

Application Number:	23/01014/HOUS
Location:	19 Castleway, Rochdale, OL11 3BP
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extension including the insertion of a first floor window on the existing rear elevation
Applicant:	Andris Punculis
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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 refers to a two-storey, semi-detached property located along the head of a cul-de-sac in Castleton. Castleway is comprised of predominantly semi-detached dwellings of varying building style. The subject property is constructed in dark brickwork with a slate-topped gable roof and an oriel window to the front elevation. It benefits from a front driveway and a paved rear garden bound by a timber fence with mature vegetation to the rear. It adjoins no. 17 Castleway to the east and is adjacent to no. 22 Castleway to the west. To the rear, the site shares a common boundary with no. 32 Manchet Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and the insertion of a first floor window on the existing rear elevation. The two-storey side extension would project 2 metres from the existing side elevation and have a dual-pitched roof to reflect the existing roof form. It would be set back 2.2 metres from the existing front elevation and its ridge would be set down accordingly. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project 2.5 metres from the existing rear elevation and have a width of 7.31 metres. It would sit flush with the proposed side extension and be set in 0.14 metres from the common boundary with no. 17 Castleway. Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The main issue in relation to this application is parking provision. The application dwelling is located on the turning head of Castleway and any overspill on street parking into the turning head would restrict the safe operation of the highway network. We must therefore ask that a minimum of two viable off street parking are provided for the extended dwelling as part of the development proposals.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity on the wider highway network..

Highways would raise no objection to this application if the required off street parking spaces can be provided. If permission was to be granted we would request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

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

- ☐ Section 5.1 of the SPD states that alterations and extensions to dwellings *“should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ☐ The proposed side extension as viewed from Castleway would appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling by virtue of its 2.2 metre setback from the front elevation with the ridge set down accordingly. The style of extension is characteristic of this dwelling type and the windows in the front elevation are considered to be acceptable in terms of size and position. The treatment of the development in brickwork to match the host dwelling will ensure a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance.
- ☐ No concerns are had regarding the ‘terracing effect’ owing to the 2.2 metre setback of the side extension from the existing front wall and the distance to the side boundary, which would be 1.4 metres when measured from the front elevation.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension would be a single-storey form and would appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would have an appropriately pitched lean-to roof with three roof lights above.
- ☐ Side extensions often restrict external access between the front and rear curtilage for the storage of bins. This proposal, however, maintains sufficient space to the side of the extension and would not affect the existing bin storage arrangements; which are well-screened from public view.
- ☐ 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:
 - *“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 5.5 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 notes the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*

- ☐ The proposed single-storey rear extension would not project beyond the rear elevations of nos. 19 and 22 Castleway.
- ☐ The proposed two storey side extension would face the blank side elevation of no. 22 Castleway and, therefore, no concerns are had with regards to an undue loss of light or outlook for the neighbouring occupiers..
- ☐ The proposed first floor window to the rear would measure approx. 11 metres to the rear boundary of the curtilage and is considered acceptable.
- ☐ It is not considered that the remaining fenestration to the front, side and rear of the proposed development would result in an undue loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all 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.
- ☐ 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 not increase the existing number of bedrooms at the property and the existing parking arrangements would not be affected by the proposed extension.
- ☐ 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:

- Plans as Existing. Sheet no. 001. Rev B
- Plans as Proposed. Sheet no. 002. Rev B

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	01/11/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	20.11.23	Signed: ML

Report Author Bob Melling