

Application Number:	23/00106/HOUS
Location:	9 Tenterhill Lane Rochdale Rochdale OL11 5TY
Proposal:	Part single part two storey front extension and installation of ground floor high level window to side elevation. Resubmission of application 22/01289/HOUS
Applicant:	CARL BRIERLEY
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

23/00106/HOUS 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 9 Tenterhill Lane, a two-storey detached property located in the Norden ward of Rochdale and within the defined urban area. The dwelling benefits from substantial front and rear garden space as well as an attached garage to the north elevation. The property is sited on a residential estate that comprises a mixture of dwelling types, forms, scale and design, with a medium-high degree of uniformity. It is noted the dwellings along the Tenterhill Lane highway feature a staggered siting with the application property sited further back than the adjacent dwelling to the south, 7 Tenterhill Lane and the bungalow to the north, 1 Higher Lodge, set significantly forward of the host property with an orientation angled 90 degrees away of the application property.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the addition of a part single / part two storey front extension considered to be a continuation of the existing front facing gable. The extension would project 5m at ground floor level and 4m at first floor level and host a front gable feature matching the pitch on the existing roof. The insertion of 1no roof would be to the ground floor south elevation.

The extension is to be finished in red brick to both the ground and first floor with matching tiles to the roof and UPVC to fenestration.

Relevant History

22/01289/HOUS TWO-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF GROUND FLOOR HIGH LEVEL WINDOW TO SIDE ELEVATION
Refuse 12.12.2022

1. By virtue of its design, form and massing the proposed extension plus dormers would be an unsympathetic and non-subservient addition to the host dwelling, and it would significantly erode the character and uniformity of the immediate streetscene. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape.

With regards to the scale of the proposal, it is considered that dwellings on Tenterhill Lane and in immediately adjacent settings on Higher Lodge, comprise a mixture of built form and scale. The proposed plans do not indicate a scale which would be seen as an incongruous addition to a dwelling of this size and one which would appear at odds with the surrounding street scene. Whilst it is acknowledged the extension would not be set down from the host dwelling, the lack of subservience is not thought to be so harmful it would warrant a reason for refusal given the extension would mimic the form and build of the existing gable. Owing to the orientation and layout of the house, it is considered that a subservient addition would appear incongruous.

It is noted a strong building line is not present amongst any of the dwellings along Tenterhill Lane nor within the wider settings along Higher Lodge therefore the proposal does not present any overriding need for protection as a result of a staggered siting of the dwellings. However, it is noted the two dwellings sited to the south of the application property both host a lean-to roof and front gable protruding elements to the front elevations to which the extension is not proposed to extend forward of.

The lean to roof, although not characteristic of the existing house, is considered to be an acceptable addition to the dwelling given similar designs features are found amongst the surrounding street scene. The proposed continuation of the front gable at first floor level would be constructed with a pitched roof matching that on the existing build and would therefore be considered an acceptable addition.

Limited details on the proposed materials have been provided on the submitted PA. It is considered that in order to promote a satisfactory standard of design and to retain an exact match of the existing detailed brickwork, prior to any above ground works, exact details and specifications of the intended finish are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

It is considered that the proposed extension would constitute a satisfactory standard of design and would not unduly impact the character and appearance of the existing street scene, in accordance with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and P3 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

The proposal would see the provision of an additional ground floor window to the south elevation of the existing dwelling. All habitable room windows are considered to comply with the minimum distance standards of section 4.1 of the SPD, and no concerns are raised in this regard. The window is not considered to pose any loss of privacy concerns for the adjacent occupiers to the south given the proposed window would face a blank elevation therefore not looking into any directly facing amenity space.

It should be noted the dwelling does not directly align at close proximity with any facing dwellings to the front therefore new front windows on the first floor of the extension would also comply with Section 4 Space Standards.

The plans indicate a window to the ground floor of the north side elevation. The window is not considered to pose any amenity concerns given it would face the retaining wall to the rear of 1 Higher Lodge therefore not posing any amenity concerns.

Sufficient garden space would be retained post development given development is proposed to the front and the site would retain the significantly large gardens at both the front and rear.

The proposal would therefore 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

The proposal would retain off-street parking for at least two vehicles, with additional space in the existing attached garage. This would exceed the maximum car parking standards contained within appendix 5 of the Core Strategy which permits a 200% parking provision at this location. Further to this, the site lies on a quiet residential road with the only through access being the Higher Lodge cul-de-sac and it is not considered that the proposal would result in any undue impacts to public or highway safety. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 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. This permission relates to the following plans:
 - SITE LOCATION PLAN
 - 22.2949.SC5.1A PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
 - 22.2949.SC5.2 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

and 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. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 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	14.03.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	30.03.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo