

Application Number:	23/00473/HOUS
Location:	12 Coleridge Drive, Littleborough, OL15 0RA
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, engineering works to existing rear landscaping, installation of canopy over entrance on front elevation and erection of detached outbuilding in side garden following demolition of existing outbuilding
Applicant:	Mr David Wilson
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?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 12 Coleridge Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac in the residential suburb of Smithy Bridge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 10 Coleridge Drive to the north-east and faces the highway to the south-east. The side curtilage boundary abuts the side curtilage boundaries of nos. 9 and 11 Whittaker Drive, as well as an adopted access road. The rear curtilage boundary borders the rear curtilages of nos. 47 and 49 Little Clegg Road to the north-west. The property comprises a detached single garage to the side of the dwelling, a side driveway and front and rear garden space. The rear curtilage of the property features a single Malus tree sited on an elevated level within the garden.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a wraparound extension comprising a two-storey side extension which projects 4m from the side elevation of the dwelling and a single-storey rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The proposed side extension is characterised by a matching pitched roof form, would be marginally set back from the main front wall by 0.23m, and set down the ridge line by 0.6m with matching height to eaves. The proposed rear extension is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.63m and a height to eaves of 2.69m.

In addition, the application proposes the alteration of the entrance door from the side elevation to the front elevation of the dwelling, alongside the addition of a lean-to porch canopy with a ridge height of 3.05m and a height to eaves of 2.55m.

Further, engineering works are proposed to excavate sections of the rear curtilage space by 0.7m.

Finally, the application seeks to replace the existing detached garage with an outbuilding which measures 7.28m in width and 2.48m in depth. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 2.89m and a height to eaves of 2.46m.

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

Relevant History

80/D10889 - Detached Private Garage - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main concerns regarding this application is parking provision.

The application indicates that there would be no impact on parking provision. However, the loss of the existing garage would leave the extended dwelling with only one viable parking space. The application dwelling is located on the turning head of Coleridge Drive and any overspill on street parking into the turning head would restrict the safe operation of the highway network. We must therefore ask that a minimum of two viable off-street parking spaces are provided for the extended dwelling as part of the development proposals.

The conversion of the garage to an “out building” does also raise concern if its potential use is residential as this use would generate additional parking demand. We would therefore ask that the building use remains as none residential.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

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

Highways would raise no objection to this application if the required off-street parking spaces can be provided. If permission was to be granted we would request no specific planning conditions.

Tree Officer

No comments have been received at the time of writing.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments 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
G6	Enhancing Green Infrastructure
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 have been accepted to set back the front wall of the proposed side elevation from the front main wall by 0.23m and set down from the ridge line by 0.6m.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ 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.*”
- ☐ 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.*”
- ☐ The surrounding street scene is characterised by modestly-sized redbrick semi-detached dwellings with regular built forms and an overall unadorned appearance. The primary ingress for the properties is located to the side elevation of the dwellings. The host property is sited at the end of Coleridge Drive and benefits from a considerably larger curtilage space than the adjacent properties.
- ☐ The proposal seeks to construct, amongst other things, a two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension. It is acknowledged the total extensions constitute a substantial enlargement in the footprint of the original dwelling, with the side extension being over half the width of the host dwelling. However, owing to its relatively sizeable side curtilage space and its location at the end of a cul-de-sac, the extension would not be readily visible upon entering Coleridge Drive and is not considered to have a dominant presence on the street scene.
- ☐ Further, the proposed side extension retains the pitched roof form of the host dwelling which would appear in keeping. It is also noted that amendments have been accepted to set the side extension down below the ridge line and back from the front main wall of the dwelling, which would ensure a degree of visual distinction and subservience from the host dwelling.
- ☐ Likewise, considering there are no dwellings directly adjacent to the host dwelling to the south-west, no concerns are had with regard to the potential harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed side extension is not considered to result in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension and outbuilding are of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a lean-to roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.

- ☐ Whilst it is noted that porch canopies and front entrance doors are not established features of dwellings in the street scene, the proposed canopy is considered to have a neutral impact on the appearance of the dwelling.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ Sufficient space for refuse bin storage out of public view would be retained to the side access of the dwelling.
- ☐ 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.

Tree: G6

- ☐ Paragraph 131 of the NPPF notes that *“trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change.”*
- ☐ Policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states proposals are expected to *“support... tree planting in new developments, and replace removed trees from a site at a ratio of 2:1.”*
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate an existing semi-mature Malus tree may be removed under the proposed development. In mitigating the harm arising from the potential tree loss, the applicant has agreed to replace the tree with a native species at a ratio of 2:1. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement has also sufficiently outlined the protection measures to be taken during construction.
- ☐ Subject to appropriate condition, the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy G6 of the adopted Core Strategy 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed side extension would not project beyond the existing front and side elevation but would result in a minimum 4.69m separation distance between the first-floor side elevation windows and the side curtilage boundary of no. 11 Whittaker Drive. Notwithstanding the presence of soft landscaping between the properties which provides some screening, the first-floor side

windows would be obscurely glazed and would adequately mitigate the potential overlooking impacts.

- ② 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 states the following maximum standard:

- ② *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*

- ② *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

- ② The proposed rear extension does not project beyond the existing rear conservatory of adjoined no. 10. It would also be sited 17.56m from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 11 Whittaker Drive.
- ② The proposed replacement outbuilding constitutes an additional 0.27m in ridge height over the existing garage and is not considered to result in significant additional amenity impacts in this regard.
- ② No concerns are had with the proposed engineering works, which would not result in any additional overlooking impacts to adjoining curtilages.
- ② 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.
- ② 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

- ② 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.”*
- ② The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from two to five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ② The current parking arrangements for the property comprises a single off-street parking space which would be retained under the proposed plans. Whilst it is acknowledged an enlarged dwelling is likely to generate additional demand for parking provision, it is noted that on-street parking arrangements are established on Coleridge Drive. Given this, and the siting of the property at the end of a low-trafficked highway, it is considered the potential addition of one off-street parking space would not result in undue harm to highway safety.
- ② The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable on balance 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 – Drawing No. P2E250222A dated 04/05/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. P2E250222A dated 04/05/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. P2E250222A received 28/09/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. P2E250222A received 27/04/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. P2E250222A received 08/09/2023

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. 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. 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-west facing 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.

5. Within the next planting season after the felling of the tree hereby approved, replacement trees shall be planted at a ratio of 2:1 within the curtilage of 12 Coleridge Drive and shall be a native species which is of a similar size at maturity. If the replacement tree is removed, dies, become severely damaged

or seriously diseased within three years of planting, it shall be replaced by a tree of similar size and species within the first planting season following removal of that tree.

Reason: To mitigate for the loss of the existing tree and to protect the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy G6 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	27/09/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	03/10/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen