

Application Number:	24/00362/HOUS
Location:	12A Regent Street, Heywood, OL10 3BX
Proposal:	Erection of single-storey side/rear extension including alteration to roof of existing single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing porch.
Applicant:	MR ASH MAHMOOD
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 13.06.2024	EXT OF TIME 21.06.2024
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. 12A Regent Street, a two-storey, detached property located on a corner plot at the junction of Regent Street and High Street in Heywood. The subject property is adjacent to no. 12 Regent Street to the west, no. 88 High Street to the south and nos. 79-87 High Street to the west. The property does not benefit from off-street parking and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders a gated alleyway. The property has an existing single-storey rear extension with a mono-pitched roof and a flat roof porch to the side. The rear garden is bound by a 2m high boundary wall.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey side/rear wraparound extension following the demolition of the existing porch. The extension would project 2.15m from the existing side elevation and 3m from the existing rear elevation. The extension would be topped by a dual-pitched roof with a maximum height of 4m and a height to eaves of 2.8m. It would also include a roof light. The proposal would involve altering the roof of the existing single-storey rear extension to create a uniform roof design. The

extension would be constructed in render, roof tiles and window frames to match the existing dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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 were sought to reduce the scale of the proposed extension, alter the roof design, include a roof light and switch the positioning of the fenestration to the rear.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 135 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 JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ❑ 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 host dwelling is located on a prominent corner plot position, flanked by three groups of terraced properties ranging from the mid-nineteenth to the late twentieth centuries. The subject property is a clear departure from the architectural values of the surrounding street scene and features a mismatch of roof forms and materials. The existing single-storey extensions to the rear correspond poorly with the original build and the resultant dwelling lacks legibility.
- ❑ The amended scheme seeks to rectify the current design issues by demolishing the flat roof porch and removing the roof of the existing single-storey rear extension to incorporate a more coherent design. The proposal would constitute an improvement on the existing situation by constructing an extension that is more in-keeping with the character of original build and the street scene. It would also use an appropriate material palette and window detailing.
- ❑ Whilst the proposed extension, in conjunction with the existing extension, would have a relatively sizeable depth, it is not considered to be out of keeping with the density of the surrounding street scene.
- ❑ The existing bin storage arrangements would not be affected by the proposed development.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, PpE, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, which requires that development proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.
- ☐ Acceptable limits for residential extensions in respect of the above are quantified in the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate that the host dwelling is physically attached to no. 12 Regent Street. However, it was noted during a site visit that the main walls of the properties are not adjoined and there is a clear visual break between the properties. As such, the Council considers the application property to be a detached dwelling.
- ☐ The SPD quantifies the permitted rearward projection of single-storey extensions so that an extension to a detached dwelling must not project further than 4m from the common boundary point, except where the particular site can accommodate an increase up to the limit set by drawing a 45 degree angle across the property from a point 4m along the shared boundary from the common boundary point at which the dwellings last meet.
- ☐ The single-storey rear extension would not project beyond a point 4m measured from the rear elevation of no. 12 Regent Street, in compliance with the SPD.
- ☐ The proposed extensions would not breach any of the separation distances required by section 4.1 of the SPD.
- ☐ Whilst the proposal would reduce the current outdoor amenity space by nearly half, it is considered that the remaining garden space would be a suitable size and layout with space available for the purposes of sitting out and drying clothes. It has also been confirmed that a shed within the garden has since been removed. Moreover, the remaining garden space would be similar to that which neighbouring properties benefit from.
- ☐ As a result of the proposals, the current levels of natural light received by the dining room (a habitable room) would be significantly reduced. To improve the levels of light filtration, the positioning of the window/door to the rear has been switched and a roof light has been proposed above the dining room. Whilst less than ideal, it is not considered that the lack of natural light would warrant the refusal of the application. Moreover, it is noted that the remaining habitable rooms within the property would be supplied with adequate natural light, including the two living areas.
- ☐ The proposed development would not result in a loss of amenity for neighbouring residents through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and the proposal is considered to accord with Core Strategy policy DM1 and the SPD in respect of neighbour amenity.

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:

- Site Location / Existing Site / Proposed Site Plans. Dwg no. 24-010.1. Rev P02.
- Existing Floor Plans And Elevations. Dwg no. 24-010.2.
- Proposed Floor Plans. Dwg no. 24-010.3. Rev P03.
- Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. 24-010.4. Rev P03.

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, 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 be in accordance with drawing number 24-010.4 revision P03 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	17/06/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	20/06/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling