

Application Number:	23/00676/HOUS
Location:	29 Cinnamon Street Rochdale OL12 6QB
Proposal:	Two-storey rear extension and removal of chimneys
Applicant:	Mohammed Ashraf
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	Yes

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

29 Cinnamon Street is a two-storey mid-terrace property located in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale and in the designated Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. The property adjoins to 27 and 31 Cinnamon Street and borders a gated alleyway to the rear which separates the row of terraces from the Bowling Green adjacent at the rear.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey rear pitched roof extension spanning the full width of the rear elevation and projecting 2.4m from the rear elevations. The material palette consists of stone cills to the windows to match those on the extending as well as brickwork or render, as agreed.

Further permission is sought for the removal of both existing chimneys to the front roof slope.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extension would not appear to have any highways impact.

The current servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

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

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

Conservation and Design

The application site is a two storey mid-terrace property on Cinnamon Street. The terrace was constructed in the late 19th century, for workers in the local mills. The houses are constructed of red-brick and slate. Some of the houses have now been rendered. There has been some loss of chimneys and the original windows have been replaced with UPVC. However, some original features remain including the stone lintels and brick arches above the doors.

The proposal is for the construction of a two storey rear extension and the removal of two chimneys. There is no objection in principle to the construction of a two storey rear extension, as there are other examples within the surrounding area. The extension would be visible for public viewpoints, as it backs onto the bowling green. As such, a condition should be imposed requiring the materials to match (red brick and natural slate).

The removal of the chimneys would further erode the loss of historic features. This incremental loss of historic features results in harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. The level of harm would be less than substantial. There do not appear to be any public benefits to address this harm.

To resolve this, the scheme should be amended to retain the existing chimneys. This would ensure that the proposal has a neutral impact on the Conservation Area. Subject to the suggested amendments and conditions, the proposal would not result in harm to the character appearance of the Conservation Area and would comply with the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and a site notice was posted on 09.08.2023 due to the property being sited within a conservation area. One letter of objection was received, signed by six additional local residents.

Objection Letter

Loss of sunlight to surrounding properties

Officer Response: Assessed in the 'amenity' section of the report

Damage to surrounding roof and chimneys

Officer Response: In line with the conservation officers consultation comments, it is considered preferable for the existing chimney to remain untouched to avoid any loss of character to the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area.

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:

P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

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 and Conservation: DM1, P2 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. Policy P2 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development to protect and enhance character, landscape and heritage. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that all new developments "should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it".

It is first noted, the row of terraces in which the subject property is sited, do not host two-storey rear outriggers as do other rows of terraces in the surrounding adjacent streets. However, the end terrace property currently hosts a single storey rear extension. Whilst in principle, to extend two-storey at the rear is an acceptable form of development, a reduced overall width would be preferable given the rear elevations of these terraces are considered to be fairly narrow therefore when constructed across the full width and up to the common boundary, it is considered to be an overhaul of the existing rear elevation however, not wholly unacceptable as the extension would demonstrate good design principles to ensure it is subservient to the existing dwelling.

The material palette of the extension states "Brickwork or render, as agreed". Given the extension would be visible from the Bowling Green and other public vantage points at the rear, it is considered necessary to impose a condition to ensure the materials of the extension are to match that on the original row of terraces (brick) to preserve the original character. The plans do state the scheme would follow the existing style of the stone cills which would ensure the character of the dwelling is not compromised.

The new window proportions of the extension are not considered out-of-character given dwellings along this row of terraces host mixed scales of fenestration.

Aforementioned above, following a consultation from the conservation officer, the removal of both existing chimneys would further erode the loss of historical features in this area therefore in the event of an approval, amendments would be sought for the retaining of this feature to not contribute to the decline of historical assets within the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. There was no objection received regarding the two-storey rear extension.

By virtue of the removal of the existing chimneys, the proposal would contribute to the loss of historical features of the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area and not visually respect the existing character of the area.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 notes that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

The SPD acknowledges the impact two-storey extensions to the rear can have on neighbouring occupiers by virtue of them being constructed close to a common boundary.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states "Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)". Plans indicate a projection of 2.4m from the original rear elevation therefore compliant with this principle.

As mentioned above, two-storey rear extensions close to the boundary can appear oppressive to adjoining neighbours.

It is considered the internal floor plan of the neighbour to the north, no.31, features a reverted layout than that at the host property therefore the window located on the first floor rear elevation closest to the host dwelling is considered to be a principal window to a habitable room. Given that no 31 is to the north of the application site and is already subject to partially reduced light and outlook by virtue of the mature trees close to the rear gardens providing a degree of screening, the extension is considered to further erode the lack of light provision to this room which is considered to be an unacceptable impact.

Whilst there is considered to be a degree of oppressive nature to the adjoining house to the south, no.27, the impact is not considered unacceptable given that no 27 is to the south of the application site, therefore the extension is not considered to impact the provision of light to the bedroom close to the extension.

Plans indicate the provision of adequate light and outlook to all habitable rooms and the retaining of a suitably sized rear garden for enjoyment of the occupiers.

In view of the above assessment, the two-storey rear extension would pose an unacceptable loss of light to the first floor rear bedroom principal window at no.31 Cinnamon Street therefore not constructed in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

In line with the comments received from the highways officer, the current service arrangements would remain unchanged post development therefore no specific planning conditions are required.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of the planned removal of both chimneys, the proposal would fail to work to preserve historical features within the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. The removal of the chimneys would contribute to the decline of the loss of historical assets within this area and fail to visually respect and preserve the existing character of the dwelling and wider area. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1, P2 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
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed two-storey rear extension would pose an unacceptable loss of light to the first floor rear principal window of the adjoining property at no.31 Cinnamon Street. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of 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.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	12.09.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	21.09.2023	Signed:TH

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following plans;

- Location Plan (Dated 16 Jun 2023)
- Proposed Site Plan (Dated 16 Jun 2023)
- Sheet 2 Rear Extension Proposed Plans and Elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo