APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01050/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01050/HOUS
Location:	11 Franklin Street Rochdale OL16 5JP
Proposal:	First floor rear extension including changes to roof at first floor and ground floor (resubmission of 20/00627/HOUS)
Applicant:	Mr Shabaz Hussain
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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 a two storey mid-terrace property in Rochdale. The property is orientated west towards the highway, which is a cul-de-sac. The property is adjoined to 9 Franklin Street to the north and 13 Franklin Street to the south. The rear boundary of the property is shared with the rear gardens of 20 and 22 Elder Street.

Description of Proposal

The site has planning permission for a first floor rear extension. The previous permission granted was for a rear extension that projecting out by 2.4m from the rear elevation of the application property, and sitting above an existing ground floor rear extension achieved under a prior approval scheme.

Whereas the previous application proposed a hipped roof for the first floor and the ground floor elements of the extensions, this application proposes to amend that to a gable roof design for the first floor extension and mono pitched lean to roof for the ground floor.

Relevant History

97/D34829 – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 105 dwellings and flats – Granted subject to conditions on 16 March 1996.

16/00342/HOUS – Rear dormer extension including increase in ridge height of roof of dwelling (retrospective) – Refused on 09 June 2016
Notes: Dormer since removed and roof reinstated.

19/00815/HH42 – Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 6 metres from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.9 metres and height to eaves of 2.5 metres) – Refused on 14 August 2019

The proposed development is not permitted by Class A of Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) as it would include the installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe, contrary to criterion k(iii).

19/01065/HH42 – Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 6 metres from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.6 metres and a height to eaves of 2.4 metres) – Prior Approval not Required as of 22 October 2019

19/01287/HOUS – Two storey rear extension – Granted Subject to Conditions 18 December 2019

20/00627/HOUS - First floor rear extension - Grant subject to conditions on 24 July 2020

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of representation have been sent to neighbours and one representation has been received. The representation objects to the proposal. The representation has been summarised below:

- Object to the amended roof design for the first floor rear extension as it is too harsh in design and construction and pitched gable design is too evasive, unlike the hipped roof, proposed in the previous application, which has a softer natural aspect.
  Officer comments: Will be discussed in the design section of the report.
- The proposed roof design will have an affect on daylighting to my property and garden. I feel that a better roof design solution could be found than the one the Applicant has proposed.
  Officer comments: Discussed in the amenity section of the report.
- Application submitted to amend the first floor rear extension roof design, however, the drawings seem to be indicating that the roof design of the existing ground floor extension will be changed and amended also from the previous application which has been approved. Therefore, the application is not clear whether the Applicant is seeking permission to amend the roof design at first floor level only or seeking approval to amend the ground floor roof also.
  Officer comments: The proposal seeks to change the design of the roof design of the first floor extension and the ground floor roof.

- The works are almost completed and that the proposed drawings are not accurate as it's indicating that the works have not commenced which is the contrary. The drawings should show 'As built' and not 'Proposed'.
  Officer comments: The application will be judged as is proposed in the proposed application. The plans reflect the intention of the applicant and have therefore been accepted as part of a valid application.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- The previous application (20/00627/HOUS - First floor rear extension) granted permission for a first floor extension extension, therefore this report will discuss the proposed change in roof design from hipped roof design (for both first floor and ground floor) to a gable roof for the first floor element of the extension and mono pitch lean to roof design for the ground floor element of the extension.
- The change in design of the first floor element of the roof would see a mono pitched lean to roof that would span approximately 3.6m. Though a gable roof design or hipped roof design would be preferable, the mono pitched design is considered acceptable. Additionally the proposed extension would be screened from the street scene.
- In regards to the first floor element of the extension. It is noted that the neighbouring property of no. 13 projects 0.6m further out than the proposed first floor rear extension of no. 11. Additionally, no. 13 has a gable roof

design, with the gable end facing no.24 Elder Street. The gable roof is considered to be more in keeping with the neighbouring property and is considered acceptable.

- The gable roof design will create a level of uniformity when viewed from the rear and the street scene. Alternatively, a hipped roof design would create a more cluttered view.
- 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

- It is noted that the two previous applications found no unacceptable impacts relating to neighbouring amenity. The projection of the proposal will remain the same and therefore the amenity impact in relation to minimum standards relating to the distance from first floor principle windows to the first floor principle windows of the properties opposite would not alter. It was noted that the distance to no. 20 Elder Street is considered acceptable on balance due to the resulting space to the boundary not being dissimilar from the provisions for adjacent dwellings and due to 20 Elder Street and the applicant dwelling not being directly facing.
- The minimum standards set out in the SPD require there to be a minimum distance of 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage. The proposed first floor extension will be approximately 10.9m from the rear shared boundary with no. 20 and no. 22 Elder Street. It is therefore considered, even with the change in roof design from a hipped to gable, the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of no. 20 and no.22 Elder Street.
- Additionally, it is noted that the proposed first floor extension would sit approximately 0.6m further back than no.13. On viewing the relationship between no.12 Franklin Street and no. 24 Elder Street, it is considered that the change in design of the roof would not lead to any greater loss of amenity than compared to the gable roof design.
- It is considered that the mono pitch roof design of the ground floor would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the neighbouring properties.
- 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

- The proposal will see no changes made to the parking supply at the property and therefore space for two vehicles to be parked off-street will be kept.
- The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

<u>Recommendation:</u> 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:

   - Site location plan, block plan and proposed roof plan (Drawing 1 of 6 - Revision D dated 11.08.2020)
   - Existing elevations and floor plans (Drawing 2 of 6 - Revision 0 dated 25.05.2020)
   - Existing elevations (Drawing 3 of 6 – Revision C dated 04.05.2020)
   - Proposed elevations and floor plans (Drawing 4 of 6 - Revision D dated 11.08.2020)
   - Proposed Elevations and Section (Drawing 5 of 6 - Revision D dated 11.08.2020)
   - Building regulation notes (Drawing 6 of 6 – Revision 0 dated 04.05.2020)

   And 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 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	15/10/20	Signed: MM
Authorisation	16/10/2020	Signed: KN

Report Author Majid Mir