

Application Number:	23/00062/HOUS
Location:	Highfield, 89 Shaw Road, Milnrow, OL16 3SS
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extension including raised decking, rear dormer, alterations to fenestration to front and rear elevation, application of white render to rear elevation, zinc cladding to the existing part of the porch and zinc canopy on the front and rear elevation
Applicant:	Mrs Harriet Whitehead
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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/A

Location

The application relates to no. 89 Shaw Road, also known as Highfield, a three-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Newhey. The dwelling is adjoined by 'Mayfield' to the south-east, adjacent to no. 87 Shaw Road to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage abuts a pond, which backs onto River Beal and open Green Belt land to the north-east. The property is visible from the Metrolink tram tracks which is sited approx. 100m from the rear curtilage boundary. The property is sited on the A663, a classified road connecting Newhey with Failsworth, Oldham.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of substantial extensions and external alterations to the host dwelling. Firstly, a part-two storey side, part-single storey front

extension is proposed to project 2.63m from the north-west side elevation and 1.22m from the front elevation. The proposed side extension is characterised by a matching dual-pitched roof that is set down 0.19m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves. The first-floor front elevation of the proposed side extension would be set back from the main front wall by 0.5m. The walls and roof of the proposed side extension would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling, whilst the proposed front porch extension would be constructed in zinc cladding.

Towards the rear, the proposal also seeks to construct a raised decking to the ground floor level which projects 3.09m from the rear elevation and sits 0.3m above the first floor level.

Further, a loft conversion is proposed, featuring a contemporary flat roof zinc-cladded dormer on the rear roof slope which measures 3.79m in length, 2.41m in height, and 3.23m in depth.

Additionally, the following external alterations are proposed:

- ☐ The addition of two zinc canopies projecting 0.44m from the proposed front elevation and 0.72m from the rear elevation;
- ☐ The alteration of the fenestration on the first floor front elevation to be constructed in black powder coated aluminium;
- ☐ The replacement of the entrance door, flanked by recessed detailing;
- ☐ Insertion of three roof lights onto the front roof slope and two roof lights onto the rear roof slope;
- ☐ The application of render to the rear elevation wall; and
- ☐ The addition of glazing on the rear elevation on all levels, including bi-folding doors, enlarged windows, and oriel window seat.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main highway consideration with regards to this application is parking provision.

As the development site is on a classified road a highway requirement would be that vehicles accessing the property must be able to do so in forward gear therefore there must be adequate internal turning space for a standard sized family car. It does not appear from the submitted plans that these turning facilities will be provided within this application. However, it would appear that adjoining properties do not have this turning facility and therefore a precedent may have been set and having checked

accident data on this section of Shaw, Highways may accept the proposed driveway arrangement.

The side extension will sever the existing driveway length and reduce off street parking provision for the extended dwelling. Council standards require that for the size of the extended dwelling that two off-street parking spaces should be provided and taking into account that Shaw Road is classified we would require that two viable parking spaces be provided.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

We do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

If the requested parking spaces could be provided Highways would raise no objection to this application or ask for any specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments 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

Extensive discussions were had regarding design amendments to the proposed plans, with the following notable changes made:

- ☐ The proposed two-storey side extension set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling;
- ☐ The simplification of materiality on the proposed front elevation;
- ☐ The proposed rear dormer scaled down and repositioned away from the side wall of the dwelling;
- ☐ The addition of privacy screen on the side of the proposed raised decking facing adjoined 'Mayfield'; and
- ☐ The reduction of proposed glazing on the rear elevation.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ☐ Paragraph 134 seeks to encourage *“innovative designs which... help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”*
- ☐ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, 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.”* In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ☐ The proposed two-storey side extension would be set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling, and would appear subservient. The use of a dual-pitched roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ With regard to any potential ‘terracing effect’, the pair of semi-detached dwellings which comprise of the host dwelling and adjoined ‘Mayfield’ are distinct from properties along the building line as they feature a prominent forward projection with a front gable wall and bay windows. As such, the houses are clearly read as individual dwellings against adjacent properties. It is also noted amendments have been accepted to set back the first floor of the proposed side extension by 0.5m, further mitigating any potential visual impact. On this basis, it is considered the proposal would not inflict harm to the character of the street scene by means of any ‘terracing effect’.
- ☐ The proposal seeks to incorporate a number of contemporary features to the host dwelling, most notably a front porch extension and front canopy constructed from zinc. The use of high-quality and modern materials are considered to constitute good design and are encouraged provided they are sympathetic to the appearance of the area. Amendments have been

accepted to soften the application of new materials on the front elevation and the proposed works are considered to provide an element of visual interest to the dwelling and would be appropriately designed. Suitable specifications of the proposed materials can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the street scene.

- ☐ It is considered the proposed front elevation fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration. The use of matching lintels and sills would also be in keeping.
- ☐ The proposed plans indicate the proliferation of glazing on the rear elevation. Whilst it is acknowledged the amount of glazing may appear excessive relative to the size of the dwelling, these works would be sited to the rear and would not be readily visible from the highway and other public vantage points. Amendments have also been made to reduce the number of fenestration on the ground floor. As such, it is considered the visual impacts of the proposed works would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The application also proposes a flat roof zinc dormer to the rear roof slope of the dwelling. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes *“dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.”* Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:

- (i) *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
- (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
- (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
- (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
- (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
- (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
- (viii) *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*

- ☐ Similar to the proposed porch and canopies, the proposed dormer would be constructed in zinc cladding and would comprise a flat roof form. Whilst this design would not necessarily match the existing roof, the dormer would nevertheless constitute an attractive and contemporary feature which would generally enhance the appearance of the dwelling. Given the design merits of the proposed works, it is considered a relaxation of the above guidelines would be justified in this instance.

- ☐ It is also noted that following amendments, the proposed flat roof dormer has been scaled down and positioned away from the side walls of the dwelling, reducing its potential prominence from the highway. The proposed dormer windows have also been resized to match the proportions of the existing fenestration.
- ☐ On this basis, the proposed dormer would comply with all points of Section 5.17 and would constitute a satisfactory standard of design and appearance.
- ☐ 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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - ☐ *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*
- ☐ Section 4.4 of the SPD states balconies *“should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”*
- ☐ Considering a front extension and a raised decking are proposed, guidance on single-storey rear extensions would also be applicable in this instance. In particular, Section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard:
 - ☐ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ Additionally, Section 5.17 of the SPD states *“dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- ☐ The proposed side extension and rear dormer do not directly face any properties towards its front and rear and would not result in significant amenity harm in this regard.
- ☐ The proposed front extension does not project beyond the existing gable-fronted projection and is sited approx. 9m from the front elevation of adjacent no. 87. As such, it is considered the proposal would not result in significant overshadowing impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The rear gardens of the host property and adjoined ‘Mayfield’ are generally open-aspect, and it is accepted that overlooking already exists to an extent

for both rear curtilage spaces given the substantial height of the dwellings. The proposed raised decking would project 3.09m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling but would not project beyond the existing 3.38m three-storey rear outrigger of adjoining 'Mayfield'. In addition, amendments have also been made to include a 2.1m-high privacy screen to the side balustrade which would limit direct side views onto the rear garden of 'Mayfield'. On this basis, it is considered the proposed works would not result in unreasonable levels of overlooking onto the curtilage space of the adjoining occupiers.

- ☐ By virtue of substantial screening from large groups of trees and a detached garage which separates the host dwelling from adjacent no. 87, and the approx. 10m separation distance between the proposed raised decking and the primary rear curtilage space of no. 87, it is considered the overlooking impacts of the proposal onto the adjacent occupiers would be acceptable.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *"provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location."*
- ☐ The proposals would increase the number of bedrooms from three to five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed side extension would sever the existing side driveway and would reduce the existing off-street parking space. Notwithstanding the concerns raised by the Highways Officer, whilst it is acknowledged the remaining turning space may be restricted, the proposal would nonetheless retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces in its front driveway. Given this, and considering similar parking arrangements already exist for adjacent properties, on balance, the proposed parking arrangements would be acceptable and would accord 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-EX-000 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023

- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-EX-001 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-PR-001 Rev. 7 dated 05/07/2023
- ☐ Existing Basement and Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-EX-100 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023
- ☐ Existing First Floor Plan and Roof Plan – Drawing No. 2271-PL-EX-101 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023
- ☐ Existing Front and Rear Elevation – Drawing No. 2272-PL-EX-200 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023
- ☐ Existing North-west and South-east Elevation – Drawing No. 2272-PL-EX-201 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023
- ☐ Existing Section Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-EX-300 Rev. 2 dated 10/01/2023
- ☐ Proposed Basement and Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-PR-100 Rev. 7 dated 05/07/2023
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan and Loft Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-PR-101 dated 05/07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Roof Plan – Drawing No. 2272-PL-PR-102 Rev. 7 dated 05/07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Front and Rear Elevation – Drawing No. 2272-PL-PR-200 Rev. 7 received 21/08/2023
- ☐ Proposed North-west and South-east Elevation – Drawing No. 2272-PL-PR-201 Rev. 7 received 21/08/2023

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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.

4. The raised decking hereby permitted shall not be first used until the smoked glass screens have been installed in full accordance with the details shown on drawing ref: 2272-PL-PR-200 Rev. 7 dated 05/07/2023. The screens shall have an obscuration level of no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

INFORMATIVE

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act. If a birds nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).

Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 it is an offence to capture, injure or kill a bat, deliberately disturb a bat, or damage or destroy a bat roost. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	18/08/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	22/08/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen