

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00887/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00887/HOUS
Location:	280 Hollin Lane, Middleton, M24 5LE
Proposal:	First floor front extension, alterations and additions to roof including pitched roofs over existing flat roofs, alterations to fenestration and canopy roof over entrance door
Applicant:	Mr Aamir Zia
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 17.01.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 280 Hollin Lane, a two-storey, detached dwelling fronting a key arterial thoroughfare connecting Heywood and Middleton. The application site is a prominent corner plot at the junction of Hollin Lane and Hazelhurst Drive. The property faces Hollin Lane to the west and is adjacent to no. 278 Hollin Lane to the south. The rear boundary of curtilage is shared with no. 19 Rosethorns Close. The application property is set further back from the highway than the adjacent dwelling and benefits from a spacious, wraparound curtilage. It has been variously extended over time including two-storey side extensions with flat roof forms to the side and rear.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor front extension and alterations to the main roof including the formation of pitched roofs over the existing flat roofs. The proposals also include the formation of an additional canted bay window at ground floor level to the front elevation and the erection of a gable-style canopy roof with supporting

pillars above the existing front door. There would be various alterations to the existing fenestration across the front, side (north-facing) and rear elevations. Materials for construction would match those used in the exterior of the existing building, including brickwork to the front elevation at ground floor level with render at first floor level.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice posted in the vicinity. No comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2024
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

Amendments

Amendments were sought to alter the design of the supporting structure for the proposed canopy roof and reduce the amount of render to the front elevation.

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.”

Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) 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.”

Policies 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 proposed first floor extension would be designed with a forward facing gable that would mirror the original gable. The SPD requires extensions to generally appear subservient to the host property, as such, in most cases, two storey or first floor extensions are required to be set back from the front elevation with a lowered ridge height to denote a degree of subservience and to preserve the design of the original dwelling.

However, in this instance, the effect of the proposed extension would provide a degree of symmetry to the front elevation. Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension would not be subservient or preserve the design of the original dwelling, the resulting appearance of the dwelling with the proposed extension is not considered to constitute poor design. Furthermore, the proposals would result in the removal of the incongruous flat roofs, which would be replaced by pitched roofs. This would create a more consistent roof shape in keeping with the street scene.

Lastly, it should be noted that there is a low degree of architectural uniformity to the building line, which would further lessen the impact of the proposed design. Therefore, it is not considered that the lack of subservience would warrant the refusal of the application in this instance.

The proposed canted bay window at ground floor level would be a well-designed addition and the replacement of the decorative stone detailing to the front elevation would also enhance the visual appearance of the property.

The proposed front canopy would be a modest addition that not appear dominant, particularly given the setback of the host dwelling from the building line.

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

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which requires that development proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

The proposed extension would comply with the projection limits for first floor extensions set out in Section 5.9 of the SPD. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in undue harm to the amenity of no. 178 Hollin Lane.

Section 4.1 of the SPD outlines a series of minimum separation distances that all new developments should comply with in order to avoid an undue loss of light, outlook and privacy for neighbouring residents. The proposed development would comply with these distances and no concerns are had in this regard.

While the proposed alterations to the main roof and the subsequent increase in massing would likely have some impact on the occupants of no. 278 Hollin Lane, it is not considered that this impact would result in an undue level of harm beyond that which already exists as a result of the current extensions. Furthermore, the application property is located directly to the north of no. 278, which would lessen any potential loss of natural light.

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 is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

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. Dated 10/09/2024
- Existing Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Drwg No. 01. Floor Plans & Elevations. Revision 1
- Drwg No. 02. Proposed ground floor plan. Revision 0

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with drawing 01 revision 1 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	09/01/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	15/01/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling