

Application Number:	23/01219/HOUS
Location:	4 New Field Close Rochdale OL16 2YJ
Proposal:	Single storey side/rear extension and installation of a new door and window on the side elevation - Resubmission of 23/00887/HOUS
Applicant:	Mrs Jolika Chowdhury
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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?	yes

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

Location

The application relates to 4 New Field Close, Rochdale, a semi-detached, two-storey property on a cul-de-sac. New Field Close is in a residential estate comprising houses of a similar design and material palette. The estate is characterised by medium density housing set back from the public highway, with generous space between properties.

The applicant property faces north-west, overlooking a front driveway and the public highway, and facing no.1 and no. 3 New Field Close. The adjacent property to the north-east is no. 6 New Field Close, while the adjoining property to the south-west is no. 2. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces south-east and borders no. 147 Croxton Avenue.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension. The proposed extension uses a sloped roof form, and includes a chamfered corner on the border with no. 2. Proposed materials include orange brick, brown roof tiles, and UPVC window and door frames, all to match the exterior of the host dwelling. The plans also indicate the addition of two skylights on the extension's roof, and two windows and a door on its rear elevation.

The extension measures approx. 7.22m in width, spanning the entire rear elevation of the host dwelling, and extending beyond the north-east elevation approx. 2.2m. The maximum height measures approx. 3.5m, whilst the height to eaves is approx. 2.17m.

Along the boundary with no.2, the extension measures approx. 3m to the chamfered corner, before extending an additional 1m at a 45 degree angle away from the boundary. Along the boundary with no.6, the extension measure approx. 4.8m; approx. 3.8m from the rear elevation of the host, and an additional 1m along the side elevation towards the front of the property.

Relevant History

Application 23/00887/HOUS: Single storey rear extension and installation of new door and window on existing side elevation – Withdrawn

Township/Member comments

Not applicable

Consultee responses

None

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 17/12/2023

One objection was received 08/12/2023 regarding the following issues:

- Decrease in natural light to rear garden and kitchen window given the proximity of the extension to the boundary fence.

Case officer response: addressed in the amenity section of the report

- Concern was raised that during construction, the gas, electric, and water supply could be interrupted, all of which are essential to medical equipment used by a neighbouring occupant.
- Similarly, the potential that construction works could prevent accessibility to neighbouring properties, including care workers.

Case officer response: The Council is sympathetic towards the concerns raised. Further, under The Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, however, the reasonable expectations of the applicant during the construction phase of any development are that the disruptions highlighted would not arise. In the event that any of the disruptions raised did occur, this would fall under a civil matter.

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 onto 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.

In general, the design of the extension is considered acceptable. The choice of materials and fenestration match the host dwelling, thus enhancing integration. The proposed roof form is also deemed appropriate and corresponding. Lastly, the proposed fenestration effectively breaks up the elevations to protect against continuous masses of brickwork, thus adding visual interest.

Nonetheless, there are two points of concern regarding the extension's design. Firstly, the chamfered corner appears awkward and undermines the extension's uniformity. Secondly, the extension does not appear subservient to the host, particularly as it extends beyond the northern elevation, and is thus visible from the public highway. However, regarding both issues raised, the proposal benefits from its setting to the rear of the property. The majority of the extension isn't visible from public vantage points thus would not be harmful to the street scene or character of

the area. Additionally, where the extension is visible from the road, it is well set back and appears subservient and uniform.

Overall, 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 Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Sections 5.5 to 5.7 of the SPD set out maximum standards for single storey rear extensions to ensure they are "not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers". For attached properties, a maximum standard of 3m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining property is applied. Furthermore, if the extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased at a 45 degree angle from the common boundary. Permission is sought for a rear extension measuring 3m along the common boundary with no.2 before projecting another 1m away from the boundary at a 45 degree angle. As such, the proposed extension complies with the maximum standards outlined above. By virtue of its compliance, the proposed extension is not considered to be overbearing, or to have an unacceptable impact on overshadowing or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.

In respect of no.2, whilst it is accepted that all development will result in some overshadowing, the proposed extension will not obstruct sun and daylight from an eastern, southern, or western perspective due to the host property's orientation to the north of no. 2. As such, the extension will not result in an undue loss of light to the rear of no.2.

Overall, 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 development would have no impact on the current parking arrangements, and are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

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:

- Existing and proposed plans: A01
- Location plan: 002
- Proposed site plan: 003
- Existing site plan: 002

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 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	19/12/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	09/01/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg