

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01077/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01077/HOUS
Location:	275 Albert Royds Street Rochdale OL16 2TZ
Proposal:	Proposed single-storey front extension
Applicant:	Rehana Begim
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
RECOMMENDATION:	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/a
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	n/a

Location

The application relates to 275 Albert Royds Street; a semi-detached two-storey property in Belfield, Rochdale. Albert Royds Street (A664) is part of the town centre ring road and therefore accommodates a high volume of traffic. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, however opposite the site is a multi-store retail warehouse.

The applicant property and neighbouring houses sit on an elevated position overlooking large driveways and the public highway. No. 275 faces west, adjoins no. 273 to the north, and sits adjacent to no. 277 to the south. The rear boundary faces east, bordering a service road at the rear of the houses along Albert Royds Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey front extension comprising a pitched lean-to roof, two windows and an entrance. Proposed materials include red brick, concrete roof tiles, and UPVC fenestration, to match the host dwelling.

The extension would measure 7.2m (width) X 2.2m (depth) X 2.3m (eaves height) X 3.4m (maximum height).

Relevant History

16/01519/HH42 – Prior Approval not required

Prior notification for a single storey rear extension measuring 6m from the rear of original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.9m and height to the eaves is 2.4m)

16/01143/HH42- Refusal

Prior notification for single storey rear extension measuring 6m beyond the rear wall of dwelling (maximum height of extension is 3.9m and height of the eaves is 2.4m)

16/00415/HOUS – Refused

Two-storey and single-storey rear extensions.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 13/11/2024; 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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy 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. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The applicant property is part of a row of prominent semi-detached houses extending northwards along Albert Royds Street. Whilst there are some differences in design between the pairs of semis, there are some corresponding fundamental design principles including that each pair of semis has symmetrical design. In addition, none of the houses along this stretch have a front extension.

Permission is sought for a single-storey front extension spanning the entire width of the property. Bearing in mind the existing symmetry with no. 273 and that none of the properties along this stretch has a front extension, the proposed front extension would appear entirely incongruous. This would be exacerbated by its elevated position above the pavement. The proposed front extension would dominate the front of the dwelling, inherently altering its form and appearance, and therefore not appearing subservient.

Ultimately, the proposed extension would constitute a bulky and incongruous addition to the front of the property, which would undermine the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining dwelling, and would harm the character and appearance of the adjacent houses. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable in conflict with the NPPF, PfE policy JP-P1, Core Strategy policies DM1 and P3, and the SPD.

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 internal amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Whilst the SPD does not offer explicit guidance regarding porch extensions, paragraph 5.6 may be relevant as it sets maximum standards for single-storey rear extensions to ensure that they are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light, outlook, or privacy for neighbouring occupants. Paragraph 5.6 sets a maximum projection of 3m along the common boundary with the adjoining dwelling. The proposed extension would project 2.2m along the common boundary from the front elevation of the adjoining dwelling, no. 273. As such, the proposed front extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed extension would have no bearing on the existing parking arrangements and is therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation:

Refuse

1. By virtue of its poor design, the proposed front extension would be an incongruous and bulky addition to the host dwelling, which would undermine the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining dwelling, and would harm the character and appearance of the street scene by failing to remain in keeping with the design of the adjacent houses. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Council Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

Procedure statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Notes for the applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- Proposed elevations, site plan, and floor plan: 2230/2
- Location plan

	Date	Officer
--	-------------	----------------

Report Completed	11/12/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	18/12/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg