

Application Number:	22/01543/HOUS
Location:	17 Penistone Avenue Rochdale OL16 4AL
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and extension of rear garage with application of cream render to front, side and rear elevations – Retrospective
Applicant:	IMRAN ANJUM
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 17 Penistone Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the ward of Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 19 Penistone Avenue to the north-east, adjacent to no. 15 Penistone Avenue to the south-west, and faces the highway to the south-east. The side boundary of the curtilage also borders the rear curtilage of adjacent no. 21 Penistone Avenue.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a single-storey extension which projects a maximum approx. 3.3m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. The extension is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of approx. 3.4m and an eaves height of approx. 2.75m.

The development also comprises of a rear extension which projects approx. 4.58m from the rear elevation of the existing rear garage. The rear extension has a ridge height of approx. 2.35m and comprises of a flat roof to match the existing garage.

The resulting development is an extended garage that is joined with the single-storey rear extension.

The development is 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. Five supporting letters and one objection letter were received. The following concerns were raised:

- ☐ Concerns over the excessive scale of the extension;
- ☐ Concerns over the development overlooking into neighbouring properties; and
- ☐ Concerns over the garage potentially being used as a self-contained granny flat.

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ Concerns over the scale of the development are addressed under the 'Design' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns over the overlooking impacts of the development are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ 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 application proposes a single-storey rear extension which joins an existing garage and an additional rear extension, effectively creating an L-shaped building which encloses the rear garden to the northern corner of the rear curtilage. While the form of the development comprises an awkward and irregular scale and layout to the host dwelling, it is noted the extensions are not clearly visible from Penistone Avenue and Kingsway Road. Therefore, on balance, it is considered the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and visual appearance of the surrounding street scene.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension is of a single storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ❑ While the use of a lean-to roof is considered to be in keeping with the host dwelling, it is noted the single-storey rear extension comprises of a roof overhang which extends approx. 1.15m from the rear extension wall. While this would not constitute good design, it is considered the visual harm would not be significant enough for refusal due to its siting to the rear of the property.
- ❑ The application proposes cream render on all elevations of the host dwelling, including the rear extensions. As properties in the surrounding street scene also features dwellings with pebbledash and white/cream render, it is considered the proposed materials would be acceptable for this context.

- ☐ It is considered the sizing and positioning of the proposed fenestration are acceptable.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.”*
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”*
- ☐ The rear garage extension is sited approx. 8.4m away from the rear conservatory of adjacent no. 21. However, given the existing limited distance between the rear curtilage of the host dwelling and adjacent no. 21, the proposed extension being of a single-storey form, and the existing boundary fence between the properties, on balance, it is considered overlooking impact would not be substantial enough as to warrant refusal.
- ☐ Additionally, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ☐ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 2.67m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjoined no. 19. Taking into account of the roof overhang, the projection extends a total 3.82m, which would not accord with the maximum standard for attached properties. However, given the low overall height of the overhang, and reduced bulk in the absence of any elevations to the overhang, sunlight to rear-facing habitable room windows of adjacent no. 19 would be retained to a suitable extent and on balance, the development would be acceptable.
- ☐ The adjoining no. 19 comprises of a small garden space to the rear which abuts the proposed rear extension. However the most intensively used garden area is primarily sited to the side and front of the dwelling. As such, it is considered the proposed development would not cause unacceptable overbearing impacts to the occupants of no. 19.
- ☐ Along the common boundary with adjacent no. 15, the proposed rear extension and adjacent no. 15 are separated by the existing garage of the host dwelling. In addition, the proposed garage extension projects approx. 4.58m from the rear elevation of the existing garage. It is noted, however, given the existing 4m projection of the garage from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 15, and the proposed extension retaining the 2.35m height of the existing garage, it is considered the additional overbearing and overshadowing impacts would not be significant enough for refusal.

- ☐ The plans demonstrate 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, therefore the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Site Location Plan
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 22.2984.3A
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2984.2A
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2984.1B

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.

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	02/02/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	07/02/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen

