan. Drg no. ZT22-196-00
 - Existing Site Plan. Drg no. ZT22-196-01
 - Existing Plans and Elevations. Drg no. ZT22-196-02
 - Proposed Site Plan. Drg no. ZT22-196-03
 - Proposed Plans and Elevations. Drg no. ZT22-196-04

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	30/11/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	12/12/2022	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling