

Application Number:	23/00076/HOUS
Location:	58 Ruthin Avenue Middleton M24 1FG
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension including insertion of new rear first floor window and application of render to front and side elevations, following demolition of existing rear conservatory.
Applicant:	Mr Terry Bailey
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	NO

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	NO

Location

The location relates to 58 Ruthin Avenue, Middleton, a semi-detached, two-storey property. Ruthin Avenue is in a residential area, comprised of semi-detached properties with a similar material pallet.

The front of the house faces west, overlooking the Highway and the opposite properties 37 and 39 Ruthin Avenue. The west elevation faces the adjacent side elevation of 56 Ruthin Avenue which sits on a corner plot and is therefore angled away from number 58. The adjoining property on the north facing elevation is number 60 Ruthin Avenue. The rear east facing boundary of the curtilage borders the gardens of 7, 9 and 11 Stanway Close.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for a two storey side extension, and a single storey rear extension, following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory. Included is the insertion of new rear first floor window and the application of render to the front elevations in replace of the original brick tiles.

- ② The two storey side extension is set back approx. 1.7m from the front wall of the host dwelling. It measures approx. 2.6m in width and 5.6m in depth. The height to eaves measures 4.8m, and the maximum roof height measures 7.2m. A front facing first floor window, and a ground floor side facing window and door are included as part of the proposal.
- ② The side extension includes a single-storey projection from the front elevation. The projection is set back approx. 0.5m from the front elevation of the host dwelling, and measures 2.3m in width and 1.3m in depth. The height to eaves is approx. 2.3m and the maximum roof height measures approx. 3m. A garage door is included in the design proposal of the projection
- ② The proposed single storey rear extension would replace an existing conservatory. It would span the width of the rear elevation of the host dwelling and the proposed side extension, measuring approx. 7.7m. The depth from the rear wall of the host property measures approx. 2.9m, and the maximum height is 2.85m. The rear extension proposal has a flat roof with 2 glass roof lanterns. The application also seeks the instillation of bi-folding doors and another separate window.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering (03/02/2023)

"It would appear that the proposed development would have no impact on the current parking provision which is in line with Council standards. The servicing of the extended property would remain unchanged. We would not expect any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the development. Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions."

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties, no responses were received.

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).

Policy 5.1, 5.11 and 5.12

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Section 5.1 of the SPD requires extensions to be designed “in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it”. As the proposal is set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling it ensures subservience. Furthermore, a sense of symmetry is maintained between the adjoining semi-detached properties which is reflective of the wider street scene. The overall design does not look overbearing or incongruous.
- ❑ Section 5.11 states that “where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, which can harm the character of the property and the area”.
- ❑ Section 5.12 provides technical requirements regarding the terracing effect stating, “two storey and first floor side extensions that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary of the property will not normally be permitted unless either:
 - (i) The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house;
 - (ii) OR The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house (Figure 9).
- ❑ However, section 5.13 allows exceptions “where there is little chance of a serious terracing effect occurring, for example where dwellings are angled away from each other or the dwelling is on a corner plot.”
- ❑ The proposal seeks a two-storey side extension on a semi-detached property. The main concern is the potential for a ‘terracing effect’ as outlined in section 5.11 and 5.12 of the SPD. In this instance, the two storey extension is within 1m of the boundary and is not set back 2m from the front elevation of the host dwelling. Whilst this does not wholly satisfy section 5.12, the risk of a

terracing affect is mitigated by the angled arrangement of the application property and number 56. Number 56 is set away from the shared boundary at an angle which ensures that a terracing effect is avoided. Therefore, under section 5.13, the side extension is deemed acceptable and will not result in a terracing effect.

- ☐ The choice of materials is largely in keeping with the host property and the wider street scene. Whilst it is unfortunate that the render will replace the original brick tiling, it would not be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene, as it will match the rendering on the adjoining property. In addition, the original tiles no longer match the terracotta tiles above the porch or in the proposed elevations.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the SPD set out relevant guidance for the development of single storey rear extensions to dwellings.
- ☐ Section 5.6 sets a maximum standard of 3m along the common boundary for the depth of single-storey rear extensions. The proposed rear extension would project approx. 2.9m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling and would be set against the common boundary of the adjoining dwelling and the proposed rear extension therefore satisfies section 5.6 of the SPD..
- ☐ Regarding the impact on amenity from the side extension, this too would be minimal. The dropped roof level and set back front elevation reduces any potential loss of light for number 56, and would be read against the existing dwelling from the neighbours perspective. Furthermore, the windows on the south facing side elevation facing number 56 are set at ground floor level and serve non-habitable rooms, therefore the side extension would not unduly impact on the neighbour's privacy.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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:

- ☐ PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: 584-10C

- ☐ PROPOSED SITE BLOCK AND LOCATION PLANS: 584-06A
- ☐ PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN: 584-07C
- ☐ PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR: 584-08C
- ☐ PROPOSED ROOF PLAN: 584-09C

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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 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	01/03/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	16/03/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg