

Application Number:	24/00479/HOUS
Location:	18 Links Road Heywood Rochdale OL10 2BG
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr M Khan
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to 18 Links Road, Heywood; a two-storey end of terrace property on the junction with Buttermere Avenue. No. 18 is on the western end of a short run of terraced houses which form part of a large residential estate, comprised of housing of a similar design and material palette. The area is typically suburban, with medium density housing, quiet roads, green spaces, and public amenities.

No. 18 faces south, overlooking a large front garden which wraps around to the west of the property. It is adjoined by no. 16 to the east, and the rear boundary of the curtilage faces north-west, bordering the rear garden of no. 2 Buttermere Avenue.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which would sit flush with the host property, and include a gable end, two windows to the front, and one window and a set of double doors to the western elevation. Proposed materials include red brick, concrete roof tiles, and UPVC fenestration.

The proposed measurements are as follows:

- 4.5m width

- 5m eaves height (to match the host dwelling)
- 7.5m ridge height (to match the host dwelling)
- 6.8m depth (to match the host dwelling)

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

None applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 14/06/2024; no objections were raised.

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:

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

Repositioning of fenestration from the rear to the side.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. In addition, paragraph 5.1 of the SPD state that extensions and alteration should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

In light of the above, there is concern regarding whether the extension would be subservient relative to the host dwelling. Measuring 4.5m in width, the extension would increase the total width of the property by approx. 65%. This is a significant increase to the massing of the property, and together with the fact that the extension would sit flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling, the development would not be considered subservient.

Furthermore, paragraph 5.14 of the SPD notes that extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space around the property.

Notwithstanding, paragraph 5.15 establishes several factors in determining 'sufficient space'. In this instance, the development would not extend beyond any existing building lines; it would be an acceptable distance from no. 2 Buttermere; and would not remove a space which is integral to the character of the street scene. As such, despite being a two-storey side extension to a corner plot, the site is large enough to accommodate such development whilst retaining sufficient space within its vicinity.

To this end, whilst the extension would not be subservient to the host dwelling, seeing as there is sufficient space to the side of the property to accommodate the proposed development, it wouldn't appear overbearing or incongruous. The extension would appear as a continuation of the existing terraced row and seamlessly integrate with the host. As such, the development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene.

Aside from the above, the proposed materials, roof form, and fenestration are all considered acceptable and would be in keeping with the surrounding properties.

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. 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.

The main concern relates to the potential overshadowing impact on no. 2 Buttermere Avenue. As such, a sunlight report was requested and later submitted by the applicant: '01 Existing Building Sun Study' and '02 Proposed Building Study'. The report displays that the impact of the development on overshadowing would be acceptable, with the hours during the times of the year when occupiers would be most likely to use their external private spaces minimally impacted by the proposal. Instances, where the overshadowing is noticeably different as a result of the development, are during times of the day/year when the rear garden of no. 2 Buttermere Avenue is unlikely to be frequently occupied. As such, the level of overshadowing towards neighbouring properties is deemed acceptable and would not adversely harm the existing levels of amenity.

Previous plans included an additional first-floor window and set of bi-folding doors to the rear elevation of the extension. An amendment was requested to relocate the window and door to the side elevation in order to comply with the separation distances set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD. Following the amendment, the officer is satisfied that the development meets the requirements of the SPD and protects the privacy of neighbours, as well as allowing sufficient natural light to infiltrate habitable rooms within the proposed extension.

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 bearing on the current parking arrangements and is 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: RAD/3064/24/1/RevB
- Proposed location, block, and site plan: RAD/3064/24/2/RevA
- 01 Existing Building Sun Study
- 02 Proposed Building Study

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	05/08/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	06/08/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen