

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00676/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00676/HOUS
Location:	8 Woodtop Avenue Rochdale OL11 4BD
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and alterations to existing detached garage to form a storage room/utility area
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Darren Wilcock
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
DETERMINATION DATE 05.09.2024	EXT OF TIME
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?	NA
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

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

Location

8 Wood Top Avenue is a two-storey semi-detached residence within the Bamford ward of Rochdale and on an estate of dwellings similar in character and scale. The pair of semis are constructed from red brick hosting both a hipped and mansard roof as well as a two-storey pitched roof fronted twin-gable element with bay windows.

The property adjoins to no.6 Wood Top Avenue and shares a common boundary with no.10 Wood Top Avenue to the south and 10 Winsford Drive to the east.

The property benefits from generous front and rear amenity space with additional amenity space to the side of the dwelling which currently hosts a driveway. There is a single storey attached lean-to extension to the south elevation, a pitched roof rear extension and a detached pitched roof outbuilding to the side and rear of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension set back from the front elevation at ground floor by 0.97m and first floor by 2.2m. The extension would project 2.7m

from the south-facing side elevation at both ground and first floor level and be finished in matching materials and roof forms to the host dwelling.

The extension would be constructed in matching materials.

Relevant History

23/01323/HOUS Two storey side extension
Refused January 2024
Reason for refusal:

- 1. By virtue of its design, siting and scale, the proposed two-storey side extension is considered to give rise to an unacceptable terracing effect when constructed close to the common boundary. The development would not be subservient to the main dwellinghouse and would therefore present undue harm to the form of the semi-detached dwellings. As such, the proposal would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework*

06/D48390 Two storey side and single storey rear extension to dwelling
Granted January 2007

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. One letter of neutral representation was received

Neutral Representation

- Clarity on assumed boundary line is correctly shown on the proposed site plan and location plan but not on the proposed floor plan. The fence is on the side of No 10 Wood Top Avenue.

Officer Response The location of the fence is not material to the planning determination

Policy

National

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

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (Adopted 2024)
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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 131 of the NPPF emphasizes that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
- ❑ The SPD outlines how new development can minimise presenting a "terracing effect" which occurs when two-storey or first floor side extensions extend up to main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage.
- ❑ Paragraph 5.11 states proposals that would create this sort of 'terracing effect', or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.
- ❑ In avoiding any "terracing effect", paragraph 5.12 sets out the following guidance for development that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary:
 - ❑ *The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house; OR*
 - ❑ *The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house*
- ❑ The proposed ground floor would be set back 0.97m from the front elevation, and the first floor would be set back 2.2m from the front elevation. As such, the proposal as amended is compliant with the guidance as stated within section 5.12 of the Council's residential guidance and standards.

- ☐ The character of the estate is relatively unique with a fairly traditional appeal to which many dwellings in this vicinity follow a cohesive material palette.
- ☐ It is noted the proposed side extension would not be designed to match the front elevation of the host dwelling, however it is not considered this would be unacceptable given the extension would appear clearly subordinate to the host dwelling, and would be well set back from the main front elevation of the property, so as not to compete with the mansard design.
- ☐ Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD sets out bin storage requirements and states “Residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets. Bins should be stored to the rear of a property away from the street scene and/or in a designated area that is well-designed, appropriately sited and screened.”
- ☐ The plans do not indicate the proposed bin storage on the development, however a 750mm distance to the side boundary is retained, and therefore it can be reasonable expected bin storage to the rear will be maintained as existing. As such, the proposal would be in accordance with Appendix 1 of the SPD.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the core strategy and the SPD which states they should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties as well as satisfy section 4 space standards.
- ☐ The SPD does not explicitly set out guidance for side extensions in terms of their impacts to neighbouring occupiers however, a sensible view can be taken that the proposed development is not considered to present any undue harm to the amenity of surrounding occupiers. Where it is noted the development would extend close to the common boundary with no.10, the neighbouring plot is generous with its rear amenity space therefore although the extension may pose an overbearing impact to the side of no.10, it is currently in use as a driveway with sufficient amenity space to the rear therefore no concerns are raised in this regard.
- ☐ The proposed principal window on the first floor of the extension at the rear is not considered to present any overlooking concerns to the rear neighbouring plot, no. 10 Winsford Drive by virtue of a 43m separation distance from the rear common boundary.
- ☐ All windows on the extension are considered Section 4 compliant and all habitable rooms within both the existing dwellinghouse and extension would receive adequate light and outlook. The side elevation of the adjacent property hosts an obscurely glazed window which indicates this window does not host a habitable room therefore not of any concern.

- ☐ The plot hosts generous amenity space to the front and rear which is to be retained post-development for the enjoyment of the occupiers.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ The development would increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling by one and would be constructed in place of part of the existing driveway however, the plot would retain part of the driveway to the front of the property which would facilitate sufficient on-site parking which would be in accordance with Appendix 5 Schedule of parking standards of the SPD.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable 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. This permission relates to the following plans and documents-

Application Form

'Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations' – Drawing No 1603.03 Rev B received 20/08/2024

Location Plan

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials to be used on the building shall match that as stated on the application form.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with policies P3 and 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	23/08	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	18/09/24	Signed:LA

Report Author Rosalind Gralton