

Application Number:	22/01249/HOUS
Location:	8 Abbey Drive Littleborough Rochdale OL15 0NA
Proposal:	Erection of replacement garage-retrospective
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Stott
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. 8 Abbey Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in the suburb of Smithy Bridge, Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 6 Abbey Drive to the north-west, adjacent to no. 10 Abbey Drive to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 76 and no. 78 Brown Lodge Drive. The application site consists of a garage outbuilding in the rear curtilage which is accessible via a driveway.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for the erection of a replacement garage, following the demolition of the original garage. The outbuilding occupies the same footprint as the original garage and measures approx. 4.25m in length, approx. 6.65m in width, and approx. 3.01m in ridge height and approx. 2.54m in eaves height.

The outbuilding is of a similar form, height and scale to the original garage and is characterised by a tiled dual-pitched roof. It is constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

83/D15935 - Two storey extension to rear of dwellinghouse - 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

- ☐ 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 outbuilding is of a single storey form which appears subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a dual-pitched roof is also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ The use of red brick for the walls and tiles for the roof match the materials of the host dwelling and are considered to be in keeping.
- ☐ The outbuilding replaces the timber windows of the original garage with uPVC windows which raises no concern.
- ☐ It is considered the windows, door and garage doors are sized and positioned appropriately in relation to the fenestration of the original garage.
- ☐ 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”*.
- ☐ The difference in ridge height between the outbuilding and the original garage is approx. 0.06m. Due to the marginal height difference, the additional harm of the proposed development by means of overbearing impact and overshadowing is not considered to be significant and would be acceptable.
- ☐ The outbuilding adjoins an existing outbuilding of adjacent no. 10 along the common boundary and is set back from said outbuilding. As such, there are no concerns over overshadowing impacts to the rear curtilage of adjacent no. 10.
- ☐ 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 outbuilding retains the footprint of the original garage. As such, the proposed development does not impact on the provision of parking spaces

for the host property. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ② Location Plan and Site Plan - HAD3435-01
- ② Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – HAD3435-02 Revision A
- ② Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – HAD3435-03

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.

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	29/11/2022	Signed: SY
Authorisation	01/12/2022	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen