

Application Number:	24/00292/HOUS
Location:	135 Hereford Way, Middleton, M24 2NL
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey front extension
Applicant:	MR SMITH
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 17.05.2024	EXT OF TIME 13.06.2024
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. 135 Hereford Way, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The property faces the highway to the east, is adjoined by no. 133 Hereford Way to the south and is adjacent to no. 137 Hereford Way to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear garden of no. 66 Chelford Close. It is located on the inside of a sweeping 90 degree bend in the road and benefits from two off-street parking spaces.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part two-storey, part single-storey front and side extension. The extension would project approx. 3.13m from the existing side elevation to the front and would narrow to a width of approx. 2.44m to the rear given the skewed nature of the side boundary. At ground floor level the extension would project approx. 1m forward of the existing principal elevation with a width to the front of approx. 5.24m. At first floor level the extension would be set back from the existing principal elevation by approx. 0.5m and the ridgeline would be set down accordingly. The storage of bins is proposed to the side of the extension. Materials for construction are proposed to match the existing.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

We have no highways comments regarding this application. Adequate parking remains onsite following development.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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

Amendments have been sought to reduce the width of the extension to the front by 0.4m and to increase the setback of the extension at first floor level by 0.2m.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ 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 that development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”
- ☐ The proposed side extension would be an appropriate width and it would include a 0.5m set back at first floor level from the existing front wall with the ridgeline set down accordingly. Therefore, the proposed side extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ☐ It is noted that several dwellings in the immediate street scene have constructed extensions that project forward of the original front wall. As such, the proposed forward projection would not appear out of keeping within the street scene and would be an acceptable addition.
- ☐ Section 5.12 of SPD states that to avoid the ‘terracing effect’, 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; OR
 - (ii) 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.
- ☐ Whilst the proposed extension would not accord with this guidance, the curvature of the building line is such that the host dwelling would not significantly contribute to a terracing effect.
- ☐ The materials to be used in construction of the proposed extensions are indicated to match those used in construction of the original application property.
- ☐ The proposed bin storage arrangements would be similar to the existing and would result in bins stored in a discrete location to the side of the proposed extension.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, 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.

- ☐ Acceptable limits for residential extensions in respect of the above are quantified in the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD.
- ☐ The SPD quantifies that an extension to an adjoined dwelling must not project further than 2.4m from the common boundary point at first floor level, except where the particular site can accommodate an increase up to the limit set by drawing a 30 degree angle across the property from a point 2.4m along the shared boundary from the common boundary point at which the dwellings last meet. The proposed extension would comfortably comply with the 2.4m projection rule outlined in the SPD.
- ☐ The extension would include an en-suite window at first floor level to the rear and this window would measure approx. 8.8m to the rear boundary of the curtilage, which is short of the 10.5m standard outlined in section 4.1 of the SPD. While it is recognised that this would largely replicate existing relationships with the first floor rear facing windows, the oblique angle of the property would bring this window slightly closer to the rear boundary and so to avoid any potential loss of privacy for neighbouring properties and the host dwelling, a condition is recommended to ensure that the en-suite window is fitted with obscure glazing to be retained thereafter.
- ☐ At ground floor level the extension would include a window in the side elevation which would directly face the side elevation of no. 137 Hereford Way. However, the facing side elevation of no. 137 Hereford Way is blank at ground floor level. As such, no concerns are had regarding overlooking.
- ☐ The remaining fenestration would not breach any of the separation distances required by the SPD.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate that all habitable rooms would be supplied with adequate natural light and outlook, in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden of a functional layout.
- ☐ The proposed development would not result in a loss of amenity for neighbouring residents through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and the proposal is considered to accord with Core Strategy policy DM1 and the SPD in respect of neighbour amenity.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy gives priority to the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live in the area affected by development. Supporting this overarching policy is the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that it is important that car parking areas are designed in such a way as to prevent parked cars dominating the street scene and to prevent cars overhanging the public highway. Ample parking within the curtilage of the host dwelling is therefore a requirement of proposals for residential extensions.
- ☐ The proposal would result in a four bedroomed house with two off street parking spaces. Moreover, the Highways Authority raised no objections.
- ☐ As such it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the requirements of 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan. Dwg no. 057ROC-100
- Site And Roof Plans. Dwg no. 057ROC-101B
- Existing Plans. Dwg no. 057ROC-102
- Existing Elevations – 01. Dwg no. 057ROC-103
- Existing Elevations – 02. Dwg no. 057ROC-104
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Dwg no. 057ROC-105A
- Proposed First Floor Plan. Dwg no. 057ROC-106B
- Proposed Elevations – 01. Dwg no. 057ROC-107B
- Proposed Elevations – 02. Dwg no. 057ROC-108B

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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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 / building hereby permitted the window on the first floor rear elevation facing west shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.6m 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	04/06/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	12/06/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling