

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00644/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00644/HOUS
Location:	8 Stubbs Road, Rochdale, OL11 2BB
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension (Retrospective)
Applicant:	Lee Williams
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 30.08.2024	EXT OF TIME 20.09.2024
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 Stubbs Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a new build housing development in Kirkholt. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 6 Stubbs Road, adjacent to no. 10 Stubbs Road, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear curtilage slopes upwards towards the north-west and borders the rear curtilage of no. 184b Hill Top Drive.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension which projects 4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension is set away from the common boundary with no. 6 by 0.3m and is characterised by a hipped roof form with a ridge height of 3.35m and a height to eaves of 2.6m.

The proposal has been constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

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)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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 constructed rear extension is of a single-storey form which appears subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a hipped roof form is also in keeping and raises no concerns.
- ☐ The extension has been constructed in materials matching the host dwelling, and has been designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the fenestration of the host dwelling.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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 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);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)."*

- ② Additionally, Section 5.7 adds that *“if the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary”*
- ② The single-storey rear extension projects 0.3m beyond a 45 degree line described in Section 5.7 from no. 6 and therefore fails to accord with the space standards outlined. However, it is considered this exceedance, which represents an additional floor area of 0.25m², is marginal and does not amount to unacceptable levels of overshadowing harm to the rear elevation windows of no. 6. Moreover, the hipped roof form further minimises the overbearing impact of the extension to the adjoining amenity space.
- ② Regards have also been had to the wider site layout, where the rear amenity space of adjoined no. 6 is already subjected to limited access to natural light due to its siting to the north-west of the pair of dwellings. The site is also relatively enclosed by the surrounding two-storey dwellings which restricts outlook from the rear. Given this context, it is considered the additional projection does not result in a substantial loss in amenity from the site prior to the construction of the extension.
- ② For the reasons set out above, it is considered the proposed extension does not constitute undue amenity harm to the occupiers of no. 6 and is acceptable on balance.
- ② No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the extension on adjacent no. 10 which would accord with the requirements of Section 5.6.
- ② Likewise, no amenity harm has been identified to the rear facing dwellings due to the marked difference in levels and considerable separation distance between the properties.
- ② The extension provides adequate natural light to the orangery and retains sufficient garden space of a functional layout, thereby ensuring an acceptable standard of living for the 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

- ② 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.”*
- ② The single-storey rear extension does not impact on the existing parking arrangements and is 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 – Drawing No. FO 06245905/6 received 05/07/2024

- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. FO 06245905/5 received 05/07/2024
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. FO 06245905/1 received 05/07/2024
- ☐ Existing Side and Rear Elevation – Drawing No. FO 06245905/2 received 05/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Section Plan – Drawing No. FO 06245905/3 received 05/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Side and Rear Elevation – Drawing No. FO 06245905/4 received 05/07/2024

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 adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	19/09/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/09/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen