

|                            |                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | 23/00899/HOUS                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 19 Lyme Clough Way, Middleton, M24 6TN                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Two-storey side and single-storey rear extension including alterations to existing fenestration on the front and rear elevations and alterations to the existing roof structure |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Miss Beth Wright                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Bob Melling                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>     | <b>Grant subject to conditions</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>N</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. 19 Lyme Clough Way, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Middleton. The property faces the highway to the north, is adjoined to no. 17 Lyme Clough Way to the east and is adjacent to no. 21 Lyme Clough Way to the west. The front garden is almost fully paved with space to park one vehicle. The side facing dwelling at no. 21 Lyme Clough Way has previously been extended to the front, side and rear by means of a two-storey side and single-storey front and rear extension and has a blank gable elevation. There is a distance of 9.9m from the existing rear elevation of the application dwelling to the rear garden boundary and a separation distance of 25m to the directly facing dwellings to the rear at nos. 83-85 Abbey Road.

### **Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension that would project 2m from the existing side elevation with a 0.8m separation distance retained between the proposed side elevation and the common boundary with no. 21 Lyme Clough Way. The proposed side extension would be set back by 1m at both floor levels behind the existing principal elevation of the dwelling. The extension would project 3m beyond the rear elevation at ground floor level and feature a lean-to roof with a maximum height of 3.6m. The extension would be formed from brickwork and render detailing to match that used in the construction of the original build. The extension would be

formed with a lower ridge height than the original house, and the existing half hip roof structure atop the original dwelling would be raised to form a fully pitched roof.

Internal remodelling not requiring Planning Permission would be carried out as part of the proposals. A result of this would be a larger master bedroom to the front with an associated ensuite bathroom. The existing smaller window on the front elevation would be fitted with obscure glazing to accommodate the ensuite. The existing rear bedroom would be subdivided to create two single bedrooms and the existing large bedroom window would be removed and replaced with two smaller windows.

### **Relevant History**

N/A

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

#### **Highways And Engineering**

The loss of the driveway to the side of the dwelling would have an impact on parking provision for the extended dwelling. For the size of the extended dwelling we would require the provision of 2 viable off street parking spaces and the submitted plans do not show that provision.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

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

Highways raise no objection to this application, subject to the provision of the requested off street parking spaces, and we would not request no specific planning conditions.

### **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to all 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 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>P3</b>         | Improving Design of New Development |
| <b>DM1</b>        | General Development Requirements    |
| <b>T2</b>         | Improving Accessibility             |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | Schedule of Parking Standards       |

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

### **Amendments**

Amendments have been sought to achieve the following:

- Rear extension altered to ground floor only
- Side extension set back 1m at both floor levels
- Roof structure altered to fully pitched

Subsequent alterations have been made to the internal layout to achieve an acceptable standard of occupier amenity.

### **Assessment**

**Design:** DM1 and P3

- ❑ Section 5.1 of the SPD states that alterations and extensions to dwellings “*should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”
- ❑ The proposed side extension would appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling by virtue of its 1m setback at both floor levels behind the existing principal elevation with the ridge set down accordingly. The style of extension is characteristic of this dwelling type and the windows in the front elevation are considered to be acceptable in terms of size and position. The treatment of the development in brickwork and render to match the host dwelling will ensure a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance.
- ❑ No concerns are had regarding the ‘terracing effect’ owing to the 1 metre setback at both floor levels behind the existing principal elevation.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension would be a single-storey form and would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ❑ Side extensions often restrict external access between the front and rear curtilage for the storage of bins. This proposal, however, maintains sufficient space to the side of the extension and would not affect the existing bin storage arrangements; which are well-screened from public view.
- ❑ The extension would result in the loss of the half hipped roof however, the use of standard pitched roofs is common across the street scene, including on the adjacent extended property and given that the existing roof form is not fully hipped, it is considered that its loss would not be unduly harmful to the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties and the new roof form would appear as an acceptable alteration.
- ❑ 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**

- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ The rearward extent of the extension meets the requirements of the SPD as the projection is limited to 3m from the common boundary point at ground floor level. As a result, it is not considered that the extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the neighbouring properties.
- ☐ The proposed side elevation would include an obscurely glazed bathroom window at first floor level and a utility room window at ground floor level. The facing side elevation of no. 21 Lyme Clough Way is blank and views from the proposed utility room window would be obscured by the existing boundary fence. On this basis, it is not considered that the development would result in an undue loss of privacy or overbearing impact upon the occupiers of no. 21 Lyme Clough Way. Obscure glazing can be conditioned.
- ☐ The proposed first floor window to the rear would measure approx. 11 metres to the rear boundary of the curtilage and is considered acceptable.
- ☐ It is not considered that the remaining fenestration to the front and rear of the proposed development, or any of the alterations to the existing fenestration would result in an undue loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Bathroom windows are to be obscurely glazed and this can be controlled through condition.
- ☐ Amendments have been sought to remove the first floor element of the rear extension in order to avoid compromising the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Subsequently, amendments to the internal layouts have been accepted to ensure that each bedroom is served with adequate levels of natural light and outlook in order to encourage an acceptable standard of living for its occupants. It is acknowledged the bedroom to the western corner of the dwelling would comprise an internal floor area of 6.24m<sup>2</sup>, which falls short of the minimum space standard set out in the “Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard”. The local planning authority has worked with the applicant to identify possible alternative solutions, however, it was concluded that a proposal which would accord with the space standard would not be feasible without significantly compromising the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Taking this into account, and given that the internal layout has been amended to ensure that all bedrooms receive an adequate level of natural light and outlook, it is considered the proposal would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ It is also considered the proposed development would retain sufficient garden space with a functional layout for its occupiers.
- ☐ 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**

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from two to three and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ❑ One parking space to the side of the dwelling would be lost as a result of the proposals, leaving only one viable off-street space to the front of the dwelling.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, regard has been had for the existing parking arrangements for the host property and other properties on the street scene, which comprise of similar arrangements with plentiful on-street parking spaces. With this in mind, and given the low-trafficked nature of the highway, it is considered the potential addition of one vehicle to the highway would not be detrimental to highway capacity and safety.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

**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
- Existing Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan. Submitted on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2023
- Existing Plans and Elevations. Dated April 2023
- Proposed Plans and Elevations – Rev E. Dated August 2023

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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first

occupation of the extension hereby permitted the proposed window labelled 'OB' in the ground floor facing south, the proposed window labelled 'OB' in the first floor facing west and the existing window labelled 'OB' in the first floor facing north shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy 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.

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 17/11/2023  | Signed: BM     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 20/11/2023  | Signed: RC     |

Report Author Bob Melling