

|                            |                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | 23/00925/HOUS                                                                                                         |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 91 Hollin Lane, Middleton, M24 5LA                                                                                    |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Formation of pitched roof over existing garage and front porch extension following demolition of existing front porch |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr & Mrs P. Crux                                                                                                      |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Bob Melling                                                                                                           |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>     | <b>Refuse</b>                                                                                                         |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>Y</b> |

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

### **Location**

The application relates to no. 91 Hollin Lane, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area in Middleton. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 91A Hollin Lane to the north-west, adjacent to no. 89 Hollin Lane to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders a public footpath. The dwelling benefits from a front and rear curtilage connected externally through the south-east side of the curtilage. It also includes a front porch, attached garage and single-storey rear extension.

The property itself is a post-war semi-detached dwelling with arts and crafts influences; two large double height bay windows form the centrepiece of the front elevation of the pair of dwellings, completed with hanging tile detailing.

### **Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for a front porch that would project 2.03m from the main front wall of the host dwelling with a width across of 2.45m. It would be characterised by a mono-pitched roof and include a window in each side elevation.

The submitted plans also include the formation of a pitched roof over the existing attached garage. The proposed roof would have a height to eaves of approx. 2.45m and a maximum height of approx. 5.61m measured externally from ground level. The roof would project approx. 1.5m forward of the existing garage door, forming a canopy above that would connect with the roof of the proposed porch. The roof would be hipped to the front and would form a gable to the rear which would project approx. 0.89m from the main rear wall. The rear-facing gable would include a small window and the front roof slope would include a roof light.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

### **Relevant History**

20/00852/HH42 Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 4.64m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3m and height to eaves 2.52m)  
**Prior Approval Not Required**

86/D19320 First Floor Extension To Side Of Dwelling  
**Grant subject to conditions**

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

#### Highways And Engineering

It would appear that the proposed extension would not unduly impact the current parking arrangements with residual parking meeting Council standards.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

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

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

### **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No letters of representation have been received from third parties.

One letter of support was submitted but this was from applicant advising that they had received no objections from the immediate neighbours.

### **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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 Council regarding the design of the proposals and their impact on residential amenity, amended plans were submitted to alter the form of the proposed roof and to reduce the forward projection of the development.

## Assessment

**Design:** DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 130 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 they are “*sympathetic to local character.*”
- ❑ Paragraph 134 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.*”
- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale 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 proposal seeks to construct a pitched roof above the existing attached garage to accommodate a home office and a front porch to accommodate a W/C. While the front hip and roof pitch would appear somewhat in keeping with the host dwelling, significant concerns are had with the design and scale of the development.

- ❑ Along the existing row of semi-detached properties, there is a relatively strong building line, with several properties, including the application property, having constructed only modest front porch extensions. The proposed front porch and canopy roof, which would project approx. 0.6m further forward than the existing front porch, would comprise a sizeable forward projection that would appear unduly prominent within the street scene.
- ❑ The scale of the existing attached garage, which has a width well over half that of the host dwelling, would result in a pitched roof above that would dominate the host property, particularly when viewed along its south-eastern side elevation.
- ❑ The offset gable projection from the rear elevation would jut out above the existing single-storey rear extension, and would relate poorly to the forms and massing of the host dwelling. It would appear awkward and incongruous to the existing rear and side elevations and the proposed window would not align with the existing fenestration, creating a cluttered appearance.
- ❑ The harm identified above would be exacerbated by the prominent location of the property, which is readily visible from the surrounding public vantage points on the highway, particularly along its south-eastern elevation.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

#### **Amenity: DM1 and SPD**

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.”*
- ❑ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
  - o *“10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.”*
- ❑ Section 4.2 explains that where there is a marked difference in levels, it may be necessary for the minimum space standards to be increased.
- ❑ Initially, it was considered that the proposed introduction of a gable elevation would result in an unacceptable loss of light and overbearing impact upon no. 89 Hollin Lane, which has two large windows on the side elevation; both of which appear to serve habitable rooms. The relationship between the properties is exacerbated by the change in levels, with the application property sited on higher ground.
- ❑ However, the roof profile has been altered to a hipped roof form and it is considered that this would reduce the impact on the adjacent neighbours to an acceptable level. .
- ❑ No concerns are had with the proposed rear window, which would measure some 29m to the rear boundary of the curtilage.
- ❑ On this basis, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity harm on 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. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ 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.

#### **Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5**

- ☐ Two off-street parking spaces would be retained which is considered acceptable for a dwelling of this size.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

#### **Recommendation: Refuse**

1. By virtue of its built forms, massing and design, the proposed development would constitute an irregular and incongruous addition to the host dwelling which would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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:

- ☐ Elevations And Plans as existing. Drg no. 1
- ☐ Ground Floor Plan as proposed. Drg no. 2. Rev A
- ☐ First Floor Plan as proposed. Dated July 2023. Rev A
- ☐ Site Plan as existing. Dated July 2023
- ☐ Location Plan. Drg no. 3
- ☐ Site Plan & Location Plan. Drg no. 3. Rev A
- ☐ Elevations as proposed. Dated July 2023. Rev A
- ☐ Proposed Sections. Dated July 2023. Rev A

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 07/11/2023  | Signed: BM     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 09/11/2023  | Signed: RC     |

Report Author Bob Melling