

Application Number:	22/01590/HOUS
Location:	1 Winchester Close Rochdale Rochdale OL11 5NE
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extension with conversion of garage to habitable space and alteration to front fenestration with render to front elevation and front car port following removal of front canopy
Applicant:	Mr Taraq
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	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

The application relates to 1 Winchester Close, a two-storey detached property located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale, originally constructed with a large front facing gable feature and buff brick masonry. The property is set back approx. 10m from the pavement to which the site boundary is softened by mature trees. The property benefits from a substantially large plot, off-road parking and an attached garage to the side. Properties along Winchester Close are comprised of detached dwelling houses, many of which are not uniform in appearance.

Description of Proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension projecting 5.7m from the current protruding two-storey rear element and 6.8m from the original rear elevation. The side extension would project 5.2m from the existing protruding snug to the north elevation and be set back 3.4m from the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension. A small infill is also proposed to the front elevation between the existing attached garage and front facing gable as well as a car port projecting approx. 5m (5m in width) from the front elevation following demolition of the existing porch.

The side extension would replace the existing garage and would accommodate a hydrotherapy pool to meet the needs of the occupiers which would be constructed in the existing buff brick masonry on the existing dwelling and three large windows to the front elevation, labelled as obscurely glazed on the plans.

White render is partially proposed to the front facing gable and partially on the single storey side extension.

The submitted plans refer to an extension to the dropped kerb at the front of the property, but this would be outside the site boundary on highway land. Separate permissions may be required for this element.

Relevant History

80/D10571	BATHROOM AND SAUNA EXTENSION FIRST FLOOR LEVEL Grant Subject to Conditions 01.05.1980
88/D22672	TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO DWELLINGHOUSE Grant Subject to Conditions 16.12.1988
89/D24151	TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO DWELLINGHOUSE Grant Subject to Conditions 23.10.1989

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

The following response was received from the highways officer regarding parking arrangements:

The submitted application form indicates that parking provision for the site will be extended with a larger access to the site but these proposals don't appear to be on the application plans for consideration. The proposals for the dwelling itself may require a higher parking provision than that for a standard dwelling and we would suggest that four off street parking spaces are provided as part of the application proposals.

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, subject to the parking provision, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. No letters of representations 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

Initial amendments were sought to ensure the proposal complied with comments received by the highways officer who requested the application to show where four off-road parking spaces could be accumulated.

Three further sets of amended plans were sought to overcome the visual harm presented by the proposed millboard cladding and small window proportions to the proposed hydrotherapy pool on the front elevation. It was considered dark grey millboard cladding and window proportions not found on the existing build would be a detrimental addition to the external appearance of the host dwelling and to the overall street scene.

Amendments saw the removal of the millboard cladding to the existing buff brick masonry as well as amended window portions from four smaller rectangular windows to three larger square windows incorporating the cross bar design on the existing.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 124 of the National Design Guidance states that good design promotes quality of life for the occupants and users of buildings. This includes function – buildings should be easy to use. It also includes comfort, safety, security, amenity privacy, accessibility and adaptability.

The SPD sets out guidance for house extensions to which it states “they should be designed to be in keeping with the host property”. It is noted the extension would not feature a scale or massing which would be out of context for a dwelling of this size and would appear to respect the visual form and layout of the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would be of an appropriate design and would demonstrate good design principals. Although flat roof extensions are not common within the Winchester Close estate, the proposed roof would therefore be acceptable given it is the current design of the existing protruding side extension element currently hosting the garage.

The proposed materials would be deemed acceptable in the respect dwellings along Winchester Close comprise various visual appearances. Although render and is not common, it would be acceptable to view the proposed materials as acceptable additions

given they would incorporate the buff brick masonry on the original build therefore sympathetic to the dwellinghouse and part of the contemporary approach. Proposed fenestration is to match the existing and therefore would constitute acceptable material additions.

The proposed rear and side extensions would not be so large that it would erode substantial garden space as a result of the dwelling being sited on a substantially large plot. It is noted much of the development is to the rear and away from public vantage points. Much of the proposed extensions would therefore have reduced public visibility and would preserve the existing street scene.

Although large, the new car port is considered to form an acceptable addition to the character of the dwelling. Neighbouring houses include large canopy porches and the car port would be similar in appearance.

Houses on the street are characterised by generous front gardens. The proposed four parking spaces cause the loss of a significant proportion of the front garden area at the property. In order to retain the remaining front garden in the interest of protecting the character of the street, it is recommended that a condition be imposed to prevent further hard surfacing which could otherwise be undertaken under permitted development rights.

Further to the above and subject to the recommended condition, the proposal would give the existing dwelling a coherent aesthetic to which a contemporary approach would be viewed as acceptable in relation to the surrounding street scene. The extensions and alterations would therefore not impact negatively on the visual amenity of the property. The design of the proposal would constitute a satisfactory addition to the existing dwelling and would act in accordance with Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets out maximum standards for single storey extensions to which it requires "a point 4m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwellings". The SPD also states the above distance can be increased when set away from the boundary providing it does not project beyond a 45 degree line. Where part of the rear extension has been constructed away from the boundary shared with the adjacent dwelling to the north, 3 Winchester Close, plans indicate the rear extension to not project beyond the 45 degree line, and would therefore be acceptable.

It is noted the rear gardens of two adjacent properties to the south would border the rear garden of the application property, 8 and 10 Bamford Way to which they would both host substantially large rear gardens therefore both dwellings are situated approx. 23m from any development taking place. Additionally, high vegetation runs along a significant portion of the curtilage boundary providing a degree of screening from the surrounding properties therefore the residential amenity impact to these two properties is considered to be minimal.

The rear curtilage boundary borders a public footpath and is heavily shielded by trees and high hedges therefore the impact to the adjacent rear garden to the rear hosted by 20 Bamford Way would be very minimal. Additionally, the single storey design of the extensions will mean that it would not pose any overbearing impact on the curtilage of surrounding properties and therefore will not affect any neighbour amenity.

The residential amenity of the host property would be maintained as a suitable portion of the rear garden with a functional, open layout. The development would have no additional interference with existing access to the rear of the property and would be maintained through two side gates along the boundary shared with 3 Winchester Close and 8 Bamford Way as well as preserving the amenity space that also exists there.

All rooms are to receive sufficient light and outlook with the exception of the hydrotherapy pool to which the windows will be obscurely glazed and the combined therapy and sensory room. Given the room is not a habitable room, the lack of outlook to this room is not thought to be harmful.

The hydrotherapy pool room would host three windows to the front elevation to which, in the interest of the occupiers, are proposed as obscurely glazed. The separation distance between the pool windows and the ground floor window of the adjacent property is 26m therefore any impact is considered to be minimal.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Post development, the property would increase from a 6-bed to a 7-bed dwelling. Given the existing dwelling currently hosts a driveway to the front with parking accommodation for 2 cars, the proposal would be therefore compliant with Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy which requires 2 spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed dwellings outside of the town centre.

In accordance with the highways officer who raised no objection to the application but required four off-street parking spaces, these spaces have been accommodated to the front of the site. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies DM1, T2 and Appendix 5

Personal Circumstances: SPD

Paragraph 5.11 of the SPD outline other considerations in respect to house extensions to which it states "Personal circumstances, such as disability, may make it difficult to provide necessary facilities within the standards set out in this document. The council may interpret these standards flexibly in such circumstances, but proposals that significantly exceed the standards set out in this document are unlikely to be appropriate". In the case of this proposal where a supporting document of a planning statement was obtained from the applicant outlining additional needs for an occupant, it is clear the

weight of this retrospective application stands in principle of personal circumstances of the current applicants.

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:-
 - EX-00 LOCATION PLAN
 - PR-01 REV B AMENDED PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN
 - PR-02 REV B PROPOSED GF PLAN
 - PR-03 REV C PROPOSED FF PLAN
 - PR-04 REV B PROPOSED EVELATIONS 01
 - PR-05 REV B PROPOSED ELEVATIONS 02and the development shall be carried out in complete 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, 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 except those as indicated on the approved plans.

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.

4. Notwithstanding permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) no further hard surfacing materials shall be installed at the front of the property in place of the remaining garden area (indicated as 'Grass Lawn' on the approved Proposed Block Plan) without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the existing character of the surrounding street scene, in accordance with policy DM1, P3 and the SPD.

Informative:

This approval does not grant planning permission for the extended drop kerb indicated on the approved block plan, which is outside the application site boundary. These works may require separate planning permission and will require a dropped kerb agreement with the Local Highways Authority.

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	05.04.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	14.04.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo