

Application Number:	23/01126/HOUS
Location:	70 Fairway, Rochdale, OL11 3BZ
Proposal:	Part single storey/part two storey side extension, extension of existing first floor rear dormer, single storey front extension following demolition of existing side extension together with alteration to existing front driveway and addition of bin store
Applicant:	Cullen
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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

This application refers to no. 70 Fairway, a semi-detached dormer bungalow fronting Fairway in Castleton. The property is orientated northeast towards the highway and adjoins no. 72 Fairway to the southeast. The topography increases gradually in a northeasterly direction, with the result that the adjacent property, no. 68, is located on slightly lower ground. There are no properties to the rear and the land immediately to the southwest is designated Green Belt. The subject property is situated within an architecturally similar run of three pairs of semi-detached dormer bungalows.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension, which would be set flush with the existing principal elevation and include the extension of the existing rear dormer. The proposals also include a front porch extension, the erection of a timber bin store to the front of the proposed side extension and the raising of the existing paved drive to match the level of the existing gravel drive, which would be finished in gravel to match. Materials for construction of the extensions are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The proposed front porch extension would seem to impact on the current parking area, however it would appear that there is adequate residual space to accommodate two parking spaces which is the maximum that we could request.

The current servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity on the wider highway network.

Highways raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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

An amendment was sought to reduce the scale of the proposed front extension.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require new development to demonstrate 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.”*

Section 5.1 of the ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD’ states that extensions *“should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*

Section 5.11 of the SPD sets out the potential for two-storey side extensions to contribute towards a ‘terracing effect’. It states: *“Where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, which can harm the character of the property and the area. Proposals that would create this sort of ‘terracing effect’, or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.”*

As such, Section 5.12 requests that *“the first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house”* or *“the ground and first floor are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front wall of the main house”*. However, where there is no or little threat of “terracing”, exceptions can be made.

Upon visiting the application site on 21st November 2023, it was noted that the adjacent property (no. 68 Fairway) had commenced the development of a two-storey side extension which was approved on 25th September 2023 (application ref: 23/00879/HOUS). The extension to no. 68 Fairway incorporates a 1m setback from the original front elevation with the ridgeline set down accordingly. Whilst the proposed side extension under the current application would not incorporate a setback, albeit the existing front dormer would not be extended across the roof slope of the proposed side extension, it is not deemed that a setback is necessary. Given the change in ground levels, a setback would result in the awkward formation of several different ridge heights between the application property and no. 68 Fairway, which would result in undue visual harm. Furthermore, the 1m setback of the side extension to no. 68 Fairway coupled with the fact that neither side extension would include the extension of the existing front dormer would ensure that there is a clear visual break in the building line which would prevent a harmful terracing effect.

The proposed development would result in architectural balance and symmetry with the adjoining property, no. 72 Fairway, by virtue of its similar design.

The proposed front porch extension would be of an acceptable design and scale which would be reflective of the front porch extension to no. 72 Fairway. Therefore, the proposed front porch would appear in-keeping with the existing pattern of development along the street scene.

The proposed materials and architectural style would help to maintain the character of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

The proposed bin store would be in accordance with the requirements of the SPD and would ensure that bins can be stored out of view.

The proposed alterations to the existing driveway would be relatively minor and would not result in undue harm to the character of the street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and would accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires that development proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Section 5.9 of the SPD states *“planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”* The submitted plans confirm that the proposed side extension would be in accordance with the above guidance.

Section 4.1 of the SPD requires *“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.”* The proposed two storey side extension would measure approx. 25m to the front elevation of the facing property on the opposite side of Fairway (no. 67). The extension would have a 14m distance to the rear boundary of curtilage and would not face any residential properties.

The proposed side extension would be set in close proximity to the blank gable elevation of no. 68 Fairway and it is not considered that the proposed extension would have an undue impact upon the levels of amenity enjoyed by the occupants of no. 68 Fairway.

The plans confirm 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 require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the provision of which would be retained in the existing front driveway.

It is recognised that the extended driveway would be surfaced in gravel to match the other half of the drive. This would differ from the existing paved surface. Gravel isn't generally encouraged as a surfacing material as it can easily be displaced onto the highway and create an untidy appearance as well as a slip hazard. However, it is also recognised that the use of a gravel surface would be allowed under permitted development, as a permeable surface. Additionally, Highway Services have raised no concerns over its use. Taking these factors into consideration, alongside the presence of the existing gravel surface, it is considered, in this instance, it would not

be reasonable for the Council to resist the use of gravel and on balance this is considered to be an acceptable driveway surface material.

It is also noted that Highway Services have advised that the widening of the driveway would require an extension to the existing vehicle crossing, which will need separate permission from the Council as Highway Authority. In this regard it is noted that the area of driveway to be altered through this application already has a dropped footway and as such this proposal would not alter the existing situation in respect of highway access. However, the other area of driveway (with a gravel surface) is not served by a dropped crossing. A footnote can therefore be added to the decision notice advising that separate permission should be sought through the Council to secure this.

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. Dated 15th October 2023.

Existing Floor Plans and Elevations. Drg no. RG379 / EX01.

Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations. Drg no. RG379 / PL01. Revision B.

Proposed Site Plans. Drg no. RG379 / PL02. Revision B.

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. The extension hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the bin store has been installed in accordance with the details shown on drawing numbers RG379 / PL01 revision B and RG379 / PL02 revision B. The bin store shall be retained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual 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.

Footnote

It is noted that the existing driveway, specifically the area with a gravel surface, is not fully served by a dropped crossing. This is an extension to the original driveway and permission should have been sought from Highway Services to extend the vehicle crossing. You are advised to contact the Council's Highway Service on 0300 303 8879 to apply for the necessary works.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	18/12/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	19/12/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling