

Application Number:	23/00663/HOUS
Location:	95 Marland Fold Rochdale OL11 4RF
Proposal:	Part single / part two-storey rear extension including first floor terrace with glass partition walls, first floor gable extension, dormer extension to side elevations, canopy over existing garage and new primary entrance, insertion of 2no windows to side elevations and 1no rooflight and alteration to fenestration on front and side elevations.
Applicant:	Mr Richard Hagan
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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)?	N/A

Location

95 Marland Fold is detached bungalow residence located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale. The property is sited along Marland Way close to the head of the junction which adjoins to Birchfield Drive to which both streets feature residential properties with predominantly bungalows, much of which have been the subject of alteration in previous years, many of which have significantly altered their original bungalow form. The dwelling is sited between 93 and 97 Marland Fold and borders Marland Wood, a greenspace corridor, to the rear.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor gable extension along the west elevation above the existing garage including a flat roof dormer extension to the west side roof slope. Permission is also sought for an additional flat roof dormer extension to the eastern roof slope of the original roof and a central infill of roof between the two gables with solar panels. Further permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension with a continuation of the two existing gables and a first floor terrace including two balconies, a glass balustrade and three obscurely glazed glass screening panels.

The existing garage is to be converted to habitable living space and a canopy erected over the existing proposed primary entrance. The plans also proposed

alteration to fenestration on the front and side elevations as well as render to the gable extension, both dormers and two-storey rear extension.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. No letters of notification 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

Amendments sought for the application are as listed below;

- Request for the single storey rear extension at the neighbouring property to be annotated onto the site plans
- Repositioning of the ground floor bedroom window (currently used as primary entrance to the dwelling) as it would not meet Section 4 Space Standards (SPD) regarding separation distances for principal windows
- The requirement to demonstrate two viable off-street parking spaces as requested by the highways officer
- Redesigning of the materials for the three screening panels to the rear sited on the first floor terrace as the initial wooden material was deemed incongruous.
- The central roof remodelling was considered to pose incongruous visual harm therefore the central portion of the roof has been reduced in projection to lessen the impact

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new

developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape.

With regards to the scale of the proposal, it is considered that dwellings on Marland Fold and in immediately adjacent settings on Birchfield Drive, comprise a mixture of built form, scale and design therefore to add an additional gable matching the scale of that on the existing is not considered to be incongruous in this location and is therefore justified on these grounds.

The development as a collective would demonstrate good design principles and produces a development with a high quality design vernacular within this area. Whilst it is noted both the gable and two-storey rear extension cannot be described as subservient to the original dwelling, the streetscene precedent showcases many extensions which cannot be described as subservient to the original dwellinghouse therefore there is no overriding need to ensure extensions along Marland Fold are subservient if they are undergoing a significant transformation of the original dwelling. Further to this, the significant roof remodeling (set 1.6m back of the principal elevation) is considered acceptable given many dwellings along Marland Fold were not originally built with a consistent roof form however, the most dominant form of housing on the estate are bungalows with a single storey side projecting element therefore given the development seeks to retain this overall form, the roof additions, although transforming the nature of the dwelling, would still visually respect the original build.

The gable extension is considered to visually respect the scale and siting of the original single gable given the proportions would mirror that on the existing. Further to this, the dormer which is incorporated in the extension is considered acceptable by virtue of its design as it would follow design principles outlined in SPD paragraph 5.17 and match a similar scale to those found locally. The dormer to the eastern elevation is also therefore considered acceptable given it would be a duplicate of the dormer on the gable extension.

The two-storey rear extension is considered contemporary in its approach and flamboyant in its overall nature however, as previously mentioned, the dwelling borders dense woodlands to the rear therefore will not be sited in a prominent location and will be shielded from vantage points. The flat roof element of the part-single element is not considered preferable however necessary in order to facilitate the first floor terrace as a functional space. The first floor terrace at the rear is deemed acceptable on the basis there is not considered to be harmful impact to the overall visual appearance of the dwelling when viewed from prominent public vantage points. The part-two storey element of the proposal would see two continuation gables to the rear however, although the two-storey extension is not considered subservient, both gables would be set in from the side party walls therefore a reduced scale to the existing gables. The large bespoke glazed doors on the first floor rear elevation are also considered acceptable given large glazing is prominent on the existing build. Whilst the obscurely glazed 1.7m screen panels are not considered to be found locally, they are proposed to the rear therefore away from viewpoints therefore not considered to compromise the visual amenity of the dwelling.

The conversion of the existing garage to additional habitable living space is considered acceptable in the interest of the occupiers. Further to this, the canopy projecting 0.9m from the front elevation extending above both the front elevation of the converted garage and new primary entrance door is

considered acceptable and in keeping with the contemporary approach of the development. Whilst canopy's are not common along Marland Fold, many dwellings host front porches of mixed design therefore the canopy is not considered to compromise the character of the estate.

The plans propose alteration to fenestration on both the front and side elevations. The changes to the front elevation are considered to be an improvement to the existing arrangement to which it currently hosts mixed colours therefore creating inconsistencies in the visual appeal of the front facade. The existing bay central bay window is to be changed to a large double glazing glass door to be used as the primary entrance for the dwelling which is considered acceptable. All new fenestration (including alterations) are to follow a consistent design throughout the dwelling. Furthermore, it is considered the placement of the new fenestration is acceptable given they are appropriately aligned on both ground and first floor. The insertion of 1no rooflight is considered acceptable given its discreet nature on the eastern roof slope. Rooflights are also common features of dwellings in this vicinity.

The street scene does not maintain a consistent and coherent aesthetic in terms of facing materials therefore the addition of white render is considered appropriate in this setting given many dwellings have sought the addition of white render.

The addition of solar panels to the roof is considered acceptable as they are present on the existing.

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

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.

The gable extension is not considered to present any immediate residential amenity concerns given it does not host any side windows. However, taking into consideration the impact of both side dormers, the windows would both directly face the roof slopes of 93 and 97 Marland Fold. The dormer facing no.93 is considered acceptable given it would not directly face another window. The dormer on the eastern slope facing no.97 is also considered acceptable under the principle that it would not directly align with the dormer on no.97 which is obscurely glazed. Although both windows fall short of SPD separation distances, neither dormers host habitable rooms therefore acceptable.

Dwellings along Marland Fold feature a staggered siting due to the curved nature of the highway along the estate. Paragraph 5.6 outlines maximum standards for single storey rear extension:

"For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)".

It also states the above distance can be increased providing it does not exceed a 45 degree line drawn 4m from the common boundary.

With reference to the two adjacent dwellings, the plans indicate the part-single storey element of the rear extension would extend beyond the permitted 4m when measured against no.95 given the adjacent property is sited further back but would not exceed the 45 degree line when drawn 4m from the common boundary.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states:

“Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached 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)”.

Where a neighbour hosts a rear extension close to the common boundary, the 30 degree line is taken 2.4m from the rear of the extensions rear elevation. In this instance, where the adjacent dwelling, no.93, hosts a rear extension close to the common boundary, given the sufficient distance away from the boundary the part-two storey element is sited, the proposal does not exceed the 30 degree when drawn 2.4m from the boundary. Similarly to that at no.97, the part-two storey rear extension does not extend beyond the rear most elevation therefore compliant.

The footprint of the proposed dwelling would increase significantly. Despite this, the existing plot size is generous to the extent that it would retain a suitably sized rear garden area following the proposed works.

Paragraph 4.4 of the SPD acknowledges that balconies and elevated terraces can result in adverse overlooking impacts if they are located in close proximity to the boundary of the curtilage. The SPD states “They should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”

With the addition of the first floor terrace, the glass screening panels are considered to reduce any overlooking impact to the adjacent private rear garden areas therefore considered acceptable. In the interest of neighbour amenity, it is deemed necessary to attach a condition to the decision notice to specify the obscure glazing of these panels.

The proposal would see the provision of 2no ground floor windows and alterations to front and side fenestration. All habitable room windows are expected to comply with the minimum separation distance standards outlines in Section 4.1 of *the SPD* therefore no concerns are raised in this regard as all habitable rooms are to be supplied with adequate light and outlook and pose no intrusion of privacy.

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

The proposal would retain off-street parking for at least 2 vehicles following the conversion of the existing garage into a habitable room. This would exceed the maximum car parking standards contained within appendix 5 of the Core Strategy which permits a 200% parking provision at this location. Further to this, the site lies on a quiet residential road and it is not considered that the proposal would result in any undue impacts to public or highway safety. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 and the NPPF.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:-
 - Location Plan
 - Rev 1a Drawing 002 Site Plan As Proposed
 - Rev 1a Drawing 009 Roof As Proposed
 - Rev 1a Drawing 004 Ground Floor As Proposed
 - Rev 1a Drawing 005 Gf Overlay
 - Rev 1a Drawing 007 First Floor As Proposed
 - Rev 1b Drawing 011 Front Elevation As Proposed
 - Rev 1b Drawing 013 Side Garage Elevation As Proposed
 - Rev 1b Drawing 015 Rear Elevation As Proposed
 - Rev 1b Drawing 017 Side Elevation As Proposedand the development shall be carried out in complete 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 saved Rochdale Unitary 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, except as indicated on the approved plans.

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 balcony hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the glazed screens have textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter. Other than the areas enclosed by the glazed screens (indicated by timber decking on the approved plans), no part of the flat roof of the rear extension shall be occupied or used as outdoor amenity space at any time.

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	14.09.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	09.10.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo