

Application Number:	23/00856/HOUS
Location:	26 Lonsdale Avenue, Rochdale, OL16 5HP
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension and two-storey side and rear extension with single-storey front porch extension and alteration to first-floor rear elevation window
Applicant:	Mr Naveed Ahmed
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. 26 Lonsdale Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential neighbourhood in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 28 Lonsdale Avenue to the north-east, adjacent to no. 24 Lonsdale Avenue to the south-west, and faces the highway to the north-west. The property benefits from a large rear garden, the rear curtilage boundary of which borders the curtilage of St. Peter's Church of England Primary School to the south-east. It also comprises a detached garage to the rear of the dwelling and a front driveway.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a wraparound extension comprising a two-storey side extension which projects 2.92m from the side elevation of the dwelling and a single-storey rear extension which projects 4.51m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the partial demolition of the existing single-storey rear outrigger. The side extension is characterised by a cross-hipped roof form and is set back 1m from the main front wall of the host dwelling. It is also set down 0.19m from the ridge

line of the host dwelling with matching height to eaves. The rear extension is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.82m and a height to eaves of 2.65m.

The application also proposes a front porch which projects 1.6m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.6m and a height to eaves of 2.62m.

The submitted plans also indicate the alteration of the existing first-floor rear elevation window.

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 front porch extension would seem to impact on the current parking area reducing the available parking space leaving the extended dwelling with only one viable parking space. Although the submitted plans show vehicles parked in front of the porch these do not represent a standard sized family car. Highways would require a standard length parking space to the front of the dwelling which must be a minimum of 5 metres in length so that vehicles do not overhang the adopted highway. If the applicant can provide two viable off street parking spaces Highways would raise no objection on this issue.

The current 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.

If the parking issue can be resolved Highways would raise no objection to this application, and request no 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

Amendments have been made to alter the setback of the proposed two-storey side extension from a 0.89m setback on the first floor to 1m setback on both levels.

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 proposed two-storey side extension would be set below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would appear subservient in this regard. The use of a cross-hipped roof would also be in keeping and raises no concern.

- ☐ Amendments have been accepted to set the front elevation of the proposed side extension back 1m from the main front wall, which would minimise the potential harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The use of a lean-to roof form is also considered appropriate.
- ☐ It is acknowledged front porch extensions are not established features of the surrounding street scene. Notwithstanding, the proposed porch is of a modest scale and regular built form with a lean-to roof form which would appear in keeping with the host dwelling. On this basis, the proposed porch is not considered to result in adverse visual harm to the street scene and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ It is noted the proposed side extension would sever the side access to enable refuse bins to be stored away from public view. However, given that numerous neighbouring properties with side extensions have similar existing arrangements, it is considered a refusal in this regard could not be reasonably substantiated.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed is considered to comprise a satisfactory standard of design which would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. 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:
 - (i) *“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 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:
 - ☐ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*

② *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)."*

- ② For the purposes of this assessment, the above maximum standard would also apply to single-storey front extensions.
- ② Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey extensions projecting *"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)"* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ② The proposed two-storey side extension is set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling and does not directly face any properties to the rear. Thus it is considered the proposal would not have adverse amenity impacts in this regard.
- ② The proposed single-storey rear extension projects 4.51m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjoining no. 28, which exceeds the maximum standard stated in Section 5.6. However, it is noted planning permission was recently granted for a two-storey side and rear extension at adjoining no. 28 (ref: 23/00628/HOUS). In *Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2009] EWCA Civ 333* Sullivan LJ held that in order for a prospect to be a real prospect, it does not have to be probable or likely; a possibility will suffice. Taking into account of the 2.4m rear extension of no. 28, the proposed rear extension projects an additional 2.11m and as such, the prospect of the adjoining development would not prejudice the proposed extension and would be acceptable in this regard.
- ② The proposed front porch extension is set away from the adjoining common boundaries and projects 1.6m from the front elevation of the host dwelling which would be acceptable.
- ② The proposed two-storey rear extension would project 0.1m beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 24. It is noted however, the exceedance is marginal and as such, the projection is not considered to result in unacceptable levels of additional overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the occupiers of no. 24 and would be acceptable on balance.
- ② It is acknowledged the proposed plans indicate a 4.49m first-floor rear extension which could potentially restrict natural light into the existing rear bedroom of the property. Notwithstanding, given the siting of the room facing the south-east, which would receive sufficient levels of unrestricted sunlight, and considering the proposed first-floor rear extension would comply with Section 5.9 when measured from the centre of the rear bedroom window, the outlook and provision of light would be acceptable in this context.
- ② The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all remaining habitable rooms and that ample 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.
- ② 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 side extension and front porch extension would reduce the number of off-street parking spaces to one on the front driveway. Notwithstanding, regard have been had on the existing parking arrangements for properties on the street scene, which comprise of similar arrangements as well as on-street parking spaces. With this in mind, and given the low-trafficked nature of the highway, it is considered the potential addition of one vehicle to the highway would not be detrimental to highway capacity and safety.
- ☐ 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 07/08/2023
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 2023/32-02 Rev. D received 02/10/2023
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Roof Plan – Drawing No. 2023/32-01 Rev. C received 04/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan - 2023/32-03 Rev. C received 02/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 2023/32-04 Rev. C received 02/10/2023

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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the south-west facing side elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	10/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	12/10/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen