

Application Number:	23/00783/HOUS
Location:	12 Hector Avenue, Rochdale OL16 2LE
Proposal:	Part single storey part two storey rear extension.
Applicant:	MR ZAHID SHAH
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)?	no

Location

The application relates to 12 Hector Avenue, a two-storey terrace property in a residential suburb of Rochdale town centre. Hector Avenue is one of several terrace streets in the area dating back to the mid-twentieth century. The applicant property faces north east, sitting flush with the pavement and overlooking Hey Brook and its river banks. The adjoining properties are no. 10 to the west and no. 14 to the east. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces south west and borders a passageway serving the rear of properties along Hector Avenue and Oswald Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part single storey, part two-storey rear extension with a hipped gable roof. The ground floor element includes a sloped roof. The proposed extension would be comprised of red brick, grey roof slate tiles, and UPVC window frames and doors to match the host dwelling. Alterations to fenestration include the addition of a first floor window on the south west elevation and two windows and a door at ground floor level on the west facing elevation.

The extension measures approx. 2.7m in width. The two-storey element measures approx. 2m in depth, 6m in height to eaves, and 6.8m in maximum height. The ground floor element measures approx. 4.5m in depth, 2.3m in height to eaves, and 3.3m in maximum height.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Drainage officer 30/10/2023:

Because the area of the extension is located within flood zone 2, a flood risk assessment report was requested (by planning). I think that the flood risk area is caused by Hey brook having been channelled a long time ago. The only flood 'complaint' that I've seen in the last 6 years is cellar water ingress for a property on a nearby street.

The construction of an extension, similar to those others that have been done will have no effect on whether the risk of flooding is likely or not. Roof drainage and sewage of these properties, in this densely populated area is dealt with entirely by combined public sewer.

For the reasons provided above:- I do not think there is a need to provide a Drainage Condition. From a drainage viewpoint, I have no objection to the extensions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 13/12/2023; no responses 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 onto 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.

Considering the above policy, the proposed development is deemed to be in accordance by virtue of its design. The combined elements integrate well with the host dwelling due to their corresponding form and layout and matching material palette. Additionally, the proposed development remains subservient to the host property and does not result in a significant departure from the property's original architectural design.

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 occupants 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.

Maximum standards

To ensure that single-storey rear extensions "are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers," paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets a maximum standard of "3m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling". At ground-floor level, the proposed extension would project approx. 1.9m beyond the rear elevation of no.10, and would not project beyond the rear elevation of no.14. Regarding two-storey rear extensions, paragraph 5.8 of the SPD sets a maximum standard of 2.4m measured "along the

common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling". At first floor level, the extension would project approx. 2.2m beyond the rear elevations of both no.10 and no.14. As such, the proposed extension complies with the maximum standards set out by the SPD for single-storey and two-storey rear extensions. By virtue of its compliance, the proposed extension would not be considered to adversely undermine the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Space standards

In addition, the Council's SPD sets out minimum space standards between new development and surrounding properties. Paragraph 4.1 requests a minimum of:

- 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;
- 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
- 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

The distance between the proposed rear first floor window and the rear elevation of no.47 Oswald Street would measure approx. 7.73m. Furthermore, the rear first floor window of no.47 Oswald Street serves a habitable room, which according to the SPD, refers to "spaces within a home where the occupants are likely to spend significant amounts of time", such as living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms. As such, the proposed extension does not comply with paragraph 4.1 of the SPD.

However, the proposed rear first floor window serves a bathroom, which is not considered a habitable room. As such, the privacy of occupants of no.47 Oswald Street would not be undermined. To further ensure protection of privacy, an obscurely glazed window will be required by condition for the first floor bathroom.

Regarding the impact on outlook for neighbouring properties, the maximum distance between the rear elevations of properties along Oswald Street and Hector Avenue is approx. 11.4m. As such, the existing arrangement between properties is one of high density whereby principle windows are overlooking and do not comply with the above space standards. Therefore, the proposed development would not be considered to create any additional harm, or inherently alter the existing relationship with properties along Oswald Street.

Garden space

Paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that "it is important that sufficient garden space is retained", and that "an extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable." The proposed extension would occupy the majority of the existing rear garden, leaving approx. 57m squared of available garden space. Whilst this would not be sufficient, the existing garden space, which measure approx. 7.6m squared is not considered to be particularly valuable. The rear garden is north facing and densely surrounded by neighbouring properties, meaning it receives minimal sunlight and isn't especially private. Furthermore, the applicant property sits

approx. 60m south west of a playing field and sports pitch, and less than 1km from Roch Wood Nature Park. Therefore, there is available green space in close proximity to compensate for the loss of garden space.

Overall, while the proposed extension would contradict aspects of the SPD, particularly regarding space standards, the existing relationship between neighbouring properties is congested, thus it would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties beyond the current arrangement. Therefore, the proposed extension is considered to be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development will have no impact on the current parking arrangements which currently include no off street parking spaces. Therefore, the development is acceptable and 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:

- Updated block plans
- Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations
- Location plan

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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby approved, the first floor window on the south facing elevation hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass, which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent), and shall be non-opening below 1.7m from the internal floor level. The windows shall be 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.

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	08/01/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	11/01/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg