

Application Number:	23/01250/HOUS
Location:	12 Clarkes Lane Rochdale OL12 6PY
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and alterations to rear fenestrations
Applicant:	Ms Salma Mahmood
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	YES

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

12 Clarkes Lane is a two storey semi-detached residence located in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale and wholly within the Defined Urban Area and sits adjacent to the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. The property itself is situated within a street scene which exhibits a predominance of semi-detached dwellings finished with a cohesive material palette of red brick.

The property adjoins to 14 Clarkes Lane to which it is the last in a row of semi-detached dwellings. The south side elevations sits adjacent to the rear elevation of the adjacent property to the south, no.116 Edmund Street and the front faces onto the courtyard at Spotland Primary School.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension projecting 3.30m from the south side elevation at both ground and first floor level, set back 1m from the principal elevation and hosting a pitched roof and matching materials. Permission is also sought for alteration to fenestration on the ground floor rear elevation.

Relevant History**06/D48180**

Two storey side extension to dwelling
Refuse December 2006

1. The proposed extension would be 7 metres away from the principal windows in the rear elevation of 16 Edmund Street, which faces the side of 12 Clarkes Lane. At present these windows maintain 10 metres to the existing gable and this is already below the minimum standard of 14 metres required by the council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Not – Guidelines and Standards for Residential Developments. The size of the proposal would further reduce the separation distance and this, together with the height of the proposal, would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the amenity of 116 Edmund Street. This is contrary to policy H/11 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan.

23/00372/HOUS

Two storey side extension including alterations to existing ground floor rear doorway to a window
Refuse September 2023

1. By virtue of its siting, design and scale, the proposed two-storey side extension is considered a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling house by virtue of the overall projection when viewed in conjunction with the overall scale. As such, the proposal would not accord with 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. By virtue of its siting, design and scale, the proposed two storey side extension would reduce the separation distance between the upper floor rear windows on 116 Edmund Street and the gable end of the extension posing an unacceptable overbearing impact to these principal windows. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

The application site is a semi-detached house, dating from the interwar period, along Clarkes Lane in Rochdale. It is not listed but is relatively close to two conservation areas: Spotland Bridge and St Edmund's Church Falinge.

The proposal is for the construction of a two storey side extension to the property. Given the distance of separation and the nature of the proposal, subject to a condition requiring bricks and roof materials to match, there would be no adverse impact on the significance of these designated heritage assets. The proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted. One letter of objection was received

Objection Letter

- ☐ Loss of sunlight

Officer Response Any impact to neighbouring properties is assessed in the 'Amenity' section of the report

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD sets out guidance for house extensions to which they are required to demonstrate that they are in keeping with the host property and are generally subservient to it.

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy outlines the importance of improving design of new development. The following design principle is therefore relevant in the context of this application "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".

With reference to the previous application which was refused by virtue of its overall disproportionate design and lack of adequate subservience against the main dwellinghouse, the new application proposes a reduced projection from 4.17m to 3.30m therefore not overly large for a dwelling of this size. The reduced projection is also no longer considered to disrupt the nature of the semi-detached dwellings. Where relevant, the new scheme is considered to adhere to good design principles and also demonstrate subservience by virtue of a 0.4m set down from the existing roof ridge and a 1m set back from the front elevation.

It is noted two storey side extensions are relatively common within the vicinity, mostly with larger projections that that proposed under this application therefore to approve such scheme is not considered to negatively impact upon the street scene, landscape or present any unacceptable harm to the adjacent Conservation Area.

The material palette and roof form of the extension would be consistent with that on the parent dwelling therefore not considered to compromise the visual amenity of the dwelling and Conservation Areas in this respect and remains acceptable on these grounds. The alteration to fenestration of the existing rear ground floor door to a window is also acceptable given it would be of consistent design to those on the existing dwelling.

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

Protection of residential amenity is considered under the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy to which it states "All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings".

Posing an unacceptable overbearing impact, the previous report was refused on the grounds of its impact to the upper floor rear principal window(s) of no.116 Edmund Street. Whilst the new application would see a reduced projection, it is not considered to be wholly sufficient in overcoming the previous reason for refusal however, on balance and on the basis the concerned principal window does not directly align with the side elevation of the extension, where the proposal is considered to pose some extent of overbearing impact to this window, the impact is not considered to be so significant it would warrant to remain a refusal on this basis given the projection has now been reduced. The other window on the upper floor rear elevation is obscurely glazed therefore is an indication that it does not host a habitable room. Furthermore, the rear elevation of no.116 Edmund St is orientated north, and as such, does not benefit from any direct access to natural light.

Where the extension is close to the rear boundary of no.116, the potential for an overbearing impact to the rear garden is present. However, no.116 previously obtained permission for a single storey rear extension which occupies a large proportion of their rear amenity space therefore although a small amount of rear garden space remains (approx. 9m²), it is not considered to be a functional space which would warrant amenity protection.

The proposal would retain approx. 1.8m of amenity space to the side of the dwelling therefore not considered to impact upon the access to the rear garden.

The development is not considered to impact upon the amenity of other surrounding occupiers such as those at no.114 Edmund Street, nos.15 & 17 Chaseley Road and no.14 Clarkes Lane by virtue of the separation distance from the extension.

All habitable rooms are to receive sufficient light and outlook and post development, the plot would retain a suitably sized rear garden for the enjoyment of the occupiers.

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

The development would increase the property from a 3-bed to a 5-bed. The property does not host on-site parking however, parking is facilitated by on-street parking adjacent to the dwelling. Post-development this would remain unchanged and is considered to adequately facilitate the need for additional vehicles by virtue of increased residency within the dwelling.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:-

- Location Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- A102.C Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan 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	22.12.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	12/01/2024	Signed: RKilleen

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo

