

Application Number:	23/00947/HOUS
Location:	1 The Brook, Calderbrook Road, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 9NW
Proposal:	First floor rear extension
Applicant:	Daniel Chapman
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. 1 The Brook, Calderbrook Road, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a semi-rural setting in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 2 The Brook to the north, adjacent to Stansfield Cottage to the south-west, and faces the highway to the north-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 9 Shopwood Way to the south-east and the Stansfield Estate Play Area to the east. The dwelling is set back 1.89m from the front elevation of adjacent no. 2. Within the wider vicinity, lies no. 2-7 Lower Calderbrook, which are Grade-II listed buildings.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension which replaces the existing first-floor balcony and projects 2.4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension is characterised by a gable-fronted roof and is set down from the ridge line by 0.29m with matching height to eaves. The rear elevation of the extension comprises a Juliet balcony to the rear bedroom.

The proposal would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

81/D12381 - Outline Application Private Double Garage And Single Storey Extensions To Side & Rear Dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

81/D12854 - Private Garage - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

The proposed extension would be to a modern dwelling, separated from the listed buildings by another pair of late 20th century houses. While in the wider vicinity of the listed buildings, the extension would be seen in the context of modern development and would not have any material impact on the setting of the heritage assets. The Conservation Officer raises no objection.

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:

P2	Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage
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

- ☐ 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 first-floor rear extension is set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would be subservient in this regard.
- ☐ The use of a gable-fronted roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ Notwithstanding the inclusion of the gable-end window, it is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ 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.

Heritage: P2

- ☐ Regard has been had to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF in respect of the impact on the nearby listed buildings as it is considered that the proposed the extension would be seen in the context of the modern development and thus is not considered to harm the significance of the setting of the designated heritage assets. This is reflected in the comments received from the Council’s Conservation Officer.

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.”*
- ❑ Additionally, Section 5.9 of the SPD states first-floor rear 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.
- ❑ The proposed first-floor rear extension replaces the existing first-floor balcony and does not directly face any properties to the rear. It also does not project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from the points 2.4m along the common boundaries from the rear elevations of adjacent no. 2 and Stansfield Cottage. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in adverse amenity impacts in this regard.
- ❑ Notwithstanding the proposed rear-facing Juliet balcony which would partially overlook the rear curtilage of adjacent no. 9, the proposal nonetheless constitutes a reduction in outlook from the existing first-floor balcony. Given this, it is considered the proposal would not result in detrimental loss of privacy to the occupiers of no.9.
- ❑ 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 proposed development would 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 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 04/09/2023
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3183.3 dated 08/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 23.3183.1 dated 07/2023
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3183.2 dated 07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 23.3183.SC1.1A dated 07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3183.SC1.2A dated 07/2023

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 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	16/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	10/11/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen