

Application Number:	24/00085/HOUS
Location:	11 Alexander Drive, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3LY
Proposal:	Part-two, part-single storey side and rear extensions, single storey rear extension with balcony and balustrade. Alterations to fenestration on the ground floor front and first floor rear elevations. Addition of 1 no. roof lights to rear, removal of existing rear eaves and existing chimney together with the conversion of existing garage to living accommodation. (Part-Retrospective) - Resubmission of 23/01183/HOUS
Applicant:	Christopher Taylor
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 25.03.2024	EXT OF TIME 05/04/2024
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 11 Alexander Drive, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a residential area in Milnrow. The street scene comprises a mix of bungalows of various built forms, materiality and design. The dwelling is distinct from the surrounding dwellings through its use of stone render and a prominent front-facing gable. It is adjacent to no. 12 Alexander Drive to the south-east, adjacent to no. 10 Alexander Drive to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto Protected Open Land and the River Beal to the north-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-two, part-single storey side and rear extension which projects 2.85m from the side elevation and 2.5m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The front projection is characterised by a dual-pitched roof which is obscured behind a 3.23m-high parapet wall, whilst the rear projection comprises a hipped roof form with a ridge height of 3.78m and a height to eaves of 2.65m. The two-storey element matches the dual-pitched roof form of the host dwelling.

The application also seeks to construct a single-storey rear extension which projects 3.5m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It comprises a balcony and glass balustrades on the first floor and has a ridge height of 2.97m.

Further, the following additional works are proposed:

- ☐ Alteration of the existing garage door to windows to facilitate garage conversion;
- ☐ Alteration of the first-floor rear fenestration to a set of French doors to accommodate proposed balcony;
- ☐ Addition of one roof light to the rear roof slope;
- ☐ Removal of the existing rear eaves; and
- ☐ Removal of the existing chimney.

The application is a resubmission of a previous application (ref: 23/01183/HOUS) with amendments made to the roof forms of the side extension and the addition of 1.8m-high privacy screen to the south-east facing elevation of the proposed balcony.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

23/01183/HOUS – Part-two, part-single storey side and rear extension and single-storey rear extension with balcony and balustrade, including alterations to fenestration on ground floor front elevation and first floor rear elevation, addition of 1 no. roof lights to rear, removal of existing chimney and conversion of existing garage to living accommodation (Part-retrospective) – Refuse

Reasons for refusal

1. By virtue of its siting, massing, roof forms, and design, the front and rear gable of the proposed side and rear extension constitutes an incongruous and uncomplimentary feature which relates poorly with the existing forms of the host dwelling. The proposed development would not be well-designed and would fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its height and siting, the proposed first-floor balcony would give rise to undue overlooking into the rear amenity space of no. 12 Alexander Drive and would result in detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposals outlined would appear to have no material impact upon the highway.

Adequate off street parking remains and there is no expected changes to vehicle movements upon the highway.

Highways have no objections to these proposals.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Six supporting letters with the following comments:

- ☐ The revised plans are an improvement upon the original submission;
- ☐ The proposal is in keeping with the property and local area.

Three objection letters were received with the following concerns:

- ☐ The proposed balcony would result in loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants;
- ☐ The proposed two-storey extension would result in loss of light to the adjacent dwelling windows;
- ☐ The proposed design would not meet the requirements of the original planning permission for dwellings to be in bungalow or chalet-style houses;
- ☐ The privacy screen would result in loss of outlook and light of the adjacent habitable rooms; and
- ☐ Fitted lights on the roof terrace would shine into adjacent bedroom.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating to overlooking and overshadowing impacts of the proposed development are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ The submitted plans do not indicate external fitted lights to the proposed first-floor balcony.

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

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

Amendments

Following discussions with the applicant, the following amendments were made to the proposed plans:

- ☐ Increase of the ridge height of the proposed side extension to match the host dwelling; and
- ☐ Roof form of the single-storey front projection of the proposed side extension amended from the shallow lean to roof to a dual-pitched roof behind a parapet wall.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and*

effective landscaping” in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*

- ② Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ② Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“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, 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 revised scheme comprises a side extension with a ridge height matching the host dwelling which would better reflect the predominant pitched roof form of the property. No concerns are had with regard to any harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’, given the distinct built forms and non-uniformity of the dwellings on the street scene.
- ② The amended front projection consisting a dual-pitched roof form and parapet wall constitutes a less prominent and obtrusive addition to the dwelling than the previously proposed front gable design and would appear in keeping with the host dwelling.
- 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 Taken as a whole, the amended proposal is considered an improvement upon the original submission and constitutes a satisfactory level of design and appearance. The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PFE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:
 - ② *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

- ☐ The proposed rear extensions project 2.5m and 3.5m along the common boundary of nos. 10 and 12 respectively and is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts in this regard.
- ☐ It is noted adjacent no. 10 comprises several windows to its side elevation facing the proposed side extension. Whilst it has not been possible to ascertain the uses of such rooms, given the presence of large principle windows to the front and the rear elevation of no. 10, and the side elevation windows being obscurely-glazed, for the purposes of this assessment, the rooms are not considered as habitable rooms and are not subject to the amenity considerations under the SPD.
- ☐ The proposed also seeks to construct a first-floor balcony directly adjacent to the common boundary of no. 12 which spans the width and projection of the proposed single-storey rear extension. Section 4.4 of the SPD states balconies *“should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”* The amended plans indicate the installation of a 1.8m-high privacy screen to the south-east elevation of the balcony, which would sufficiently mitigate the previously identified overlooking harm to the rear amenity space of adjacent no. 12 and would be acceptable. Likewise, having considered the 9.89m separation distance and the potential viewpoints and line of sights, it is considered the proposed balcony would not result in unreasonable levels of overlooking to the rear amenity space of adjacent no. 10 and would be acceptable.
- ☐ No concerns are had regarding the amenity impacts of the privacy screens, given its siting to the north-west of the habitable room windows of adjacent no. 12 which would retain largely unrestricted access to natural light as well as outward views towards the north-east of the dwelling.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that 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.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ Notwithstanding the removal of the side access space, the proposal would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces for its occupants. 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 29/01/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3229.4 received 29/01/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 23.3229.1A received 29/01/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3229.5 received 29/01/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 23.3229.SC2.1E received 07/03/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3229.SC2.2F received 28/03/2024

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 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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the north-west facing elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The roof terrace hereby permitted shall not be first used until the smoked glass screens have been installed in full accordance with the details shown on the plan titled “Proposed Extensions Drawing No. 23.3229.SC2.2F” received 28/03/2024. The screens shall have an obscuration level of no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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	05/04/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	05/04/2024	Signed: RG