

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00861/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00861/HOUS
Location:	6 Wensley Way, Rochdale, OL16 5HA
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and front porch
Applicant:	Zolfikar Khan
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 06.11.2024	EXT OF TIME
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 no. 6 Wensley Way, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of pebbledash construction located in Kingsway. The dwelling is sited on a corner plot at the junction with David Lewis Close and is adjoined by no. 8 Wensley Way to the south, adjacent to no. 4 Wensley Way to the north-west, and faces the highway to the east. The property benefits from a generous front/side garden space and front hardstanding.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 3.4m from the side elevation of the dwelling. The extension is flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling and is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form that is set down 0.56m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves.

The proposal also seeks to construct a front porch extension which projects 1.2m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form and has a ridge height of 3.17m and a height to eaves of 2.6m.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objections to this proposal. Adequate parking is retained and the development will not impact the highway.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.
- ☐ The application seeks to construct a two-storey side extension to the dwelling. The projection would be set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling which would appear subservient. The use of a dual-pitched roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ Notwithstanding the absence of setback of the proposed side extension, by virtue of its siting on a corner plot and at an angle from adjacent no. 4, it is considered the proposal is unlikely to result in a 'terracing effect' within the immediate street scene which would be acceptable.
- ☐ It is acknowledged the proposed side extension would erode the open garden space currently enjoyed between the host dwelling and adjacent no. 4. However, in the absence of a strong building line between the properties, it is considered sufficient residual space would be retained in the intervening land to maintain a sense of openness in this location. On this basis, the proposal would not result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene.
- ☐ The proposal also seeks permission for a gable-fronted porch extension. Whilst front porches are not original features of the existing dwellings within the estate and the building line is generally unbroken, it is noted the principle of front porch extension has been established elsewhere on Wensley Road (ref: 22/00780/HOUS). The proposed porch would be of a proportionate size and of a built form consistent with the apex roof style porch canopies prevalent in the surrounding estate. Given this context, the design of the

porch would not constitute undue visual harm and would be acceptable on balance.

- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate sufficient space for refuse bins to be stored away from public view behind the proposed side extension which would form acceptable arrangements.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed side extension does not project beyond the front elevation dwelling and would retain sufficient separation distance between the first-floor windows of the host dwelling and no. 5 Wensley Way. Given the open aspect nature of the front garden space of no. 4, it is considered the potential overlooking impacts from the side elevation windows would not be so great as to cause detrimental amenity harm.
- ☐ No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the front porch projection which would be acceptable.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not result in significant amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed side extension would sever the existing driveway, resulting in one residual off-street parking space. However, it is noted that on-street parking is prevalent on Wensley Way and given it is a low-trafficked highway,

it is considered the addition of on-street parking space would not give rise to undue harm to highway safety. The Council's Highways Officer has also raised no objections to the proposed plans.

- ☐ 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 06/09/2024
☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – received 06/09/2024
☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 1 received 06/09/2024
☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 2 received 06/09/2024

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint 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, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	05/11/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	05/11/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen