

Application Number:	23/00879/HOUS
Location:	68 Fairway, Rochdale, OL11 3BZ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, extension to existing rear dormer and alterations to existing front porch and the addition of a bin store to the front elevation. Re-submission of 23/00575/HOUS
Applicant:	Barry Deegan
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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

This application refers to no. 68 Fairway, a semi-detached dormer bungalow fronting Fairway in Castleton. The property is orientated northeast towards the highway and adjoins no. 66 Fairway to the northwest. The topography increases gradually in a northeasterly direction, with the result that the adjacent property, no. 70, is located on slightly higher ground. There are no properties to the rear and the land immediately to the southwest is designated Green Belt. The subject property is situated within an architecturally similar run of three pairs of semi-detached dormer bungalows.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension, which would be set back 1 metre from the existing front elevation and include the extension of the existing dormer at first floor at the rear elevation. The proposals include the erection of a bin screen to the front of the proposed extension and the relocation of the existing entrance door to the front of the porch. Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

Reasons for refusal:

1. *By virtue of its siting, massing, scale and design, the proposed two storey side extension would be detrimental to the character of the street scene and would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling. In addition, it would contribute to a potential terracing effect between the host dwelling and no.70 Fairway that would result in the loss of a valuable break in the built form of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the visual amenity aims of 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.*
2. *The proposed extension would restrict external access to the rear of the property resulting in refuse bins being stored to the front of the property in public view. This would cause an unduly negative impact upon the visual amenity of the surrounding street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the 'Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy', the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD' (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses**Highways And Engineering**

As with the previous application for this site (23/00575) Highways main concern would be parking provision for the extended dwelling.

The size of the extended dwelling would require the provision of two off street parking spaces to meet Council standards, and if the applicant can demonstrate that such a provision can be accommodated within the development proposals we would raise no objection.

The servicing arrangements for the building would remain unchanged.

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

Subject to the provision of parking spaces Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 require new development to demonstrate high quality design. Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 outlines that all new development must “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.”

Furthermore, paragraph 5.1 of the ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD’ states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Under the previous application, the Council raised concerns regarding the lack of subservience of the extension to the host property, the potential for a terracing effect should the adjacent property extend in a similar way and the lack of designated bin storage.

To overcome these concerns, the extension has been set back 1 metre from the front elevation, which demonstrates subservience to the host dwelling and avoids the potential for a harmful terracing effect. Further to this, the storage of bins is proposed to the front of the extension, with a screen ensuring that the bins are obscured from public view. Further details of this screen, in respect of its materials, can be sought through condition.

The proposed relocation of the entrance door to the front of the porch is considered acceptable and would be in-keeping with the immediate neighbouring properties.

In light of the above, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires that proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

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).” The submitted plans confirm that the first floor of the two storey side extension would not surpass the front or rear elevations of the adjoining and adjacent neighbouring properties.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires “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 two storey side extension would measure approx. 26m to the front elevation of the facing property on the opposite side of Fairway (no. 67). The extension would have a 14m distance to the rear boundary of curtilage and would not face any residential properties.

The proposed side extension would be in close proximity to the upper floor window in the northwestern side elevation of no.70 Fairway, with a separation distance of approximately 2.3m. However as this is not a principal window serving a habitable room it does not require a high level of protection. It is noted that no. 70 has a front elevation window located adjacent to the proposed side extension and that the side extension would project 5m beyond this window. The proposed development would result in a loss of light and outlook to this window, however it would appear that this window is a secondary window, where the window on the rear elevation is the primary source of light and outlook to the room. Furthermore, the window on the neighbouring front elevation is already significantly overshadowed by virtue of its setback from the original front wall. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not have an undue impact upon the levels of amenity enjoyed by the occupants of no. 70 Fairway.

The plans confirm 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

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states ‘Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.’

It is noted that the proposed development would reduce the space currently designated as drive way to one car. No parking plan is provided. While on street parking is limited in this location and the proposal would not adhere to the maximum parking requirements of Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS, it is not considered the reduction of one parking space would result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, and would be in accordance with 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan, Block Plan and Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations. Drawing Amended 07/08/2023.

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.

4. The extension hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the bin screen has been installed in accordance with the details shown on 'Location Plan, Block Plan and Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations. Drawing Amended 07/08/2023'. The bin screen shall be retained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials to be used for the proposed bin screen have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 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	05/09/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	25/09/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling