

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00976/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00976/HOUS
Location:	89 Bramhall Close Milnrow Rochdale OL16 4BY
Proposal:	Single storey side extension and alteration to fenestration to the front and rear elevations
Applicant:	ADAM LORD
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
DETERMINATION DATE 02.12.2024	EXT OF TIME
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.89 Bramhall Close, a two storey end of terrace residential property located at the end of a cul-de-sac. The dwelling faces east onto the highway, adjoining to no.91 to the north and adjacent to no.87 to the south-east. The rear and side boundary of curtilage borders a large area of green space.

Description of Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension. The proposed extension would have a mono-pitched roof. The proposed extension would be constructed using tiles and bricks (same as the existing). The proposed extension would be 3.3m wide and 8.7m in depth. The depth would be the same depth as the existing dwelling. The maximum height of the proposed extension would be 3.5m.

The proposed extension would have an external door on the rear elevation, three windows on the side elevation and no openings on the front elevation.

The application also proposes to make amendments to the host property. The applications proposes to install a new window on the ground floor front elevation to service the existing lounge room. To the rear the application proposes to replace an existing kitchen window with a smaller window and external door.

Relevant History

78/D06158	Fifty Dwellings And Public Open Space. Decision: Withdrawn.
78/D07417	18 Houses, 20 Flats And Public Open Space. Decision: Approved.
79/D08705	Residential Development (Thirty-Eight Dwellings). Decision: Approved.
21/01002/HOUS	Two-storey side extension. Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice was placed in the vicinity of the site, no responses were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

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

- The application property is a two storey end of terrace residential dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac. Although the dwelling is identified as an end of terrace dwelling, the application dwelling and the adjoining dwelling are set further back than the other two dwellings in the terrace. No. 87 and no. 85 are semi-detached dwellings set at a 90 degree angle to the application dwelling. The dwellings are set in advance of the front elevation of the application dwelling. Further east, no. 73 to 83 have a stepped layout with the frontages set further forward. As such, the proposed extension would not be clearly visible from Bramhall Close and would not be prominent. However, the proposed extension would be more visible from the green space to the rear and side.
- The proposed extension would have a mono-pitched roof. Although a dual-pitched roof with a roof form matching the application dwelling would be preferable, owing to the scale of the proposed development and its location, the mono-pitched roof would be acceptable on this occasion.
- The proposed extension is considered to represent a subservient addition to the host dwelling. The use of matching materials would help to reduce the visual amenity impact of the proposed extension and are considered to be acceptable.
- The application proposes to insert a new window on the ground floor front elevation of the host property, replace an existing window with an external door and window on the rear elevation of the host property, install a door on the rear elevation of the proposed extension and three windows on the side elevation of the proposed extension. To the front, the existing dwelling only has one external door with a window above. The addition of the window on the ground floor front elevation would reduce the mass of brick and have a positive impact on the overall design. The remaining elements of the proposal are considered to also be acceptable.

- ☐ On balance, 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

- ☐ In regards to the proposed extension, the windows would be sited to the side elevation. The nearest directly facing properties to the side are those on Buckley Chase. The distance between the properties and the proposed extension would substantially exceed the minimum distances set out in the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (SPD).
- ☐ To the front, the proposed extension would face towards the side elevation of no. 87. There are no windows on the side elevation of no. 87. Additionally, the application does not propose any windows on the front elevation. Furthermore, it is noted that no. 89 was granted planning permission for a two storey side extension in 2021. Taking note of the above, it considered that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of no 87.
- ☐ The application proposes a new window on the rear elevation of the host property. The nearest properties to the rear are those on Buckley Hill Lane. The distances retained would be the same as the existing arrangement and would exceed the minimum distances set out in the SPD.
- ☐ The application also proposes a new window on the ground floor front elevation of the host property. The window would directly face towards the side elevation of no. 83. There are no windows on the side elevation of no. 83. No. 87 is sited approximately 2.4m to the southeast from the front elevation of no. 89. Owing to the topography, no. 87 is set on lower ground than no. 89. Therefore the proposed window would be set at a height that is in between the ground floor and first floor windows on the front elevation of no. 87. Due to the offset position of the no.87 and the proposed window, views would be oblique and would not be direct views. Furthermore, it is noted that more direct views in to the windows would be attainable from windows further north of the proposed window. Further to the above, it is noted that the window could be installed under permitted development rights. In conclusion, the amenity impact of the proposed window would be no greater than the existing.

Occupier Amenity

- ☐ The proposed window on the ground floor front elevation would face the side elevation of no. 83. The distance between the window and side elevation would be approximately 15.2m. This would exceed the minimum distances set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD. Furthermore, it is noted that no. 83 is set on lower ground. In regards to no. 87, it is noted that there is a gap of approximately 2.2m between the two properties. Furthermore, it is noted that whereas the existing window faces south, the proposed window would face east. Nevertheless, on balance, the light and outlook received by the

habitable room would not be reduced in comparison to the existing arrangement to a level that would warrant a refusal.

- ☐ An adequate amount of light and outlook would be achieved for all other habitable rooms.
- ☐ The site plan displays that sufficient garden space with a functional layout would be retained.
- ☐ On balance, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or the occupiers of the application property and therefore would be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD, PfE 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:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drawing number: 21.2604.12
- Existing Details. Drawing number: 21.2604.10
- Scheme 1 - Proposed Details. Drawing number: 21.2604.11A

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, 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 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	14/11/2024	Signed: MM
Authorisation	27/11/24	Signed:LA

Report Author Majid Mir