

Application Number:	23/00221/HOUS
Location:	40 Marigold Street Rochdale OL11 1RJ
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing attached garage
Applicant:	SUNDUS GUL
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	Yes
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	No

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

40 Marigold Street is a two-storey detached corner plot property located in the Milkstone and Deeplish ward of Rochdale and in a Defined Urban Area as allocated under saved policy G/D/1. The dwelling currently hosts a side lean-to garage and benefits from off-street parking, generous garden space around the dwelling and a degree of shielding by high hedges along the boundary.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension projecting 4m from the south-side elevation which would be set down 0.3m from the existing roof ridge and set back 0.5m from the existing front elevation. Permission is also sought for a single storey rear extension spanning the full width of the new rear elevation (including side extension) with a lean-to roof and standing 3.6m in overall height.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The only issue arising from this application is parking provision.

It would appear that the application proposals will include the loss of the existing garage therefore there will be an impact on parking provision. For the size of the extended dwelling Council standards would require the provision of two off street parking spaces. If the applicant can demonstrate adequate and viable off street parking provision Highways would raise no objection.

The servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

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

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. No letters of representation 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:

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

Five sets of amended plans were received given the initial side extension was considered disproportionately wide in comparison to the existing dwelling. The extension was reduced in overall projection and also set down from the existing ridge

and set back from the front elevation of the existing dwellinghouse to ensure the side extension appeared subservient to the host dwelling.

In addition, an amended site plan was received in order to show the proposed works were in accordance with the consultation received from the highways officer.

Procedural Note

It is noted that the applicant is an officer of the Council, working within the legal department. However it is understood that they do not have any involvement in planning matters.

In accordance with the Council's constitution as it relates to the determination of planning applications, it is therefore not necessary for the application to be referred to the Planning and Licensing Committee, and can be determined as a decision delegated to officer level.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to a high standard of design. Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 requires "development to be of a high quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area."

The SPD does not explicitly set out guidance for side extensions however paragraph 5.1 states extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The two-storey side extension is considered to respect the proportions and visual appearance of the existing dwellinghouse. It is acknowledged the positioning of the existing front door to the far right of the front elevation may present any two-storey side extensions as an incongruous addition therefore it is noted the extension is wider than preferred in its overall appearance however, is considered, on balance, acceptable in this regard.

The single-storey rear extension, although large in length, is considered to form a satisfactory addition to the dwelling. Although it can be seen from the highway, the impact is not considered to be so unacceptable to warrant a refusal on this basis alone given much of the ground floor of the dwelling is shielded by hedges which run along the front and side boundaries.

The materiality and roof form of the proposed works would respect the existing visual appearance of the host dwelling. Both extensions are to be constructed from matching red brick and white UPVC together with a white cladding panel between the ground and upper floor windows on the front elevation of the side extension to follow the design feature on the original build and wider street scene.

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

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.

Section 4.1 of the SPD sets out minimum space standards for new residential development to which it requires "21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level". The separation distance between the first floor side extension window and the directly facing upper floor window at 15 Marigold Street would be 24m therefore is considered to satisfy this requirement.

It is considered for single storey extensions to not pose any overbearing or loss of light/privacy impacts that the following maximum standards is applied, "For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)". When measured along the common boundary, the single storey rear extension would project 2.6m from the rear elevation of the neighbouring detached house, 38 Marigold Street therefore in accordance with this requirement.

It is not considered the proposed works would have any impact on the neighbouring house to the rear, 42 Marigold Street, given the side elevation would directly face the rear elevation of 40 Marigold Street and hosts no side windows.

Whilst it is considered the proposed works would occupy a large portion of the existing garden space, however, given the property hosts generous garden space around the dwelling itself, the garden space retained is considered to be sufficient for the occupiers.

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

Following the removal of the existing side garage and the addition of two extra bedrooms, the site would retain off-street parking for at least two vehicles and is not considered to have any impact to highway safety.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:
 - SITE LOCATION PLAN
 - 23.3084.2C EXISTING AND PROPOSED BLOCK PLANS
 - 23.3084.SC1.1G SCHEME 1 – PROPOSED DETAILSand the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan 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	06.06.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	12.06.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo