

Application Number:	23/00764/HOUS
Location:	6 Rose Avenue Littleborough Rochdale OL15 8QJ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and extension to front driveway and dropped kerb
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Steve & Jackie Booth
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 6 Rose Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dormer bungalow located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 8 Rose Avenue to the north-east, adjacent to no. 4 Rose Avenue to the south-west, and faces the highway to the north-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the side curtilage of no. 2 Chichester Close to the south-east. The property is sited close to the junction with Smithy Bridge Road/B6225, a classified road.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 2.4m from the side elevation of the dwelling. The extension continues the pitched roof form and flat roof front and rear dormer of the host dwelling with matching ridge and eaves. The ground floor front elevation of the extension comprises a store room for refuse bin storage.

The submitted plans also indicate the alteration of the ground floor rear elevation windows to a set of bi-folding doors.

The proposed extension would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The proposal also seeks to extend the existing front driveway and dropped kerb to accommodate two off-street parking spaces. The driveway would be constructed in permeable paving.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Our main concern regarding this application is the potential loss of parking provision as a result of the side extension.

The dwelling is situated close to the junction of Rose Avenue and Smithy Bridge Road so any displaced parking onto the street would have an impact on the safety of that junction. For the size of the extended dwelling we would require the provision of two off-street parking spaces which must be viable and not extend onto the adopted highway. If the applicant can provide these spaces then Highways would raise an objection on this issue.

It would appear that the 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, subject to the confirmation of the required parking provision, and request no specific planning conditions.

UPDATE:

Further to Highways' previous comments on this application the amended plan now shows two off-street parking spaces which meets Council standards.

The widened driveway is likely to require an extension to the existing vehicle access crossing which will need a separate permission from the Council as Highway Authority.

Highways raise no objection to this application subject to the widening of the vehicle access crossing.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One neutral representation was received with the following concerns:

- ☐ Concerns over potential damage to adjoining roof as a result of the proposed works.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns over damages to the neighbouring property relates to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

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

Amendments were made to alter the ground floor of the proposed side extension from the previous design which featured a ground floor set back and overhang. The extension of the front driveway and dropped kerb were also added following the initial Highways comments.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- Paragraph 130 of the NPPF 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.”*
- 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 proposal seeks to construct a two-storey side extension comprising front and rear flat roof dormers. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes *“dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.”* Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:
 - (i) *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
 - (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
 - (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
 - (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
 - (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
 - (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
 - (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
 - (viii) *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- The host dwelling is a semi-detached dormer bungalow, an established house type design prevalent in the surrounding street scene and wider area. It comprises front and rear flat roof dormers which occupy the full width of the roof slope. The proposed front and rear dormer would match the existing in terms of their siting, scale and materiality. On this basis, the site context

justifies a relaxation of the above guidelines and therefore no concerns are raised in respect of the design of this element of the proposal.

- ☐ Likewise, the use of a dual-pitched roof form would match the host dwelling and appear in keeping.
- ☐ Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed two-storey side extension would share the same ridge and eaves height of the host dwelling and thus not appear subservient, given the built forms of the dormer bungalow, it is considered this proposal would better respect the design and character of the street scene and would be acceptable.
- ☐ No concerns are had regarding any potential harm arising from the 'terracing effect', given the difference in built forms between the host dwelling and the regular two-storey form of adjacent nos. 2 and 4 Rose Avenue, and the siting of the host dwelling on an elevated position from the pair of dwellings.
- ☐ 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 amended scheme includes refuse bin storage to the front of the proposed side extension behind roller shutter doors, which would ensure they are stored away from public view.
- ☐ 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 of the SPD 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."*
- ☐ Section 5.17 of the SPD states *"dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed."*
- ☐ No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the proposed two-storey side extension, given it does not project beyond the existing front and rear elevation of the host dwelling.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

- ☐ 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 driveway extension would provide sufficient off-street parking space for two vehicles which would meet highways requirements.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the front driveway to be constructed from permeable paving. Permeable driveways do not require planning permission and as such, it would not be necessary to condition details.
- ☐ 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 19/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – received 19/10/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 001 Rev. C dated 10/2023

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 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.

INFORMATIVES

The applicant is reminded of the need to provide a standard vehicle access crossing which will require a separate permission from the Council as Highways Authority for the works. The works will be required to be approved and implemented in full prior to the first use of the approved development.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	16/11/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/11/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen