

Application Number:	24/00066/HOUS
Location:	1 Clifton Road Middleton M24 2RD
Proposal:	Two-storey side, single-storey rear, single-storey front porch extension. Alteration to fenestration on front and rear elevations and alteration to boundary treatments.
Applicant:	Mr Craig 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?	YES

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

Location

The application relates to no.1 Clifton Road, a two-storey semi-detached post war dwelling set at the junction of Clifton Road and Church Avenue in the Slattcoks area of the borough. The site faces east towards the highway, beyond which are dwelling arranged along Church Avenue, and even further beyond is the Grade II listed St John's Church. The site has recently been taken out of the Green Belt by virtue of the adoption of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan as it abuts the JPA.2 Stakehill allocation.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the following works:

- A single- storey rear extension with a pitched roof comprised of red brick and grey slate roof tiles, including a set of bi-folding doors on the southern elevation. The rear extension would measure approx. 4m in depth, 3.6m in with, 2.2m in height to eaves, and 3.5m in maximum height.

- A two-storey side extension with a hipped roof, comprised of red brick and grey slate roof tiles. The side extension would accommodate a garage and include additional fenestration to the front, side, and rear of the property. The side extension would measure approx. 3.8m in width, taking the total width from 5.15 to 8.95m. The side extension would sit flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling and integrate with the existing hipped roof form.
- A single-storey front porch extension with a hipped roof, comprised of red brick and grey roof tiles, and including a UPVS front door. The front porch extension would project 1m forward, measuring approx. 2.3m in width, 2.2m in height to eaves, and 3.2m in maximum height.
- Alterations to the boundary treatment, including the erection of a timber fence between brick columns atop the existing boundary wall along the western and southern boundary, taking the total height to 1.85m. In addition, removing the existing boundary wall on the corner between Clifton Road and Church Avenue and dropping the curb to create a new vehicle entrance.
- A new permeable driveway with vehicle parking and a new pedestrian access.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering 11/03/2024:

The proposals made in this application will have no significant impact upon the highway.

We have no highways objections to this proposal.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 06/03/2024.

One letter of support was received.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes onto state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Permission is sought for a two-storey side, single-storey rear, and front porch extensions. In light of the above policy, the main concern is that that proposed works would not be subservient, seeing as they would significantly increase the footprint of the building. In particular, the two-storey side extension may not appear subservient to the host dwelling as it would sit flush with the principle elevation and increase the

width by approx. 73%. Notwithstanding, the scale of development is considered appropriate as there is an abundance of space around the side of the property, and because the adjoining property have extended in a similar way.

Paragraph 5.14 states that planning permission will only be granted to side extensions on a corner plot where sufficient space is maintained to the boundary. The proposed works would result in a separation distance of 1.6m to the boundary along Church Avenue. This is considered sufficient in terms of retaining an acceptable amount of space around the side of the property. In addition, the other properties which border Church Avenue, including 866 Rochdale Road and 1-7 Church Avenue, are set closer to the public highway than the applicant property, thus allowing scope to extend without projecting beyond any existing building lines.

Generally with side extensions, subservience is achieved by setting them back from the principle elevation of the house. Subservience is especially key for side extensions to semi-detached dwellings where it is important to protect the symmetrical form of the adjoining properties. However, in this instance no. 3 have a side extension which sits flush with the principle elevation and projects 3.8m. The proposed side extension would simply match no.3's extension and would in fact reinstate the symmetrical relationship between the properties. The same is true of the proposed front porch extension, which again would mirror no.3's porch extension, and others seen along Clifton Road. As such, on balance, the specific context and material considerations in relation to this application mean that the proposals would be acceptable in this regard.

Aside from matters relating to subservience, the proposed side extension follows a uniform design with an acceptable roof form, matching materials, and suitably arranged fenestration.

Regarding the proposed single-storey rear extension, this would be a modest addition with a suitable roof form, fenestration and material palette. It would integrate well with the host dwelling and respond to the character of the surrounding properties, particularly those with similar single-storey rear extensions.

The proposed boundary treatment includes a timber fence separated by brick columns atop the existing brick wall along Church Avenue and the rear alley way. The maximum height would increase to 1.85m. Taller boundary treatments such as this are not commonplace along Church Avenue. However, the proposed boundary retains much of the original red brick, therefore responding well to the character of the area. Furthermore, in the interest of occupier privacy, it is considered acceptable to have a boundary treatment which reduces visibility to the rear of the house.

Overall, 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

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.'

Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD establishes minimum separation distances between new and established residential developments in the interest of protecting residential amenity. This includes 21m between facing principle windows of habitable rooms at an upper floor level. The proposed two-storey side extension includes a master bedroom window at the front of the property with a separation distance of 18m to 1 Church Avenue. However, the existing relationship between the two properties currently involves a separation distance of 18m between habitable room windows at first floor level. As such, the proposed side extension would not “detract from the general levels of privacy and amenity typical in the area”, as deemed acceptable under paragraph 4.3 of the SPD.

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD similarly sets a maximum standard for single-storey rear extensions; a point 3m along the common boundary with any adjoining property, taken from the rear- including extensions- of the adjoining property. No. 3 has an existing single-storey extension. The proposed single-storey extension measures 4m in depth, therefore projecting approx. 1m beyond the neighbour’s rear extension. By virtue of its compliance, the proposed rear extension is considered acceptable in the interests of residential amenity and would not unacceptably undermine occupier privacy or outlook.

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 plans include alterations to the front driveway, allowing vehicular access and accommodating 2 off-street parking spaces. The Council’s Highways Officer was therefore consulted yet raised no concerns. Additionally, the driveway would meet the statutory maximum standard of two off-street parking space. 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Proposed roof and floor plans: B1-ZZ-DR-A-2000
- Existing and proposed site plan: SI- 00-DR-A-0800
- Proposed elevations: B1-ZZ-DR-A-3000
- Location plan

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 proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	29/04/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	01/05/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg