

Application Number:	23/00949/HOUS
Location:	32 Carnforth Square, Rochdale, OL11 2YE
Proposal:	Part two storey and part single storey rear extension - Resubmission of 22/01254/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr Shajar Abbas
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?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

Location

This application refers to a two-storey, semi-detached property located along the head of a small cul-de-sac in Castleton. Carnforth Square is comprised of five pairs of semi-detached houses constructed in red brick with hipped roof forms. The subject property benefits from a moderately sized rear garden that slopes down slightly to the rear and off-street parking to the front. It adjoins no. 34 Carnforth Square to the southeast and is adjacent to no. 30 to the north. To the rear, the site shares a common boundary with no. 1191 Manchester Road and a parcel of Green Belt land. To the west of the site there is a band of mature trees protected under TPO 016.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension that would project a maximum of 3.57m from the existing rear elevation to the ground floor and 3m to the first floor. To the ground floor the rear wall would have a chamfered edge from a point approximately 3m along the common boundary with no. 34 Carnforth Square. To the first floor the extension would have a stepped rear wall from a point 3.33m in from the common boundary with no. 34. The proposed development features a hipped roof design with a lean-to roof above the part single storey extension. The development is to be constructed in materials to match existing.

Relevant History

22/01254/HOUS

Part two, part single storey rear extension

Withdrawn

The Case Officer advised withdrawing the application because further investigation of the location and extent of the tree root systems may result in the proposals being deemed unable to be implemented.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

I am reassured that it could be possible to construct the extension without causing undue harm to trees, with the Condition that the Arboricultural Method Statement provided to inform the application (ROAVR Group, Aug 2023) is required to be implemented in full.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. 1 letter of support was received in response to the proposed development. The letter explained that the proposals will enrich the local community by bringing a derelict house back into use as a family home with an extension that is in-keeping with other local houses.

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

N/A

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.

The proposed development would constitute a large volumetric increase to the host dwelling. However, when considering the immediate context, it would not appear overbearing or disproportionate. It would feature hipped roof forms to the rear set sufficiently below the existing ridgeline and appropriate window detailing aligned at the ground and first floor levels. Further to this, the proposed development would be afforded limited visibility from the public realm.

Whilst the chamfered edge to the proposed rear wall is not considered to be good design, this aspect is situated at the rear of the dwelling at ground floor level. Given that this would not be visible from the street scene, it is not considered to result in undue harm to the character of the host dwelling or locality.

The development would be constructed in a material palette coherent with the host dwelling and is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

In light of the above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not “adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”

In particular, section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:

- ☐ “21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”

Additionally, section 5.6 states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

- ☐ “For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);

Section 5.7 explains that:

- ☐ “If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary.”

In respect of two storey rear extensions, section 5.9 states that:

- ② “Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”

The proposed part single storey extension would project a maximum of 3.57m from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling (no. 34). However, the extension tapers 45 degrees inwards at a point 3m along the common boundary in order to comply with the SPD guidance. It is not considered, therefore, that the extension would result in an undue overbearing or overshadowing impact on the adjoining dwelling.

The proposed part two storey rear extension would accord with the SPD guidance and is not considered to result in an undue overbearing or overshadowing impact on the adjoining dwelling.

In respect of the of relationship with no. 30, due to the host properties location at the end of the cul-de-sac, the houses face perpendicular with and angular boundary between the two. This oblique angle between the two properties results in the, extensions being sited further from the shared property boundary than the existing house, with the spacing between the two ensuring that there would be no harmful loss of amenity through loss of privacy or undue levels of overshadowing.

The extension would also be in close proximity to the side/rear boundary of the curtilage, which borders the rear garden of no. 1191 Manchester Road. However, it is noted that no. 1191 Manchester Road is set within a substantial wrap-around curtilage, with its side elevation measuring some 40m from the application property. Additionally, the dense foliage and band of protected mature trees located between the properties ensures any overlooking would be limited and not unduly harmful.

The proposals indicate that all habitable rooms would receive sufficient natural light and that a 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.

In view of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed development accords with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The existing off-street parking arrangements would not be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, the proposals would be in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Council's Core Strategy, which requires a maximum of 2 car parking spaces for a dwelling of this size.

Trees: G6 and G7

Policy G6 of the Core Strategy states that it is important to protect and improve green spaces and to maximise their contribution to sustainable development. Policy G7 of the CS makes clear that sites and features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection.

In the supporting Tree Report, eight off-site trees have been identified on the edge of the site boundary. The report states that the proposed development encroaches into the radial root protection areas of T1, T2, T3 and T4 (protected under TPO016).

However, it is considered by the Council's Tree Officer that it could be possible to construct the extension without causing undue harm to trees.

To ensure the protection of the trees, a condition is applied which requires that the Arboricultural Method Statement provided to inform the application is implemented in full.

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
 - Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Site Plan. Drg no. 1943/1
 - Proposed Floor Plans. Drg no. 1943/2
 - Proposed Elevations and Site Plan. Drg no. 1943/3

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 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 development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the tree protection measures set out in the 'Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment' reference 23_5837_02_35 produced by ROAVR Group dated 23 August 2023.

Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with policy G7 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	19.10.2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	24/10/2023	Signed: RC

Informative:

The following British Standards should be referred to:

- a) BS: 3998:2010 Tree work – Recommendations
- b) BS: 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to demolition, design and construction - Recommendations

Report Author Bob Melling