

Application Number:	22/01087/HOUS
Location:	Hawthorn Terrace 206 Broad Lane Rochdale OL16 4PU
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension, alteration to fenestration to existing rear extension and to rear steps leading to garden, following removal of first floor rear balcony and insertion of a window
Applicant:	Mr Andy Seth
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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. 206 Broad Lane, also known as Hawthorn Terrace, a two-storey late-19th century terraced house in Burnedge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 204 Broad Lane to the south-east, adjoined by no. 208 Broad Lane to the north-west, and faces the highways to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders no. 6 Verdant Way to the north-east. The dwelling is identified as a non-designated heritage asset, together with no. 202-212 Broad Lane, due to its architectural and historical interest.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension which projects approx. 3.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjoined no. 208, following the removal of an external storage facility, the rear steps leading to the garden, and the first-floor rear balcony. It is

characterised by a lean-to roof form with a rooflight and has a ridge height of approx. 3.72m and an eaves height of approx. 2.46m.

Alterations to the fenestration are also proposed, amending the existing first-floor rear balcony door to a window, and the existing rear extension window to a set of bi-folding doors.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation Officer

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the host dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore there are no issues with the proposal, provided the materials match those of the host dwelling.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One neutral letter was received. The following concerns were raised:

- ☐ Concerns over the effect of the foundation of the proposed extension on the neighbouring property; and
- ☐ Concerns over the impact of the proposed extension on the external wall, roof overhang and guttering of the neighbouring property.

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ Concerns over the structural integrity of the proposed development relates to building regulations and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.
- ☐ Concerns over the impact of the proposal on the amenities of the neighbouring properties are addressed in the 'Amenity' section of the report.

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:

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage

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 and Heritage: DM1, P2 and P3

- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires 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”*.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension is of a single storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a lean-to roof would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ❑ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ❑ It is considered the proposed window and bi-folding doors are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ❑ The host dwelling is identified as a non-designated heritage asset and forms part of a row of terraced housing dating back to the late 19th century. Together with no. 202-212 Broad Lane, the terraced houses are present in the first edition OS map from 1890. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states *“the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm*

or loss and the significance of the heritage asset". In addition, policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strives to *"protect the borough's heritage by... conserving, enhancing and utilising other non-statutory heritage assets of local interest"*.

- ☐ As assessed by the Conservation Officer, the proposed development would have a neutral impact on the significance of the host property as a non-designated heritage asset.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1, P2 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 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"*.
- ☐ 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"*.
- ☐ Furthermore, Section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ☐ *"For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)"*.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is set 0.5m away from the external wall of the existing extension of adjoined no. 208 and does not project beyond the 3.5m projection of the existing rear extension and the existing rear extension of adjoined no. 208. Therefore it accords with the maximum standard for attached properties.
- ☐ No concerns are had in respect of the rear facing Juliette balcony where this could be achieved under permitted development rights, and notwithstanding, would not provide substantially greater views into the garden areas of surrounding properties.
- ☐ The proposed bi-folding doors would provide adequate natural light into the habitable room occupied in the proposed extension, in accordance with Section 4.1 of SPD.
- ☐ The proposed development would retain sufficient garden space with a functional layout for its occupiers, in accordance with Section 5.4 of the SPD.
- ☐ 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 proposed development would not result in the addition of bedrooms and would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property. 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
☐ Site Plan – LA01/0922/04
☐ Existing Floor Plans – JA01/0722/01
☐ Proposed Floor Plans – LA01/0822/03A
☐ Existing and Proposed Elevations – LA01/0822/02 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.

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	17/11/2022	Signed: SY
Authorisation	21/11/2022	Signed: RK

