

Application Number:	23/01389/HOUS
Location:	22 Farnley Close Rochdale OL12 7SQ
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension and alteration to fenestration to front and side elevations following demolition of existing rear conservatory
Applicant:	DAVID SALISBURY
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 16.02.2024	EXT OF TIME 27.02.2024
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?	NO

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

Location

22 Farnley Close is a detached bungalow residence sited within the Norden ward of Rochdale and a cluster of 3no dwellings of similar properties. The dwelling benefits from generous amenity space and a detached double garage located southeast of the main dwellinghouse as well as a driveway to the front of the dwelling.

The property is sited south of no.20 Farnley Close and the southern and rear curtilage borders the rear gardens of both nos. 9 and 11 Albury Close.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension with a staggered "L" shape projection measuring 4.8m from the rear elevation along the northern elevation and 9.4m at its longest projection. The extension would span 8.2m in length and would peak 0.3m above the existing ridge

The extension is to be constructed in matching materials to the main dwellinghouse with hipped roofs.

Relevant History

79/D08816 Outline application for residential development
Granted December 1979

86/D19327 Residential development – 50 dwellinghouses
Granted August 1986

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding occupiers. One letter of neutral representation was received.

Neutral Representation

No plans available on public website

Officer Response The neighbour was contacted following upload of the documents for their viewing.

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

Amendments were sought for the reducing of the initially proposed roof ridge which sat above the roof ridge of the main dwellinghouse in order to obscure the development from public viewpoints where necessary.

Seeking consistency between the set of plans, further amendments were sought for so the existing dwelling was represented the same within all plans.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states house extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property whilst generally being subservient to it.

Paragraph 53 of the National Design Guide outlines that well-designed new development should consider "the composition of street scenes, individual buildings and their elements;" as well as "façade design, such as the degree of symmetry, variety, the pattern and proportions of windows and doors, and their details;"

It is first acknowledged the development can be considered visibly contrary to the above guidance by virtue of the lack of visual subservience against the main dwellinghouse however, the dwelling itself is one of three similar properties of which they are sited at the head of a cul-de-sac with no through access with the adjacent two dwellings having previously been extended to the side with no set down from the existing ridge. Whilst it is noted the implementations of both of these additions significantly pre-date the current SPD, Core Strategy and NPPF, it is not considered prudent to warrant a refusal for the lack of subservience in this location given the harm is not considered to be so significant where development is to the rear and a precedent is already set.

The massing of the dwelling would increase significantly post-implementation of the proposed works. However, the development will not be easily visible to the common observer and would therefore not unduly impact the street scene in a negative way as a result of this. Minor limitations of extending at the south side and rear would arise from its siting within the plot therefore the extent of development is not considered to be so problematic given it would maximize internal space relative to the size of the plot.

The proposed window proportions would closely match those on the existing and would be relatively consistent throughout the dwelling with the exception of the vertically elongated windows and bi-folding doors to the rear and side elevation of the extension. Where it is considered this is an attempt at maximizing light flow through to the existing dwelling, this is not considered to be of concern.

The material palette of the development would match that on the main dwellinghouse therefore considered to visually respect the appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area.

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 property is detached therefore affords excess space around the dwelling to extend. Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets out maximum standards 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);
- For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

The plot is sited within a relatively small cul-de-sac therefore is not sited in line with surrounding neighbours. The two adjacent properties, no.20 Farnley Close and no.11 Albury Drive are considered to be sited a sufficient distance away from the development to not be of any concern.

The rear curtilage borders the rear garden of no.9 Albury Drive to which the rear elevation of the extension at its greatest projection from the dwelling would be 15.7m from the rear boundary therefore considered a sufficient distance away from the rear boundary to not pose any overlooking to the adjacent rear garden.

Section 4 of the SPD sets out minimum separation distances for principal windows which the works are considered to be in accordance with where necessary. Where additional side windows directly face the common boundary shared with no.20 Farnley Close, no concern is raised by virtue of the siting of the large detached

garage and foliage which sit on the boundary and provides a degree of screening. Similarly with the windows proposed to the south side of the extension directly facing the rear garden of no.11 Albury Close where a principal window is proposed, the foliage running along the boundary provides a sufficient degree of screening to protect the amenity of both occupiers.

Sufficient light and outlook is to be retained to all rooms within the existing house as well as those within the extension where appropriate.

The plot is large and therefore affords generous amenity space at the rear. Post-development, much of this space will be retained as a functional and open layout for the enjoyment of the occupiers.

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

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
 - 23.3176.3B Existing & Proposed Block Plans
 - 23.3176.SC5.2 Scheme 5 Proposed Elevations
 - 23.3176.SC5.1 Proposed Scheme 5 Ground Floor Planand the development shall be carried out in complete 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 saved Rochdale Unitary 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 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	07.02.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	27.02.2024	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo