

Application Number:	24/01062/HOUS
Location:	24 Cherrington Drive, Rochdale, OL11 2XS
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension, insertion of window within existing side elevation, extension to existing front dormer and erection of pitched roofs over existing front and rear dormers including 2no roof lights.
Applicant:	DANIEL BARON
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national, sub-regional and local policies and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the Planning Officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

N/A

Assessment

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line	✓
Height and massing	✓
Facing materials and detailing	✓
Roof style	✓
Window proportions	✓
Bin storage	✓
Impact on trees	✓

The proposed extension of the existing front dormer and the addition of pitched roofs above the front and rear dormers would be similar to existing extensions within the street scene, namely those seen at nos. 28 and 30 Cherrington Drive. The addition of a pitched roof is considered to improve the overall appearance of the dormer and the minor extension to the front dormer would retain a sufficient gap to the edge of the roof slope.

While the proposed single-storey rear extension would have a slightly awkward built form, it is acknowledge that the chamfered corner would be at the private side of the dwelling, with no public visibility. Moreover, the use of a flat roof is considered acceptable given that it is replacing an existing flat roof extension. Further, it is noted that a pitched roof would likely result in an awkward roof design that would intersect the rear dormer.

Lastly, it is not considered that affixing the proposed extension to the existing detached garage would result in any harmful impact on the character of the host dwelling or street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on privacy, light & outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	✓
Light and outlook of application property	✓

Remaining garden space of application property	✓
--	---

While it is acknowledged that the proposed single-storey rear extension would marginally exceed the projection limits outlined in Section 5.6 of the SPD, it should be noted that the existing single-storey rear extension exceeds this limit to the same degree. In order to mitigate any additional loss of light or outlook for the adjoining property (no. 26 Cherrington Drive) the extension has a chamfered corner. Given the existing relationship, it is not considered that the proposals would unduly harm the residential amenity of no. 26.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	✓
Parking provision	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with CS Policy T2, CS Appendix 5 and the NPPF.

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:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Floor Plans. Dwg no. 24.3385.1
- Existing Elevations. Dwg no. 24.3385.2A
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Dwg no. 24.3385.3
- Scheme 4 Proposed Floor Plans. Dwg no. 24.3385.SC4.1A
- Scheme 4 Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. 24.3385.SC4.2A

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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, the 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 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	19/12/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	19/12/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling