

Application Number:	22/01506/HOUS
Location:	96 Waithlands Road, Rochdale, OL16 5EX
Proposal:	Two-storey side, Part two, part single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Parveen Bibi
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. 96 Waithlands Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of rendered construction located in a residential neighbourhood in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 94 Waithlands Road to the north-west, adjacent to no. 98 Waithlands Road to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north east. The rear boundary of the curtilage abuts industrial units of Kingsway West Business Park to the south-west.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a wraparound extension comprising a two-storey side extension, and a part-two, part-single storey rear extension. The proposed side extension projects 1.88m from the side elevation of the dwelling, is set back from the front main wall by 2.12m, and is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with matching roof pitch and height to eaves.

The proposed rear extension consists of a 6m ground floor and 4.93m first floor projection along the common boundary of adjacent no. 98, and a 3m ground floor and 2.43m first floor projection along the common boundary of adjoined no. 96. The

two-storey extension is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form with matching eaves to height. The single-storey extension is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a maximum ridge height of 3.76m and an eaves to height of 2.96m. A roof light sits on the rear lean-to roof slope above the kitchen area.

The extensions would be set down from the ridge line by 0.6m and would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

21/00876/HH42 - Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 6m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.8m and height to eaves 2.6m) – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

1. By virtue of its projection, the proposed single storey rear enlargement would surpass the 3m maximum allowance for attached properties. This would result in an unduly harmful loss of privacy and natural light to the adjoining property no.94 Waithlands Road. The application therefore fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

21/01148/HH42 - Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 6m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.8m and height to eaves 2.6m) (Re-submission 21/00876/HH42) – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

1. By virtue of its projection, the proposed single storey rear extension would surpass the 3m maximum allowance for attached properties. This would result in an unduly harmful loss of privacy and natural light to the adjoining property no.94 Waithlands Road. The application therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

For the size of the extended dwelling we would require the provision of two off-street parking spaces which should be shown on the application plans.

The servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

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

Subject to the parking provision Highways would raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties, and again following the submission of amended plans. Two objection letters were received in total with the following concerns:

- ☐ The proposal will result in loss of light into the adjacent rear garden space and rear and side elevation windows;
- ☐ The lack of sunlight into the adjacent rear garden will negatively impact on the neighbour's mental wellbeing.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating to overshadowing impacts are addressed under the 'Amenity' section of the report.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – September 2023
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

Extensive discussions were had regarding the proposed plans, and the Council has worked proactively with the applicant to devise and agree upon an amended scheme which comprises the following changes:

- ② The simplification of built forms, massing and roof forms of the rear extension;
- ② Removal of the chamfered walls of the rear extension in favour of more regular internal layouts;
- ② The proposed side extension set forward with roof pitch to match host dwelling; and
- ② Alterations to proposed front and rear fenestration.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ② Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require 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.”*
- ② The proposed scheme comprises a part-two, part-single storey rear extension of differing projections, of which was in part informed by the existing extensions of adjacent no. 98, which consists of a 6m single-storey rear extension and a 2.4m first-floor rear extension.
- ② It is noted the sum of the extensions at no. 98 do not benefit from planning permission, however, with reference to Section 171B and 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the time for enforcement action for the works has expired and the development is therefore deemed lawful.
- ② With this in mind, it is acknowledged that whilst the design of the proposed rear extension would appear somewhat unusual, particular in its unresolved massing, the amended scheme nonetheless constitutes an improvement from the previously proposed plans and features more regular uses of built forms, roof forms and fenestration.
- ② Given this site context, and owing to the fact the proposal would also be largely sited away from view from public vantage points, mitigating its visual impacts on the street scene, on balance, the design of the proposal would be acceptable.
- ② The proposed side extension is substantially set back from the main front wall of the dwelling, and thus would not result in any harm arising from the

'terracing effect'. The side extension also comprises a dual-pitched roof matching the host dwelling and is set down below the ridge line which would appear subservient.

- ☐ 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 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

- ☐ 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."*
- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *"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."*
- ☐ Additionally, 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."* Section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard:
 - ☐ *"For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)."*
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey extensions projecting *"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)"* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension faces an industrial unit and does not face any residential properties.
- ☐ The proposed single-storey rear extension projects 3m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjoining no. 94, and projects 0.95m from the rear elevation of the existing rear extension of adjacent no. 98.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension does not project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from the point 2.4m along the common boundaries from the rear elevations of adjacent nos. 94 and 98.

- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposal is not considered to result in adverse amenity impacts to the 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.
- ☐ As it stands, the property comprises one off-street parking space to the front driveway, which would be retained under the proposal. Given that no parking space would be lost, and the presence of on-street parking on Waithlands Road, it is considered a refusal on highway grounds could not be reasonably substantiated.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Grant subject to 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 03/02/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – received 03/08/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Roof Plan – Drawing No. A101 dated 20/03/2022
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Roof Plan – Drawing No. A102.E dated 30/08/2023

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. Notwithstanding the details included in the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the details of external materials as set out in the submitted Schedule of External Materials ref. A2358 and dated September 2023.

Reason: In the interest of achieving well-designed places and in accordance with Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the south-east side elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

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	11/09/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	13/09/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen