

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00358/HOUS**

|                                         |                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b>              | 24/00358/HOUS                                               |
| <b>Location:</b>                        | 26 Stonehill Drive, Rochdale, OL12 7JN                      |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                        | Single storey rear extension and first floor side extension |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                       | Carl & Lucy Brassington                                     |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>                    | Sam Yuen                                                    |
| <b>DETERMINATION DATE</b><br>13.06.2024 | <b>EXT OF TIME</b>                                          |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                  | <b>Grant subject to conditions</b>                          |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>Y</b> |

|                   |                                                                             |            |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>CONDITIONS</b> | <b>Pre-commencement conditions proposed?</b>                                | <b>N</b>   |
|                   | <b>Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?</b> | <b>N/A</b> |

**Location**

The application relates to no. 26 Stonehill Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Spotland. The dwelling forms part of a building line of semi-detached dwellings that are joined by attached side garages. It is adjoined by no. 24 Stonehill Drive to the east, adjoined by no. 28 Stonehill Drive to the west, and faces the highway to the south.

**Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor side extension which projects 2.46m from the side elevation of the dwelling, above the single-storey attached garage. It is set back 1m from the main front wall of the dwelling and set down 0.23m from the ridge line and is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with matching height to eaves.

A single-storey rear extension is also proposed to project 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form and has a ridge height of 3.25m and a height to eaves of 2.51m.

Additionally, the proposed plans indicate the alteration of the rear ground floor fenestration.

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

### **Relevant History**

N/A

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

N/A

### **Representations**

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One neutral representation was received with the following concerns:

- ☐ Proposal should ensure care is taken with the guttering to prevent excess water discharging into adjoining property;
- ☐ Concerns relating to access to boundary fencing in the event of a fire.

### **Officer's Comments:**

- ☐ Concerns over access to and/or damages to the neighbouring property relate to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

### **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:

## 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 135 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.”*
- ☐ 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 proposed first-floor side extension is set down below the ridge line of the dwelling and would appear subservient. The use of a dual-pitched roof would also be in keeping and raises no concerns.

- ☐ The building line is characterised by two pairs of semi-detached dwellings joined by their respective side garages. Nos. 22 and 24 are sited on a noticeably lower position to the host dwelling and no. 28. The proposed first-floor side extension would be set back from the main front wall by 1m. Having regard to the site context, it is considered the proposal would ensure sufficient visual balance of the semi-detached dwellings and not give rise to potential harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’.
- ☐ No concerns are had with the single-storey rear extension, where the built form and roof form would constitute satisfactory standards of design.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE 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 first-floor side extension does not directly face any properties and would not result in significant amenity impacts in this regard.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.6, the proposed rear extension complies with the minimum space standards set out and would not unduly harm the amenities of the adjoining rear windows.
- ☐ 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: 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 18/04/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 24.3329.SC1.3 received 18/04/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 24.3329.1A received 18/04/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 24.3329.2 received 18/04/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 24.3329.SC1.1B received 18/04/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 24.3329.SC1.2A received 18/04/2024

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 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.

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 12/06/2024  | Signed: SY     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 13/06/2024  | Signed: RK     |

Report Author Sam Yuen