

Application Number:	22/01412/HOUS
Location:	30 Ashley Close, Rochdale, OL11 3EP
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing detached garage (Re-submission 22/00152/HOUS)
Applicant:	Mr Nouman Tariq
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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 refers to no.30 Ashley Close, a two-storey, semi-detached property located in a residential area in Rochdale. The property faces south on to the highway, adjoins no.32 to the west and is adjacent to no.28 to the east.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey side and rear wraparound extension with a maximum projection of 4.2m from the existing rear elevation and 2.3m from the existing side elevation. The extension has a hipped roof with a maximum height of 3.8m and a height to eaves of 2.6m. The works include the use of materials to match those evident on the existing dwelling. The extension will follow the demolition of an existing detached garage to the rear.

Relevant History**21/01682/HH42**

Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 4.2m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.65m and height to eaves 2.6m)

Decision: Refusal

Reason for refusal: *By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of amenity for the occupiers of no.32 Ashley Close due to a loss of light and outlook to the rear ground floor windows and an overbearing impact on the rear outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

22/00152/HOUS Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing detached garage
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The side extension over the existing driveway severs access to what appears to be an existing garage so development would result in the loss of some parking for the extended dwelling. Council standards would indicate that the extended dwelling should have two off street parking spaces.

Our preference would be that the applicant provides two off street parking spaces as part of the development proposals.

There should be no change in the servicing arrangements for the extended dwelling.

We do not envisage that there would be a detrimental impact on road safety or highways capacity as a result of the development.

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters were sent to all surrounding neighbours and 2 representations were received in objection to the application.

- Ability of neighbours to maintain property

Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.

- Extension should not exceed 3m from original building

Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'amenity' section of the report.

- Impact on amount of light and outlook to windows and garden

Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'amenity' section of the report.

- Potential encroachment onto neighbouring properties

Officer's response: The submitted plans do not indicate that the extension will encroach onto neighbouring properties.

- Potential damage to neighbouring property during construction

Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.

- Construction will result in significant traffic

Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.

- Impact on resale value

Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.

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
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: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

- ☐ The proposed single storey side and rear extension would be appropriately sited, with a proportionate scale, hipped roof design and matching materials. It is acknowledged that several properties on Ashley Close have constructed side extensions of a similar scale, and that the proposed extension would not appear overbearing or uncharacteristic when viewed from the street scene.
- ☐ Whilst the chamfered edge to the proposed rear wall is not considered to be good design, this aspect is situated at the rear of the dwelling. Given that this would not be visible from the street scene, it is not considered to result in undue harm to the character of the host dwelling or locality.
- ☐ Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states *“residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid dominating residential streets.”* The proposed extension would restrict access between the front and rear curtilage, including the space currently used for bin storage. However, given that the garage would not be capable of accommodating a parked vehicle due to its small size, it would be able to serve as a storage area for bins out of view of the street in accordance with the SPD.
- ☐ In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed extension would accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the relevant provisions of the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ To ensure that developments do not cause a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of nearby dwellings, paragraph 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD sets out the following minimum space standards that all developments should adhere to:
 - (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;*
 - (ii) *14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;*
 - (iii) *10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.*
- ☐ The proposed fenestration to the rear elevation would be at a ground floor level and measure 12.5m to the directly facing single storey elevation of no. 10 Tomlinson Street. Further to this, visibility would be restricted between the properties given the presence of a solid boundary treatment. Therefore, the proposed fenestration is not considered to result in an undue loss of privacy to the neighbouring rear windows and garden.
- ☐ Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD provides 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).”*
- ☐ Paragraph 5.7 states, *“If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary.”*
- ☐ The proposed single storey extension would project a maximum of 4.2m from the rear elevations of the adjoining and adjacent dwellings. However, the extension tapers 45 degrees inwards at a point 3m along the common

boundary in order to comply with the SPD guidance. It is not considered, therefore, that the extension would result in an undue overbearing or overshadowing impact on the neighbouring dwellings.

- ② The proposed extensions would reduce the amount of natural light received by the dining room owing to the removal of an existing side window and an existing rear window. Whilst not ideal, it is acknowledged that the proposals show an open plan living/dining area with an internal wall removed. This would ensure that the dining room receives natural light, albeit less than was enjoyed previously. Therefore, on balance, it is considered that all habitable rooms will receive adequate natural light 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 In light of the above assessment, the extension 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 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states, *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”*
- ② It is noted that the proposed development would reduce the space currently designated as drive way to one car. No parking plan is provided. Whilst on street parking is limited in this location, the provision of one off street parking space would comply with the requirements of Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS. Further, it is not considered the reduction to one parking space would result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, and would be in accordance with 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. The permission relates to the following plans:
 - Location Plan
 - Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Site Plan. Drg no. 1835/1
 - Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Site Plan. Drg no. 1835/2

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	04/01/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	06/01/2023	Signed: AT

Report Author Bob Melling