

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0538
Location: 94 ANDOVER AVENUE, MIDDLETON, MANCHESTER, M24 1JN
Proposal: Single storey rear extension, garage conversion and front porch
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Sam Yuen

LOCATION

The application relates to no. 94 Andover Avenue, a two-storey detached dwelling located in Alkrington. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 92 Andover Avenue to the south and faces the highway to the north-west. Notably, the plot is sited perpendicular to a row of terraced dwellings comprising nos. 96-106 Andover Avenue. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the side curtilage of no. 148 Andover Avenue to the south-east. As it stands, the dwelling comprises a single-storey attached garage to the side.

PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements and alterations to the host dwelling:

- A single-storey rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a flat roof and has a ridge height of 2.87m.
- A front porch extension measuring 2.8m in width by 1.77m in depth. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3m and a height to eaves of 2.44m.
- Garage conversion including alteration to roof and front elevation fenestration.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

RELEVANT HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Five objection letters and one neutral letter were received with the following representations:

- The proposed first-floor extension would result in overbearing impact and loss of outlook to the adjacent property's outdoor amenity space.
- The proposed first-floor extension would result in overshadowing and loss of natural light to the neighbouring garden space and windows.
- The proposal would result in loss of privacy to neighbouring property.
- The scale, height and massing of the proposed first-floor extension would be out of character with the pattern of development in the area and would be a disproportionate and incongruous addition that harms the character of the area.
- The cumulative impact of the extensions would diminish the enjoyment of the adjacent property through its oppressive impact.
- The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the plot.
- The proposal should be subject to a daylight and sunlight assessment.
- The alleyway adjoining the host property serves as refuse bin access and means of fire escape and should not be blocked during building work.

Officer's Comments:

- Concerns relating to overbearing, overshadowing impacts and loss of outlook are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- Concerns relating to the visual amenity of the proposal are addressed under the 'Design' heading of the report.
- The Residential SPD contains guidance on amenity impact and space standards and is a material planning considerations for proposals of housing extensions. The LPA does not consider the submission of a daylight and sunlight assessment to be necessary for the scope of this proposal.
- Concerns over access to and/or damages to the neighbouring property relate to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

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:

Policy 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

Following concerns regarding the amenity impacts of the first-floor side extension, amendments were made to omit this enlargement from the proposed plans. Amendments were also made to alter the roof form of the proposed porch from a gable-fronted to lean-to form.

DESIGN

The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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 applicant has accepted amendments to omit the previously proposed first-floor side extension. As such, previous objections to the extension relating to visual harm can be removed.

The proposed porch would introduce a new addition to the front of the dwelling. Having regard to the surrounding street scene, which is characterised by a number of similarly sized front

porch extensions, it is considered the proposed porch would not represent an obtrusive and incongruous addition to the dwelling. The applicant has also accepted amendment to alter the roof form to a lean-to roof, which would be akin to the form of the original porch canopy. As such, the addition would not appear out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable.

The proposed rear extension would be of a single-storey form and would be subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a flat roof form, whilst at odds with established roof forms in the area, would not be readily visible from the highway and would not amount to unacceptable levels of visual harm to the surrounding area.

Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling and would be designed appropriately for this context.

It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and the NPPF.

AMENITY

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

As discussed previously, the applicant has accepted amendments to omit the previously proposed first-floor side extension. As such, no concerns are had regarding the amenity impacts to the north-facing properties.

Given that the proposals relate to a rear extension, paragraph 5.6 of the SPD is engaged to which both the proposed single-storey rear extension and front porch extension comply with these requirements, and therefore it is not considered the proposals would not result in undue levels of overshadowing to no.92.

In respect of adjacent properties set perpendicular to the north, paragraph 4.1 of the SPD typically expects 10m between a principal window to a habitable room which faces a single storey elevation. It is noted that the proposals would fall approximately 2m short of this standard in respect of the relationship between the proposed rear extension and no.102, however having regard to the impact of the existing dwelling, the modest overall height and that this shortfall only results due to no.102's own conservatory extension, such harm is limited. Notwithstanding, whilst this matter does form a material consideration, it is considered that developments which result in a greater massing against this boundary are likely achievable under permitted development rights and therefore it is not considered that there exists any good reason to refuse planning permission.

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 Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

The proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property and is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that any conditions imposed on the original permission remain in force other than as expressly hereby varied and development must be started in accordance with Section 73(5) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Location Plan - received 12/06/2026
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan - drawing no. 502 received 12/06/2026
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 0E1 received 12/06/2026
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 0P1 Rev. 1 received 25/06/2026

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted 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 the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale

Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.