

Application Number:	23/00140/HOUS
Location:	10 Broadhalgh Road Rochdale Rochdale OL11 5NJ
Proposal:	Single storey front, side and rear extension, front porch extension and alterations to existing first floor side fenestration. Resubmission of 22/00833/HOUS
Applicant:	ALISON & NIC ASPEN & GRIFFITHS
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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 10 Broadhalgh Road, a two storey semi-detached property located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale. The property benefits from sufficient garden space, an internal porch and a driveway to the side of the dwelling sufficient for two designated car parking spaces. The site faces north-east at the rear to which the dwelling currently hosts an approx. 1.8m single storey rear extension, not thought to be part of the original build. The street scene is comprised of semi-detached dwellings with a low degree of uniformity to which all would respect the traditional style appearance and typical two-storey built form.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey front, side and rear wraparound extension projecting approx. 2.3m from the front elevation, 4m from the south side elevation and 3.5m from the rear elevation. The plans also proposes the addition of a front porch measuring 0.9m from the existing internal front porch. Alteration to fenestration on the side elevation is sought to change with the existing first floor window to be reduced in length from 1m to 0.5m. Similarly, the 1.8m high window on the existing rear elevation will be reduced to 0.7m in height to make way for development.

Materials on the extension are sought to match those on the existing.

Relevant History

22/00833/HOUS

TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, FRONT PORCH EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, CONSTRUCTION OF FRONT BOUNDARY WALL AND GATE FOR VEHICLE ACCESS

REFUSE 25.11.2022

1. As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two-storey side extension fails to be subservient to the existing house and would constitute an incongruous feature in the street scene. The proposal therefore fails to constitute a satisfactory standard of design and would result in visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable.

Consultee responses

None Applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. A site notice was placed in the vicinity of the site. No letters of representation were received.

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

An amended site plan was sought to correct the inaccuracy between the proposed ground floor and the existing and proposed block plans which did not correctly show the projection of the front porch extension.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, in addition to being sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and maintaining a strong sense of place.

The SPD sets out guidance for house extensions to which it states “they should be designed to be in keeping with the host property”.

With the dwelling situated on a substantially sized plot, it is not considered the proposed extension and alteration would be an incongruous addition to a dwelling of this size given it hosts generous space to the front, side and rear. The overall design would be in keeping with the built form of the host dwelling and would appear to visually respect the massing, scale and design of the property.

It should be noted the dwelling currently features a front facing gable feature which projects approx. 2.3m forward of the rest of the dwelling at two-storey level, to which the single storey extension would project forward to match the siting. It is acknowledged the extension has been designed to not exceed the building line formed by the application property along with the attached house 12 Broadhalgh Road and the two adjacent detached dwellings to the north-west, 14 and 16 Broadhalgh Road. The dwelling to the south-east features a siting of which the orientation would be angled slightly away from the application property therefore there is no presence of a strong building line in correlation with this property and those adjacent to the south-east. However, it can be noted the single storey extension would not project beyond the front elevations of these dwellings.

With regards to the impact on the surrounding street, aforementioned above the dwellings along Broadhalgh Road and in immediate adjacent settings, Chester Avenue and Beaumonds Way, would be of varied and conspicuous designs to which the degree of uniformity would be very low therefore it is acceptable for the extension to be judged by its own merits.

Facing materials would utilize the existing use of red brick with a distinct white pointing feature on the ground floor of the existing dwelling to be in keeping with the original design. The windows would match those on the existing of white UPVC and the reduction in size to 2no windows to the side and rear elevations would be acceptable alterations given they would make way for development.

It is noted that the garage door and new porch would introduce arrangements of materials and design details which would be somewhat contemporary in appearance. Whilst the character of the house is traditional/mid-C20th, it is considered that the overall appearance of the building would not be significantly compromised by these elements of the proposed additions.

The proposed hipped roof style would match that on the existing dwelling and similarly various dwellings along Broadhalgh Road utilizing tiles to be in keeping with the existing roof. The new lean-to

roof is also thought to be an acceptable addition to the dwelling, although not on the original, the street scene is comprised of various roof styles therefore a small lean-to roof over the front porch would be deemed appropriate in this setting.

It is therefore considered the proposed extensions and alterations would constitute a satisfactory standard of design and would not unduly impact the character and appearance of the existing street scene, in accordance with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and P3 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposal is for a side and rear wraparound extension. Although the SPD does not specifically set out guidance for side extensions, Paragraph 5.6 sets out guidance for rear extensions to which it requires “a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”.

The SPD states the above distance can be increased providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining property. At 3.5m, the extension would project an additional 0.5m rearwards and would be set 0.5m from the boundary and would therefore satisfy this requirement.

In terms of effects on the neighbour’s outdoor space, while it is noted that the rear extension would be in close proximity to the shared boundary, the adjoining property hosts substantial rear garden space to which the 3.5m extension would only project a limited extent along the boundary. Therefore it is considered the rear extension will not pose a harmful visual impact or overbearing effect therefore in accordance with paragraph 5.6 of the SPD.

Additionally, high fences run along the boundary which would provide a degree of screening between the two dwellings at ground floor level therefore acceptable in residential amenity terms to 12 Broadhalgh Road.

Aforementioned above, the orientation of the dwelling to the south-east, 8 Broadhalgh Road, is angled slightly away from the application property and sited a sufficient distance away to avoid any visual intrusion as a result of the proposed works at ground floor level. Therefore the impact to 8 Broadhalgh Road would be acceptable.

The development is not thought to pose any amenity concerns to the adjacent neighbours to the rear, 2 Gloucester Court, given that the extension would be single storey level and away from the rear curtilage boundary to which 2m high fences shield the extension at ground floor level.

Whilst it is unknown what the first floor side window of the north elevation of 8 Broadhalgh Road currently hosts, the alteration to the directly facing window on the application property is not thought to pose any additional amenity concerns given that this window is existing at a larger proportion and is not a principal window to a habitable room.

Given a high partition fence runs along the common boundary between the application property and 8 Broadhalgh Road, obscurely glazed conditions were not deemed necessary for both the garage window and ground floor wet room as it was considered the fences would provide sufficient screening at ground floor level and not give rise to any loss of privacy concerns.

The dwelling has a west facing orientation to which much of the rear and side extension would gain sufficient light from the east and south. Additionally, the extension would provide sufficient outlook at the rear given the site hosts a generous rear garden which would not be largely compromised post-development.

Subject to the recommended condition, the proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The SPD Paragraph 3.15 outlines guidance for car parking to which it states "In situations where garages may be counted towards car parking provision for planning purposes, they will need to have internal dimensions of at least 5.5 meters in length and 3.5 meters in width". Proposed plans indicate internal measurements of 6.8m in length and 3.7m in width therefore well in exceedance of that required by the SPD.

Appendix 5 of the Adopted Core Strategy sets of Schedule of Parking Standards to which it requires a maximum of two spaces per dwelling (not including a garage) for a 2+ bedroomed houses outside town centres. Post development, the number of bedrooms at the property would remain unchanged and the site would host a garage and a front driveway sufficient for approx. two designated car parking spaces therefore 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. This permission relates to the following plans;
 - LOCATION PLAN
 - 22.2874.4A REV A AMENDED EXISTING AND PROPOSED BLOCK PLANS
 - 22.2874.10A PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONSand the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

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	21.03.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	06.04.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo