APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01182/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01182/HOUS
Location:	23 Heald Close Rochdale OL12 7HJ
Proposal:	Erection of detached garage
Applicant:	Mr Mohammed Ashiq
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
Recommendation:	**Grant subject to conditions**

DELEGATION	**Applicant a Council Member or officer?**	**N**
	Contrary to previous decision?	**N**
	Called in by Ward Member?	**N**

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national and local policy and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during the site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Policy

National
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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:
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

Not applicable.

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring property and one objection has been received. The comments have been summarised below:

- Too large, very high and will be unsightly when viewed from property.
  Officer comments: discussed in design section.

- Looks like a dormer bungalow in disguise rather than a garage.
  Officer comments: discussed in design section.

- Will overshadow garden and restrict light to trees, shrubs and plants to their detriment.
  Officer comments: discussed in amenity section.

- No objections to flat roof design to lower height and impact of the building.
  Officer comments: discussed in design section.

- Height will exaggerate downhill lie of land resulting in ground level becoming increasingly lower than 23 Heald Close.
  Officer comments: discussed in amenity section

Assessment

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line	Y
Height and massing	Y
Facing materials and detailing	Y
Roof style	Y
Window proportions	Y
Bin storage	Y
Impact on trees	Y

It is noted that there are concerns in regards to the size, height and siting of the proposed detached garage. The proposed garage will be 6.4m in depth and 5.6m in width. The garage size is bigger than a traditional single garage but smaller than a double garage. The size is considered to be acceptable for a single garage with storage space and an acceptable size for a property of this size.

The ridge height of proposed detached garage would be approximately 5m and the eaves will be approximately a height of 3m. However, the proposed detached garage would be a single storey and would be set to the rear of the host property. The height of the proposed extension is not substantially high enough to warrant a refusal. The amenity impact of the proposed detached garage relating to the height is discussed in the amenity section of the report.

An objection has suggested that a flat roof garage would be acceptable. It is noted that there is already an outrigger with a flat roof and the garage would be set back from the host property. Additionally, a number of properties in the area have flat roof garages or car ports to the side of the property. However, due to the siting of the garage, it would be still be visible from the street scene and a flat roof design would not be in keeping with the host property and would be considered to be of poor design. Additionally, the gable roof to the front would mimic the gable roof to the front of the host property and allow the proposed detached garage to be in keeping with the host property.

On balance, 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.

Residential Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on privacy, light & outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	Y
Light and outlook of application property	Y
Remaining garden space of application property	Y

The proposed extension would be approximately 5m high and be sited close to the boundary with no. 25 Heald Close and 7 Hillkirk Drive. In relation to no. 25 Heald Close, it is noted that no.25 is set on higher ground than no. 23 and has a rear conservatory that projects out by approximately 4.3m. Additionally, as no.25 sits on a corner plot, the rear of the property angles away. Finally, the proposed detached garage would fall within the guidance set out in the SPD in relation to single storey rear extensions and would not project beyond a 45 degree line measured a point 3 metres along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjacent property.

In relation to no. 7 Hillkirk Drive, it is noted that the garage would be approximately 27.7m from the rear elevation of no. 7. Additionally, there are number of mature trees, including trees protect under Tree Preservation Order 139 that run along the rear garden of no. 7 and the neighbouring properties on Hillkirk Drive. The distance between the rear elevation of no. 7 Hillkirk Drive and the proposed detached garage would meet the requirements set out in the SPD. Furthermore, with the mature trees screening the proposed detached garage from the majority of the rear garden of no.7, it is considered that the proposed detached garage would not unduly impact on the amenity of no.7 Hillkirk Drive.

On balance, the proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	Y
Parking provision	Y

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

Location plan
Existing site plan, proposed site plan and proposed floor plan. Drawing no: 1667/1
Proposed elevations. Drawing no: 1667/2

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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	24.12.2020	Signed: MM
Authorisation	24.12.2020	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir