

Application Number:	23/00394/HOUS
Location:	33 Charter Street Rochdale OL16 4UD
Proposal:	First floor side extension and two-storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Mohammed Nafees
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Refuse

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?	N/A
	Neighbour comments received?	NO

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

Location

The application relates to 33 Charter Street, Rochdale, a two-storey, semi-detached property. The property sits within a residential area on the outskirts of Rochdale town centre. Charter Street and the surrounding area comprises similar semi-detached houses. Playing fields border the north and east boundaries of the curtilage of the property. The adjoining property to the west is 31 Charter Street, and opposite the front south facing elevation is the side elevation of Berkeley drive.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor side extension and a two-storey rear extension.

The proposed first floor side extension sits atop the existing ground-floor extension. From the top of the existing extension, the height to eaves of the proposed extension measures approx. 2.2m, whilst the maximum height measure 4.9m. From ground level this would make the combined side extension 4.9m in the height to eaves, and 7.5m maximum height. The width of the side extension measure approx. 6.2m.

The proposed two-storey rear extension will sit behind the proposed side extension. The width measures approx. 6.3m; the height to eaves measure approx. 4.9m and the maximum height measures approx. 7m. The proposed rear extension will sit flush

with the existing ground floor rear extension but will protrude forward of the existing first floor rear elevation.

The combined depth of the side and rear extension will measure approx. 6.7m.

The proposal includes a door at ground level on the side elevation; ground-floor and first floor windows at the front and rear elevations to match the existing windows; and one window at first-floor level on the side elevation.

Relevant History

82/D14258 – Private double garage granted subject to conditions.

Township/Member comments

none

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the relevant properties 03/05/2023

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policies P1, P3 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
- ❑ Permission is sought for a first-floor side extension which sits atop the existing ground floor extension. When combined, the existing and proposed extensions would result in development which is excessive in scale, and would dominate the host dwelling. The combined additional development would be larger than the original host dwelling, creating an incongruous and dominant extension. The proposal would detract from the architectural qualities of the property which is well proportioned, and the symmetrical relationship shared with the adjoining property. It is noted that there are two-storey side extensions on neighbouring properties however, these extensions are much smaller in size than that proposed within this application.
- ❑ As the rear extension integrates into the side extension, similar issues pertaining to scale and massing apply. The proposed extension projects beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling at first-floor level producing a wholly disproportionate massing within the context of the surrounding area. It is noted that dense evergreen vegetation lines the boundary shared with the adjacent park, however it is still considered that the overall scale and massing would be visible from select vantage points within the park, harming the general level of visual amenity in this area.
- ❑ The proposed materials, fenestration and roof form are all appropriate and sympathetic to the existing property and wider street-scene.
- ❑ The proposed side and rear extensions, both combined and separately, constitute design which is excessive in scale and would not sit sympathetically within the surrounding context. The proposal is therefore not well-designed and planning permission should be refused as per paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Despite the large-scale design, the proposed development's impact on amenity is minimal as it is situated at the end of the street and lies adjacent to open playing fields rather than other properties. The proposed extension would create no loss of privacy or sunlight to 31 Charter Street or 1 Berkeley

drive. Similarly, due to the separation to surrounding dwellings, no concerns are had in respect of a loss of privacy.

- ☐ 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

- ☐ The proposed extension would not result in the loss of any off-street parking, and the maximum standard of 2 spaces is retained.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

- ☐ By reason of its excessive scale and massing, the proposed extensions would constitute a wholly disproportionate addition to the host dwelling which would appear conspicuous and incongruous from public vantage points along Charter Street and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, the proposals would not be well-designed and therefore fails to comply with the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

Notes for the applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, the application relates to the following drawings:

Proposed floor and site plan: 200/2

Proposed elevations: 200/3

Existing floor plan and site plan: 200/1

Location plan

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/06/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	28/06/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg

