

Application Number:	22/01266/HOUS
Location:	119 Mitchell Street Rochdale OL12 6SH
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Jabeen Ayub
Case Officer:	Aimee Bovaird
Recommendation:	Grant/Grant subject to conditions/Refuse

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 proposed development is located at no.119 Mitchell Street which is a two storey terraced dwelling. The dwelling consists of red brick elevations and a tiled roof. The row of terraced houses are staggered and the surrounding street scene is mainly residential and consists of two storey terraced housing. The proposed development is within Spotland Conservation, in the defined urban area. It is not a listed building and does not contain any protected trees.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a single storey rear extension. This rear extension will sit under the existing cantilevered roof and will function as a porch. The rear extension will project 1.08m from the rear of the dwelling and will have a width of 3.59m. Its external elevations will be in brick.

Relevant History

21/01014/HOUS -Single storey rear extension – application withdrawn

08/D51357- First Floor Rear Extension To Dwelling - approved

92/D28453 – Single storey rear extension to dwelling - approved

21/01014/HOUS – single storey rear extension – application withdrawn

Township/Member comments

Not applicable

Consultee responses

Conservation Officer

The application site is a mid-terrace property within the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. The terrace dates from the late 20th century and is of no historical or architectural interest.

When considering any planning application that affects a conservation area, a local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). Conservation Areas are also designated heritage assets for the purposes of NPPF Chapter 16 and Rochdale CS policy P2.

In this instance the existing building has a neutral impact on the significance of the Conservation Area, and its character and appearance. The proposed extension would be a modest feature which would be seen in the context of the existing modern terrace.

Subject to a condition requiring materials to match, it would have a neutral impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset, complying with the aims of NPPF Chapter 16 and Rochdale CS policy P2. It would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with the requirements of the 1990 Act.

No heritage objections

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties and there were no responses.

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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design and heritage

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires “development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.” Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all new development must “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.”
 - ☐ The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.1 that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
 - ☐ The proposed development is considered subservient to the host dwelling as it is a small addition to the rear and will not have an effect on the overall characteristic of the property.
 - ☐ The SPD sets out space standards for single storey rear extensions in paragraph 5.6, ‘The following maximum standard will apply 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);’ This development adheres to these standards resulting in no undue loss of privacy or light.
 - ☐ The extension will be constructed in materials similar to the existing dwelling and this would maintain the character of the host dwelling and not have a negative impact on the wider street scene.
 - ☐ 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
- ☐ In addition, Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)
- ☐ Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the Borough’s heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets including consideration of their wider settings.
 - ☐ This scheme would accord with policy P2 of the Core Strategy which seeks to conserve, enhance and promote key heritage assets. As the Council’s Conservation Officer has identified a neutral impact on the significance of designated heritage assets, it is not required that any harm be weighed against their public benefit.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council’s adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss

of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.

- ☐ The proposal would not affect the amenity of the neighbours as the windows in the rear elevation are not overlooking neighbouring properties.
- ☐ The SPD sets out guidance in paragraph 5.4 'sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers.' This proposal will leave sufficient garden space in relation to the house 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

- ☐ The proposed development would not impact the current provision of off road parking available at the host dwelling. Therefore the arrangements at the application site are considered 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:-

- Site Location Plan – 21.2615.3
- Existing Elevations and Floor Plans – 21.2615.1
- Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans – 21.2614.2A

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 saved Rochdale Unitary 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 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	7/12/22	Signed: ABovaird
Authorisation	04/01/23	Signed: LA

Report Author Aimee Bovaird