

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00465/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00465/HOUS
Location:	29 Arden Avenue, Middleton, M24 1PN
Proposal:	Part two-storey, part single-storey side extension, alterations to fenestration and conversion of existing garage to form habitable space including increase in height and single-storey link extension to main dwellinghouse.
Applicant:	Mr Carl Healey
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 17.09.2024	EXT OF TIME
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 refers to no. 29 Arden Avenue, a two-storey, terraced dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The dwelling faces the highway to the southeast, adjoined by no. 31 Arden Avenue to the northeast and adjacent to no. 27 Arden Avenue to southwest. It is faced to the front by no. 36 Arden Avenue and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders a footpath. The host dwelling benefits from an existing detached garage within the rear garden and off-street parking for two cars to the front.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part two-storey, part single-storey side extension that would project 2.14 metres from the existing side elevation, be set flush with the existing front porch at ground floor level and be set back 0.45 metres from the existing front elevation at first floor level.

The proposals also include a single-storey rear extension which would form a link between the main dwellinghouse and the existing detached garage. The existing garage would be converted into a habitable space and the height of the existing garage would be increased from 2.5m to 2.68m. In addition, a set of 2.35m wide bi-fold doors would be fitted on the northeast facing side elevation of the existing garage.

Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

It should be noted that the proposed side extension is the same as the extension approved under application ref. 24/00360/HOUS.

Relevant History

24/00360/HOUS	Part two storey, part single storey side extension and alteration to fenestration at rear elevation - (Resubmission of 23/00533/HOUS) Grant subject to conditions
23/00533/HOUS	Part two storey, part single storey side extension and alteration to fenestration at rear elevation Grant subject to conditions
03/D41592	Single Storey Side And Rear Extension To Dwelling Grant subject to conditions
92/D28399	Private Garage. Grant subject to conditions
84/D16701	Two Storey Extension To Side Of Dwellinghouse Grant subject to conditions
83/D15840	Two Storey Extension To Side Of Dwellinghouse Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways – No objections.

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)

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.”*

It was confirmed under the previous application (ref. 24/00360/HOUS) that the proposed two-storey side extension would be acceptable in terms of its design. Therefore, no concerns are had regarding the design of the proposed side extension.

To the rear, a single-storey extension would link the main dwellinghouse with the existing detached garage. The height of the garage would be increased by 0.18m and a set of bi-fold doors would be fitted within the existing northeast-facing side elevation. While the link extension and garage together would read as a sizeable extension with a total length of approx. 9.66m – almost the entire length of the rear garden – it is not considered that it would result in undue harm towards the character of the host dwelling or street scene. While it would be visible at close quarters from the public footpath to the rear, it would be fairly well-screened by existing boundary treatments. Moreover, large outbuildings and single-storey rear extensions are common along Arden Avenue, with the result that the proposal would not appear discordant within its context.

The scale and design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states planning decisions should *“create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.”*

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”* PfE Policy JP-P1 also requires new development to offer a high level of amenity and address microclimate issues such as sunlight and shade (inter alia). The ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ SPD has been produced to assess the matters relevant to residential amenity. As CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the SPD are concerned with high standards of residential amenity in all developments, they are relevant to considerations of this application.

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 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

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

Although, as a standalone addition, the single-storey rear extension would only exceed the above guidance by approx. 0.11m, it would be attached to the existing garage, thus resulting in a 9.66m by 2.68m brick wall against almost the entire length

of the shared boundary with no. 27 Arden Avenue. While it is noted that the garage is an existing structure, it currently has a height of 2.5m, which falls within Permitted Development (PD). Under the current application, the height of the garage would be increased by 0.18m and the visual break between the existing garage and the host dwelling would be removed, resulting in the aforementioned combined projection of 9.66m. With the increase in height to the existing garage, the development would be clearly visible above the existing 1.8m high timber fence. While the loss of sunlight from this height and projection would be limited given that the proposed development would be to the northeast of no. 27, it is nonetheless considered that the increase in height coupled with the additional massing against the common boundary would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the rear garden and ground floor windows of no. 27 Arden Avenue.

In light of the above, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of no. 27 Arden Avenue. Therefore, the proposal would fail to accord with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale and massing, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact to the rear windows and rear garden of no. 27 Arden Avenue. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 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:

- ☐ Site Location Plan. Drwg no. PK109-010
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans. Drwg no. PK109-001
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans. Drwg no. PK109-002H
- ☐ Existing Elevations. Drwg no. PK109-003
- ☐ Proposed Elevations. Drwg no. PK109-004F
- ☐ Existing Site/Block Plan. Drwg no. PK109-005E
- ☐ Site/Block Plan. Drwg no. PK109-005D

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	02/09/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	17/09/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling