

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00082/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00082/HOUS
Location:	33 Charter Street Rochdale OL16 4UD
Proposal:	First floor side and rear extensions and formation of pitched roof over existing single storey side - Re sub of 23/00394/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr Mohammed Nafees
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	no
	Contrary to previous decision?	no
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	no

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	no
	Neighbour comments received?	no

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	no
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	n/a

Location

The application relates to 33 Charter Street, Rochdale, a two-storey, semi-detached property. The property sits within a residential area on the outskirts of Rochdale town centre. Charter Street and the surrounding area comprises predominantly semi-detached housing of similar design and material palette.

The property faces south, overlooking a private forecourt and the side of 1 Berkeley Drive. Playing fields border the north and east boundaries of the property's curtilage. The adjoining property to the west is 31 Charter Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first-floor side extension above part of the existing single-storey extension, including a hipped roof and sitting flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling. A hipped roof above the remaining single-storey extension is also proposed.

The first floor side extension would measure approx. 2.3m in width and 6.6m in depth. From ground level it would measure approx. 3.4m in height to eaves and 5.2m in maximum height. It includes a double window on the front elevation. The

remaining single-storey side extension would measure approx. 1.96m in width and 6.6m in depth, with a height to eaves of 1.6m and maximum height of 2.6m.

Permission is also sought for a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, incorporating the existing single-storey extension and the proposed first-floor extension, again with a hipped roof.

At ground floor level, the rear extension measures approx. 6.2m in width, whilst at first-floor level it measures approx. 4.1m. At both levels the rear extension measures approx. 2m in depth, thus protruding approx. 1m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. From ground level the height to eaves measures approx. 3.4m, and the maximum height measure approx. 4.9m. The rear extension includes a hipped roof, and 5 additional windows – 3 on the ground floor and 2 on the first floor.

Relevant History

23/00394/HOUS- First floor side extension and two-storey rear extension – Refused

Permission was refused due to a lack of subservience in relation to the host dwelling and the adjacent property. The proposed first-floor side extension sat above the whole of the existing single-storey side extension.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 14/02/2024. No comments 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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Planning permission was refused under application 23/00394/HOUS on the basis that it was excessive in scale relative to the host dwelling and surrounding houses. Furthermore, it was considered to undermine the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property, 31 Charter Street.

The current proposal addresses some of the previous concerns by reducing the scale of the first-floor side extension to less than half the width of the host property. As such, the proposed side extension would be considered subservient to the host dwelling and appropriate in its massing and scale. Similarly, the remaining single-storey side extension appears modest and inconspicuous.

However, there remains concern that the proposed side extension would undermine the semi-detached relationship with no. 31 by reducing the existing symmetry. Policy 5.11 of the SPD refers to side extensions, stating that first-floor side extensions which extend up to the front wall of the house can harm the character of the property and the area. Policy 5.12 therefore requires first-floor side extensions to be set back 2m from the front main wall of the house, or the ground and first-floor to be set back by 1m.

Nonetheless, the officer recognises that the proposal seeks to maintain and develop around the existing single-storey side extension. As such, setting the proposed first-floor extension back by 2m would in fact lead to an awkward and complicated design requiring varying roof levels, forms, and elevations. While the proposed plans would undermine the symmetrical relationship with no.31, setting the extension back by 2m would in fact result in a more incongruous design and form.

Furthermore, as the applicant property is set away from the public highway, it isn't viewed squarely from public vantage points. Therefore, the semi-detached

relationship with no.31 is not a prominent feature of the street. Lastly, throughout Charter Street and the surrounding streets, there are numerous examples of two-storey side extensions which do not match their respective adjoining property. Whilst they do not necessarily comply with the SPD, they demonstrate a leniency and flexibility which would make it difficult to refuse the proposed development. In particular, the proposed plans are especially similar to works carried out to 1 Berkeley Drive, which are not only deemed acceptable, but also more visually prominent.

The proposed side extension is therefore acceptable and would not be an unacceptable addition to Charter Street.

Regarding the rear extension, whilst this is generally acceptable, there are some concerns with the design appearing overcomplicated and excessive. The extension projects 1m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, other than at first-floor level adjacent to no.31. This standalone set back appears awkward. Furthermore, the scale of the rear extension is not considered subservient to the host dwelling. Notwithstanding, the rear extension would not be visible from the street and there are no properties to the rear which would overlook. As such, it would not be a harmful addition to the area and would not undermine the character of the street scene.

Across all aspects of the development, the proposed fenestration is well proportioned and aligns between floor levels, whilst the hipped roof form corresponds well with the host dwelling. Alongside the matching material palette, the form and layout of the design therefore integrate well with the host property.

Overall, the design is generally acceptable and attempts to integrate with the host dwelling and alleviate previous concerns under application 23/00394/HOUS. Whilst there are concerns relating to a lack of symmetry and complications in form, the development would not harm the character or appearance of the street scene, and would not be especially visible from public vantage points. 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. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. 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.

Despite the large-scale design, the proposed development's impact on amenity is minimal as it is situated at the end of the street and lies adjacent to open playing fields rather than other properties. The proposed extension would create no loss of privacy or sunlight to 31 Charter Street or 1 Berkeley drive.

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 maximum standard of two off street parking spaces would be maintained, thus the 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:

- Proposed floor plans and site plan: 2000/2
- Proposed elevations: 2000/3
- Location plan: PP-12715474v1

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	15/03/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	21/03/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg