

Application Number:	22/01272/HOUS
Location:	29 Harbour Lane Milnrow Rochdale OL16 4EL
Proposal:	Outbuilding - Retrospective
Applicant:	Mr Ged Whiting
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

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. 29 Harbour Lane, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in the town of Milnrow. The dwelling is located in a corner plot at the junction opposite no. 196-206 Harbour Lane and no. 47 Harbour Lane. It is adjoined by no. 31 Harbour Lane to the north-east and faces the highway to the south-east. The application property shares a rear and side curtilage boundary with adjacent no. 27 Harbour Lane to the north-west. The application site consists of a front triangular-shaped curtilage and benefits from off-street parking, with a front driveway flanked by two grassed lawns on either side.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a single-storey outbuilding which is sited in the front curtilage to the south of the host dwelling. The structure is set horizontally against the boundary of the highway, with a set of French doors facing no. 196 Harbour Lane to the south-west. It is characterised by a flat-roofed form and measures approx. 4.1m in length, approx. 4.54m in width along the highway boundary, approx. 2.92m in width facing the curtilage, and approx. 2.7m in height. It comprises of a 0.2m high timber decking which projects approx. 1.56m from the principal elevation of the outbuilding.

The outbuilding is constructed in black uPVC horizontal cladding, with its roof constructed from fibreglass and French doors constructed from uPVC.

Relevant History

92/D28554 - Single storey side extension to dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

79/D09966 – Replacement of garage and porch - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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

- ❑ Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 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”*. Paragraph 134 seeks to encourage *“innovative designs which... help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings”*.
- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires 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 dwellings along the building line of the host dwelling consists of 20th century red-brick semi-detached dwellings with brick-built low wall and hedges as boundary treatments. Additionally, dwellings along the building line south-west of Harbour Lane consists of late-19th century to early-20th century stone-built terraced housing. As such, the overall street scene is characterised by uniformity and cohesiveness in architectural design, form, and materiality.
- ❑ The outbuilding is characterised by a contemporary design, and consists of a flat-roofed structure constructed from black horizontal cladding. By virtue of its design, form and materiality, the proposed development is not in keeping with the host dwelling and fails to respect the character of wider street scene.
- ❑ The harm on the street scene is exacerbated by the siting of the outbuilding, which is located in the front curtilage of the host dwelling and is visible above the boundary treatment and from all public vantage points on the junction of Harbour Lane. As a result of its horizontal orientation and its proximity to the front boundary treatment, the outbuilding appears overly prominent when viewed from the highway, obscuring the front elevation of the host dwelling at certain angles.
- ❑ Furthermore, the outbuilding is situated forward of the principal front elevation of the host dwelling, which forms part of a strong existing building line with adjacent properties. The proposed development erodes this building line and presents a hard edge to the highway, adding visual harm to the street scene.
- ❑ By virtue of its siting, form, materiality and design, the outbuilding constitutes an incongruous form of development which fails to comprise a satisfactory

standard of design and results in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene.

- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy”*.
- ❑ In particular, Section 4.1 states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - ❑ *“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”*.
- ❑ The French doors of the outbuilding, which is considered as a principal window, do not directly face any principal windows of no. 196 Harbour Lane. The approx. 8m distance between the French doors and the southern corner of the curtilage boundary of no. 27 is also considered acceptable.
- ❑ The outbuilding consists of an approx. 0.2m-high timber decking which may result in potential visual intrusion into the curtilage of adjacent no. 27. However, given the general visibility of the front curtilage of no. 27 from the highway, the overlooking impact is considered to be acceptable.
- ❑ Due to its siting and considerable distance from surrounding dwellings, no concerns are had over any potential overshadowing impacts.
- ❑ No information has been submitted regarding the primary usage of the outbuilding. However, the French doors and rooflight are considered to provide adequate natural light into the outbuilding as a habitable room.
- ❑ In spite of the footprint of the outbuilding creating an awkward and irregular curtilage layout, it is considered sufficient garden space is retained for its occupiers.
- ❑ The proposal does 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

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location”*.
- ❑ The existing driveway of the host dwelling and its two parking spaces has been retained following the construction of the outbuilding. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

- ☐ By virtue of its siting, form, materiality and design, the outbuilding constitutes an incongruous form of development which causes undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene. The development proposal represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and therefore fails to 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.

INFORMATIVES:

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – HC-22051-(60)-001
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – HC-22051(60)-002
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – HC-22051-(60)-003
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – HC-22051-(60)-004
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – HC-22051-(60)-005

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	24/11/2022	Signed: SY
Authorisation	25/11/2022	Signed: AT

Report Author Sam Yuen