

Application Number:	23/00019/HOUS
Location:	31 Wordsworth Crescent Littleborough Rochdale OL15 0RB
Proposal:	First floor extension to side elevation incorporating ground floor support columns/carport
Applicant:	Mr Dan Newland
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 31 Wordsworth Crescent, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Smithy Bridge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 33 Wordsworth Crescent to the west, adjacent to no. 29 Wordsworth Crescent to the east, and faces the highway to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 10 Derwent Drive, which is sited on a significantly higher level than the host property. Wordsworth Crescent is characterised by a steep incline towards the south-west and as such, dwellings along the building line are arranged at stepped heights.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor extension which projects approx. 2.1m from the side elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed side extension is supported by columns on the ground floor, so as to retain access to the front entrance and rear garden. It is characterised by a pitched roof which is set down

from the ridge line with an eaves height matching the host dwelling. The extension is marginally set back from the front wall of the host dwelling by approx. 0.1m.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extension to the existing dwelling does not appear to have any impact on the existing driveway arrangements and the residual parking provision would meet current Council standards for the size of the extended dwelling.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

Highways representatives do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

As such, Highways raise no objection to this application or ask for any specific planning conditions.

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

- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require 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 proposed first-floor side extension is set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling which would appear subservient. The pitched roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ❑ By virtue of the steep topography of Wordsworth Crescent, dwellings along the building line of the host dwelling are arranged at an angle and at stepped heights. Given this, and the pitched roof form of the proposed extension which would be readily distinguished from the gable-fronted host dwelling, it is considered the proposed development would not result in any potential ‘terracing effect’ and would be acceptable in this regard.
- ❑ It is acknowledged the void on the ground floor of the proposed first-floor side extension creates an unusual and awkward appearance to the host dwelling. However, given the insubstantial projection which would not appear overtly prominent, and the presence of a similar extension to adjacent no. 41, on balance, it is considered the visual harm of the proposed development would not be so significant as to warrant refusal.
- ❑ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ❑ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.

- ☐ The proposed extension would retain ground-floor access to the rear curtilage of the host dwelling, thus sufficient space for refuse bins to be stored away from public view would be maintained.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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 proposed side extension does not project beyond the existing front and rear elevations of the host dwelling and does not directly face any habitable room windows to the front and rear of the host dwelling. In addition, the directly facing side elevation of adjacent no. 29 comprises of obscurely-glazed windows to non-habitable rooms. For these reasons, it is considered the proposed development would not result in adverse amenity impacts to neighbouring properties.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to the extended north-east facing first-floor bedroom and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained.
- ☐ It is noted the approx. 4.78m depth of the proposed rear-facing bedroom and the relatively small size of its principal window may limit the amount of natural light into the room. However, the resultant loss of natural light would not be significant as to recommend refusal and thus it is considered an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants would be retained.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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 proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed development would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces, therefore the proposed parking arrangements are 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – dated 04/01/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. DL01/0123/04
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. DL01/0123/05
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. DL01/1222/01A
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. DL01/1222/02
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. DL01/0123/03A

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	07/03/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	13/03/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen

