

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00493/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00493/HOUS
Location:	32 Tarnside Close, Rochdale, OL16 2QD
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Bradley
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 29.07.2024	EXT OF TIME 20.09.2024
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/A

Location

The application relates to no. 32 Tarnside Close, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a 20th century housing estate in Smallbridge. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 30 Tarnside Close to the north-west, adjacent to no. 34 Tarnside Close to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 3.2m from the side elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing side conservatory. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof which projects from the existing front-gable roof and is set down 0.73m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves.

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. No comments were received.

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:

Policy 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

Amendments

The following amendments were made in light of design concerns from the Planning Officer:

- ② Removal of the previously proposed chamfered wall and set back of the proposed side extension by 2.01m; and
- ② Set down of the proposed side extension roof from the ridge line by 0.73m.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.
- ② The proposal seeks to construct a two-storey side extension which would considerably increase the overall width and scale of the dwelling. Notwithstanding, it is noted the dwelling is sited at an angle to the adjacent no. 30, where the common boundary tapers towards the front curtilage. Given this site context, it is considered the projection would not be readily visible from the street scene and thus would not appear an overly obtrusive addition to the host dwelling.
- ② Furthermore, amendments have been made for the extension to be set back from the front main wall and set down below ridge line, which would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ② Given the spatial relationship between the host dwelling and no. 30, no potential harm arising from the 'terracing effect' has been identified.
- ② Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ② It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ② The design of the proposal would therefore be acceptable, in accordance with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE, and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② 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.”

- ② The proposed extension does not directly face any habitable room windows and thus is not considered to result in overlooking impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ② Whilst it is noted the proposed front-facing living room window is unlikely to benefit from significant levels of natural light and outlook due to its enclosed position, the amended plans indicate a reduced room depth and the retention of the rear facing windows where access to natural light to the south-west would remain. Therefore, the amenity impacts would be acceptable on balance.
- ② In addition, 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.
- ② The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the host occupants and would accord with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ② 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.”*
- ② 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 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:

- ② Location Plan – received 22/05/2024
- ② Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 10135/03 Rev. A received 19/08/2024
- ② Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 10135/01 received 22/05/2024
- ② Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 10135/02 Rev. A received 19/08/2024

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	16/09/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/09/2024	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act. If a birds nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).

Report Author Sam Yuen