

Application Number:	22/01255/HOUS
Location:	36 Sunningdale Drive Heywood OL10 2DB
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey side and rear extension
Applicant:	Mrs Kalsoom Siddique
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

This application relates to no.36 Sunningdale Drive, a detached property situated at the end of a cul-de-sac within a residential area of Heywood. It is L-shaped in design with an adjoining flat roofed garage, the roof of which extends over the property's front entrance, creating a canopy.

The property is built in buff brick with uPVC shiplap cladding over sections of the side and front elevation at a first floor level.

The host property belongs to a group of four similarly designed properties situated at the end of the cul-de-sac. Other properties of similar L-shape design are distributed throughout the street scene interspersed by dwellings with a square footprint of a similar period.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension and a single storey side and rear extension. The two storey side enlargement would be set back 6.88m from the front wall and project 3.52m from the existing side elevation adjacent to no.15 Sunningdale Drive. It would align with the existing eaves, be set down slightly from the existing ridge line and have a hipped roof design.

The application also proposes the erection of a small single storey extension that would 'fill in' the corner recess at the rear. It would be in line with the existing side

wall and project 1.51m beyond the existing rear wall. It would be 3.29m high, with its eaves lining with the eaves of the existing building.

It would be built of matching facing brick walls and tiled roof.

Relevant History

93/D30076 Two Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling.
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

None 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:

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

- ☐ Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that

planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

- ☐ Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. The proposed two storey extension is set sufficiently below the existing ridgeline and is set back 6.88m at both a ground and first floor level from the existing front elevation. In addition, given the set back of the proposed two storey extension and the positioning of the application property, it is noted that the proposed two storey enlargement would be afforded significant screening from public viewpoint, limiting any impact on the character of the street scene. Overall, the proposed extensions are considered to be subservient additions that respect both the character of the host build and wider street scene.
- ☐ Paragraphs 5.11 - 5.13 of the SPD details the requirements of side extensions in order to prevent the terracing effect, requiring two storey side extensions that fall within 1m of the side boundary to be set back from the front elevation by 2m at a first floor level or 1m at both a ground floor and first floor level. Given that the proposed side extension is set back 6.88m from the existing front elevation, it is considered that the proposed extension would not give rise to a terracing effect.
- ☐ Whilst it is noted that the overall proposal would feature a large scale, it would not appear overbearing or out of character with the surrounding area and the design would be complementary to the host property. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would respect the visual amenity of the host dwelling and locality.

Summary

- ☐ In view of the above assessment, 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

- ☐ The proposal would adhere to the separation distances contained within section 4.1 of the SPD. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for surrounding occupiers.
- ☐ The part single storey side and rear extension would not result in undue harm to the amenity of no.34 Sunningdale Drive given its minimal projection from the rear elevation of the host dwelling and the irregular positioning of the neighbouring dwellings.
- ☐ Whilst the proposed two storey side extension would bring additional scale and massing closer to the common boundary with no.15 Sunningdale Drive, it is not considered to have an undue impact on the outlook from or light received by the principal windows of no.15. The proposed two storey

extension would likely result in some overshadowing impact to the outdoor amenity space of no.15 in the late afternoon to early evening, however it is not considered that this overshadowing would impact the most intensively used outdoor amenity space.

- ☐ The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden with a functional layout.
- ☐ In light of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and would provide a satisfactory standard of occupier amenity for all future occupiers in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

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
- Existing Floor Plans and Site Plan. Drg no. 1942/1
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 1942/2
- Proposed Floor Plans and Site Plan. Drg no. 1942/3
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 1942/4

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	10/11/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	28/11/2022	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling