

Application Number:	23/01057/HOUS
Location:	29 Harbour Lane, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 4EL
Proposal:	Single storey side and single storey rear extensions
Applicant:	Mr Ged Whiting
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

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. 29 Harbour Lane, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area of Milnrow. The dwelling is located in a corner plot at the junction opposite nos. 196 - 206 Harbour Lane and no. 47 Harbour Lane. It is adjoined by no. 31 Harbour Lane to the north-east and faces the highway to the south-east. The application property shares a rear and side curtilage boundary with adjacent no. 27 Harbour Lane to the north-west. The application site consists of a front triangular-shaped curtilage and benefits from off-street parking, with a front driveway flanked by two grassed lawns on either side.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey side extension which projects 2.73m from the side elevation of the existing single-storey side extension. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 2.56m.

The application also proposes a single-storey side and rear extension which projects 1.08m from the side elevation of the dwelling and 2.93m from the rear elevation of

the existing side extension. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.16m and a height to eaves of 2.4m.

The submitted plans also indicate the bricking up of the existing garage door with a slot window.

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

Relevant History

92/D28554 - Single storey side extension to dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

79/D09966 – Replacement of garage and porch - Grant subject to conditions

22/01272/HOUS - Outbuilding – Retrospective – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

1. By virtue of its siting, form, materiality and design, the outbuilding constitutes an incongruous form of development which causes undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene. The development proposal represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The loss of the garage would have an impact on the parking provision for the extended dwelling and it is unclear from the submitted plans if development proposals include two viable off-street parking spaces which would meet Council standards. If the applicant can demonstrate that parking can be provided in line with Council standards Highways would raise no objection on this issue.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

Highways do not expect that there would be any detrimental impact on highway capacity or road safety as a result of the proposed development.

Subject to the required parking provision, Highways would raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 134 states *“development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”*
- ❑ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ❑ Policy 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 development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ❑ The host dwelling has unfortunately been subject to a substantial single-storey side and front extension which has distorted the built forms and proportions of the semi-detached dwelling. The proposed extension would project further from this enlargement and accentuate the horizontal emphasis of the dwelling, resulting in a built form which is disproportionate with the regular forms of the neighbouring dwellings along the building line.
- ❑ The use of a flat roof form and the addition of French doors and slot window to the front elevation of the side extension further contributes to the disjointed and unresolved appearance of the dwelling, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ❑ For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with the proposed lean-to side and rear extension, the built form and design of which is not considered to harm the appearance of the host dwelling.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ 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.”*

- ☐ The proposed single-storey side extension does not directly face any properties and does not project beyond the front elevation of adjacent no. 27. Thus the amenity impacts would be acceptable in this regard.
- ☐ No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the proposed side and rear extension given its small footprint and siting to the rear of the property.
- ☐ 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 would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ 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. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, built form, window proportions and design, the proposed single-storey side extension constitutes a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the dwelling, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding street scene. The proposal would not be well-designed and therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – Drawing No. HC-22051-(60)-001 received 26/09/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. HC-22051-(60)-009 received 06/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. HC-22051-(60)-0010 received 06/10/2023

- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan, Elevations and Roof Plan – Drawing No. HC-22051-(60)-006 received 09/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Roof Plan – Drawing No. HC-22051-(60)-007 received 09/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. HC-22051-(60)-008 received 26/09/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	20/05/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	17/06/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen