

Application Number:	23/00886/HOUS
Location:	24 Juniper Drive, Milnrow, OL16 3BE
Proposal:	First floor side and front extension including garage conversion and hip-to-gable roof extension, single storey rear extension including Juliet balcony following demolition of existing conservatory, and extension to front porch - Retrospective
Applicant:	Mr Barry Shirtcliffe
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 24 Juniper Drive, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a late 20th century residential estate in Firgrove. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 26 Juniper Drive to the east, adjacent to no. 22 Juniper Drive to the west, and faces the highway to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto and is adjacent to the rear curtilages of no. 28 Juniper Drive and nos. 4, 6 and 8 Holford Walk. The dwelling benefits from a rear garden space and an extended front driveway.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought a number of substantial alterations and extensions to the host dwelling. Firstly, a first-floor side and front extension which projects 2.72m from the side elevation and 1.21m from the front elevation of the dwelling. The front projection would be constructed in render and is characterised by

a gable-fronted roof form with ridge and eaves height matching the existing gable wall.

A single-storey rear extension is also proposed to project 3.49m from the rear elevation of the dwelling following the demolition of the existing conservatory. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 3.06m.

Additional alterations are proposed, including the following:

- ② A hip-to-gable roof extension;
- ② The addition of a Juliet balcony to the first-floor rear bedroom; and
- ② An enlargement and alteration to the front porch to a lean-to roof form which projects an additional 0.85m to the side with a ridge height of 3.48m and a height to eaves of 2.68m.

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

Relevant History

01/D39266 - First floor side extension to dwelling – Grant subject to conditions

21/01071/HOUS - Single-storey rear extension and first floor side extension following demolition of existing conservatory – Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways' main concern regarding this application is the position of the proposed garage in relation to the existing highway. A standard requirement of this Council for garages is that their associated driveway length must be a minimum of 5m from the highway and the proposed garage is directly adjacent to Juniper Drive and the approach is at an oblique angle.

This proposed arrangement would have a detrimental impact on road safety as it does not provide adequate visibility between vehicles reversing in or out of the garage and pedestrians on the footway of Juniper Drive. Vehicles accessing the garage would have to undertake difficult manoeuvres because of the angle of approach and are also likely to come into conflict with other vehicles on Juniper Drive.

It would appear that there is adequate off-street parking provision on the existing driveway.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

At this stage Highways cannot support this application because of the position of the proposed garage as it is likely to have a detrimental impact on road safety.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Five objection letters were received with the following concerns:

- ☐ The proposed balcony would overlook onto rear gardens and rear habitable room windows of adjacent properties and result in loss of privacy;
- ☐ The proposal would devalue neighbouring properties due to loss of privacy;
- ☐ The proposal would set a precedent for rear balconies to be permitted in surrounding properties;
- ☐ The proposed balcony and glass balustrade are out of character with the surrounding dwellings.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Following discussions with the applicant, amendments have been agreed to omit the balcony and balustrade from the proposed plans. With this in mind, the Council is satisfied the design and amenity concerns raised have been addressed. Notwithstanding a full assessment of the merits of the application are set out in detail below.
- ☐ Matters relating to property prices do not form a material planning consideration to which the LPA shall have no regard.

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

Following significant design and amenity concerns, the applicant has agreed to remove the previously proposed balcony and garage from the proposal.

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 surrounding residential estate is a mixed street scene of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings. Whilst the use of brickwork and light render finish is prevalent, the dwellings are generally characterised by an inconsistent design language and vary in terms of built forms, massing, roof forms and architectural styles.
- ❑ The proposal has drastically overhauled the appearance of the existing dwelling, including the alteration of the Dutch gable roof form to a dual-pitched roof and the removal of the high hip-roofed garage. Whilst it is noted the scale of the dwelling has been substantially enlarged under the proposal, the resultant development nonetheless comprises of a regular and consolidated built form. Taking into account of the mixed street scene, it is considered the proposed development does not detract from the character and visual appearance of the surrounding area and would be acceptable on balance.
- ❑ As it stands, the proposed front projection comprises of brickwork with the ground-floor constructed from breezeblocks, likely from the previous attached garage. Whilst the proposed render of the front projection in isolation would constitute an obtrusive and unsympathetic feature, it is accepted that the use of a more complementary material such as brick slips would result in greater visual harm due to its visible protrusion from the breezeblocks. Given this,

and the established use of render within the estate, it is considered the proposed materiality would be appropriate in this context.

- ☐ Owing to the orientation of the host dwelling at a considerable distance away from adjacent no. 26, the proposal is not considered to result in any potential harm arising from the 'terracing effect'.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. Whilst the flat roof form of the extension does not match roof forms of the host dwelling, it is acknowledged the extension is sited to the rear and is not visible from public vantage points on the highway. On this basis, the rear extension is not considered to result in undue visual harm to the street scene and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ No concerns are had proposed porch extension, which would appear subservient and in keeping in terms of its scale and lean-to roof form.
- ☐ 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.

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."*
 - (ii) *"14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room"*
- ☐ 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)."*
- ☐ The proposed first-floor front extension does not directly face any habitable room windows and is sited approx. 24m from the front elevation of no. 25

Juniper Drive. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in significant overlooking impacts to the occupiers of no. 25.

- ☐ It is noted the resultant two-storey elevation is sited approx. 9.62m from the rear-facing habitable room windows of adjacent no. 26, which falls below the minimum space standards. However, given the siting of two-storey elevation to the west and at an angle away from no. 26, it is considered the extension would not result in adverse levels of overshadowing and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The proposed single-storey rear extension project 2.1m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the conservatory of adjacent no. 22. As such, the amenity impacts on no. 22 would be acceptable. Whilst the conservatory is noted to be a typical construction comprised entirely of glazing, the overbearing impact of the proposal would not be so great as to warrant refusal particularly on any external amenity areas, and the overshadowing impacts would be minimal due to the single storey form and the placement of built form to the east of the conservatory, where it would not obstruct existing provisions of sunlight into the afternoon.
- ☐ Whilst it is acknowledged a Juliet balcony would result in greater overlooking impacts than a standard-sized window, it is noted the Juliet balcony would only marginally project beyond the rear elevation and would be partially screened by the parapet wall of the single-storey rear extension, restricting its outlook onto adjacent rear curtilages. It is not considered that this feature would offer significantly different views than the existing window and on this basis, the amenity impacts in this regard would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ 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 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 provision of which would be retained in the front driveway.
- ☐ 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 and Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. 72_01 dated 21/07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 72_09 Rev. A dated 27/09/2023
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 72_02 dated 21/07/2023
- ☐ Existing First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 72_03 dated 21/07/2023
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 72_04 dated 21/07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 72_05 Rev. B dated 04/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 72_06 Rev. B dated 02/10/2023
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 72_07 Rev. E dated 09/10/2023

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.

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	05/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	09/10/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen

