

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00454/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00454/HOUS
Location:	18 Greenbridge Close Rochdale OL11 1TL
Proposal:	Part single-storey, part two-storey side extension and a two-storey rear extension
Applicant:	Qumar Khan
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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

Location

The application relates to 18 Greenbridge Close, a two-storey semi-detached property on the outskirts of Rochdale Town Centre. Greenbridge Close forms part of a residential estate comprising houses of a similar design and material palette. The area is predominantly residential in character, though there are several commercial and industrial sites within close proximity.

No. 18 sits on a bend in the road and faces north-west, overlooking its driveway and the public highway. It is adjoined by no. 20 to the north, and lies adjacent to no. 16 to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces east, bordering no. 13 Denholme Road.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part single-storey, part two-storey side extension, and a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension. This includes additional windows to the front and rear and a set of bi-folding doors to the rear. Proposed materials include red brick, concrete roof tiles, and UPVC fenestration.

The side extension will be set back by 1.5m at first floor and have a pitched roof, and a 0.5m set back at ground floor level and a lean-to roof. It would measure 2.5m in

width, have an eaves height of 4.8m, and a maximum height of 6.7m. The side extension would integrate with the proposed rear extension.

The rear extension would be two-storey along the border with no. 16, and single-storey where it meets the border with no. 20. The two-storey element would include a hipped roof and two-first floor windows. It would project approx. 3m from the rear elevation of the property, and measure 5.3m in width, 4.8m in eaves height, and 6.3m in maximum height.

The single-storey element includes a lean-to roof, and would also project 3m from the rear elevation, with a width of 1.8m. The eaves height measures 2.5m, and the maximum height 3.4m.

The proposal also includes a timber bin screen in front of the side extension.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Highways 11/06/2024:

We have no objection to this proposal which retains one parking bay

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 03/06/2024; no objections were raised.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable places

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

Setback to ground-floor side extension by 0.5m

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping.

In light of the above, the main consideration is whether the proposed development would appear subservient and respond well to the character of the area. The combined extensions would considerably increase the massing and scale of the house and erode some of the space around it. Notwithstanding, the majority of the work is to the rear where it won't be seen from public vantage points and would not impact on the street scene. In addition, where the development would be visible, to the side, it has been setback from the front of the property in order to appear subservient. As such, whilst significantly increasing the footprint of the building, the proposed works would generally appear subservient from the street.

Furthermore, paragraphs 5.11-5.13 of the SPD provide guidance on side extensions in order to avoid the 'terracing effect'. Paragraph 5.12 requires a minimum setback of 1 metre at both ground-floor and first-floor level. The proposed side extension includes a 1.5m setback at first-floor, and a 0.5m setback at ground floor. Considering the position of no. 16 which is angled away and set back from the proposed side extension, there would be no chance of a terracing effect, and therefore an exception to paragraph 5.12 can be made, as per paragraph 5.13.

In terms of its design, the proposed extensions include appropriate roof forms, suitably arranged and proportioned fenestration, and matching materials. As such, the design would integrate well with the host dwelling and include no incongruous features, and would therefore respond well to the character of the area.

Lastly, the proposed bin screen is considered acceptable in terms of the materials, setting and scale.

Overall, 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 Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The main consideration is the impact of the development towards the adjoining property, no. 20, and whether the rear extensions meet the requirements of the SPD.

The single-storey element projects 3m, and therefore meets the requirements of paragraph 5.6 which sets a maximum standard of 3m for single-storey rear extensions to adjoining properties.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states that two-storey extensions to adjoining properties are generally considered acceptable provided they don't project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary. As the two-storey extension is set away from the boundary with no. 20, the proposed 3m projection can be accommodated, as per paragraph 5.9.

By virtue of their compliance with the SPD, the rear extensions are not considered to adversely impact on the amenity of residents at no. 20 through overshadowing, overbearing impact, or reduced outlook. Regarding overshadowing, the impact of the development is further reduced due to the angle of the adjoining properties which exposes more of the rear of no. 20 from a southern aspect.

In addition, the proposed development meets the minimum separation distances under paragraph 4.1 of the SPD.

Overall, 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 proposed side extension would reduce the parking space on site to one bay. However, this would be in keeping with numerous properties on the street which only have one space. Furthermore, the highways officer raised no issue from a safety perspective. 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:

- Location plan
- Proposed site plan and floor plan: 2021/2
- Proposed elevations: 2021/3

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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	15/07/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	17/07/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg