

Application Number:	23/00305/HOUS
Location:	48 Phyllis Street, Middleton, M24 2AQ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, front elevation bay window and canopy.
Applicant:	Mrs Syed
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

The application refers to no. 48 Phyllis Street, a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of East Middleton. The application property faces northeast on to the highway, adjoins no. 46 Phyllis Street to the northwest and is adjacent to no. 50 to the southeast. To the front, the house is set back some 6m from the highway where there is a small front garden and area of hardstanding. To the rear, the ground levels slope down in a southwesterly direction where the subject property shares a common boundary with no. 7 Easton Close and no. 14 Chilton Drive.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension and a single storey front extension to form a bay window with a lean-to canopy roof above extending over the front door. The two storey side extension would project 2.26m from the existing side elevation and be set back 1.2m from the existing front wall. It would be set against the side boundary and include a dual-pitched, gable-style roof with a ridgeline set down from the existing. The proposed front bay window extension would project 0.81m from the existing front elevation with a width of 3m.

Fenestration for the development is proposed as a large window to the front elevation (ground floor) to serve the living room, a single window to the side elevation (ground floor) to serve the living room, a window to the front elevation (ground floor) to serve the guest bedroom, a window to the front elevation (first floor)

to serve bedroom 3, a single window to the rear elevation (ground floor) to serve the en-suite and a single window to the rear elevation (first floor) to serve the bathroom.

The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match existing.

Relevant History

<u>87/D20693</u>	Two Storey Rear Extension To Dwellinghouse Grant subject to conditions
<u>20/01127/HOUS</u>	Two storey and single storey side and rear extension Withdrawn
<u>21/01772/HOUS</u>	Two-storey rear extension- Resubmission of 20/01127/HOUS Withdrawn
<u>22/01608/HOUS</u>	Two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension including canopy Withdrawn

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The only issue arising from this application is parking provision.

It would appear that the application proposals will include the loss of access to the existing garage therefore there will be an impact on parking provision. Taking into account the narrow carriageway of Phyllis Street, existing on street parking problems and the size of the extended dwelling Council standards would require the provision of two off street parking spaces. If the applicant can demonstrate adequate and viable off street parking provision Highways would raise no objection to this application.

The servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

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

Highways raise no objection to this application, subject to the requested parking provision and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties. 2 objections and 1 neutral representation were submitted, these were all . The letters raised concerns over the following:

- ☐ The close proximity of the extension to the boundary might cause subsidence.
- ☐ The potential for damage to be caused to a neighbouring property during construction.

Officer's response: These concerns are not material planning considerations.

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

Following concerns raised by the Officer in respect of the storage of bins, amended plans were submitted indicating the provision of a bin store to the front of the proposed development.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. The proposed two storey extension would incorporate a dual-pitched roof and be set sufficiently below the existing ridge. The extension would be set back 1.2m from the existing front elevation and appear subservient to the host dwelling.

Whilst there is a notable absence of bay window features along Phyllis Street, it is noted that several properties, including the adjacent property, have erected front porch extensions. This means that there is some variation to the frontages along the street. The proposed bay window extension with canopy roof above would be a proportionate scale with a window to match the existing. Therefore, it is not considered to result in undue harm to the character of the host dwelling or surrounding street scene.

The proposed extensions would be constructed in a materiality consistent with the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Paragraphs 5.11 - 5.13 of the SPD details the requirements of side extensions in order to prevent the terracing effect, requiring two storey side extensions sited within 1m of the side boundary to be set back from the front elevation by 2m at a first floor level or 1m at both a ground floor and first floor level. Given that the proposed side extension would be set back 1.2m from the existing front elevation at both ground and first floor level, it is considered that the proposed extension would not give rise to a terracing effect with the neighbouring property.

Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states “residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets.” The submitted plans confirm that a bin store would be installed to the side of the property. This would minimise any visual harm to the surrounding street scene and is considered acceptable. A condition has been applied to ensure that the bin store is installed prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.

The scale and 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 Core Strategy states that all development proposals must not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Section 4.1 of the SPD outlines the minimum spatial standards developments are required to accord with.

The proposed two storey side extension is set against the common boundary with the adjacent property at no. 50 Phyllis Street. It should be noted that the facing side elevation of the adjacent dwelling has an entrance door and one window (first floor) which appears to serve a landing. Therefore, the two storey side extension, which is set against the backdrop of the existing two storey side elevation, is not considered to unduly impact the light and outlook received by any principal windows to habitable rooms, nor would it have an overbearing impact on the enjoyment of the neighbouring gardens.

The proposed fenestration to the rear elevation is not considered to result in undue harm to the neighbouring amenity given that it serves an en-suite and a bathroom and would not project beyond the existing rear elevation.

The dwellings to the front have an existing facing distance of some 18m. The proposed bedroom window (first floor) to the front elevation is set back 1.2m from the existing front elevation and is not considered to result in undue harm to the facing neighbours beyond that which is existing.

The proposed bay window extension is not considered to overshadow or result in an undue loss of privacy to surrounding properties given its minimal projection from the front elevation and separation from neighbouring properties.

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.

In light of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and would provide a satisfactory

standard of occupier amenity for existing and future occupiers in accordance 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.”

Whilst the proposed development removes the existing side access to the garage, it is noted that the Council’s parking standards for this type of residential dwelling excludes garages. Further to this, the existing side access measures approximately 2.3m in width, which would not meet the minimum width for a car parking space outlined in paragraph 3.15 of the SPD.

The development retains the existing area of hard standing to the front which has the capacity for one off-street parking space.

Therefore, the provision of one off street parking space is in accordance with the requirements of Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS and is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:
-Location Plan. Drg no. (02)001
-Proposed Plans & Elevations. Drg no. (02)101. Rev A
-Existing Plans & Elevations. Drg no. (02)100
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

4. The extension hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the bin store has been installed in accordance with the details shown on Drg no. (02)101. Rev A. The bin store shall be retained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11/05/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	24/05/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling