

Application Number:	22/01226/HOUS
Location:	16 Wrenbury Drive, Rochdale, OL16 4PJ
Proposal:	Part-two storey, part-single storey rear extension (resubmission 22/00154/HOUS)
Applicant:	STUART CARROLL
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. 16 Wrenbury Drive, a two-storey detached dwelling located in the ward of Kingsway. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 18 Wrenbury Drive to the north, no. 14 Wrenbury Drive to the south, and faces the highway to the west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders no. 2 Richmond Close to the north-east and Tithe Nook, Lower Lane to the east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-two storey, part-single storey extension which projects 2.8m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The first-floor rear extension projects approx. 1.45m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjacent no. 18. The two-storey extension has a ridge height of approx. 6.95m and an eaves height of approx. 4.91m, and is characterised by a cross hipped roof form. The single-storey extension has a ridge height of approx. 3.5m and an eaves height of approx. 2.25m, and is characterised by a pitched roof form.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The proposal is a resubmission of a previous application (22/00154/HOUS), with amendments made to reduce the first-floor projection and a single-storey extension in place of the originally proposed chamfered edged projection.

Relevant History

22/00154/HOUS - Two storey rear extension - Grant subject to conditions

07/D48984 – Single storey rear extension to dwelling including demolition of existing conservatory - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires 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 extension is of a cross hipped roof form with a lower ridge height and matching eaves height which would be subservient to the host dwelling.
- ❑ The proposed single-storey extension is of a pitched roof design and while its scale is considerably smaller than the proposed two-storey extension, it would remain subservient to the host dwelling and would be considered acceptable.
- ❑ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ❑ It is considered the proposed windows and bi-folding doors are sized and positioned appropriately within the proposed rear elevation.
- ❑ 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

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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”*.
- ❑ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers”*.
- ❑ In particular, Section 4.1 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”*.
- ❑ The distance between the principal windows of the proposed extension and Tithe Nook measures approx. 21.21m, and the distance between the principal

windows of the proposed extension and the rear boundary of the curtilage measures approx. 11.28m. This accords with Section 4.1 of the SPD.

- ② Furthermore, Section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ② *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ② The proposed rear extension does not project beyond the current 2.8m projection of the existing conservatory along the common boundary of adjacent no. 14, in accordance with the maximum standard for detached properties.
- ② The proposed rear extension projects approx. 4.38m along the common boundary of adjacent no. 18 from its rear elevation, marginally exceeding the maximum standard for detached properties. However, it is noted the proposed extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point 4m along the common boundary of adjacent no. 18. Moreover, the resubmitted proposals further reduces the potential overbearing and overshadowing impact of the original submission by massing at first-floor level. On balance, the additional projection would be considered acceptable.
- ② Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey extensions to detached dwellings projecting *“beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ② The proposed two-storey extension would not exceed beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary of adjacent no. 18, in accordance with Section 5.9 of the SPD.
- ② The proposed windows and bi-folding doors would provide adequate natural light into the dining area, lounge and first-floor rear bedrooms, according with Section 4.1 of SPD.
- ② The proposed development would retain sufficient garden space for its occupiers, in accordance with Section 5.4 of the SPD.
- ② 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

- ② 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”*.
- ② The proposed development would not result in the addition of bedrooms and would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property.
- ② 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan
- ☐ Site Plan – 21.2710.3D
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – 21.2710.1
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – 21.2710.2G
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – 21.2710.6B

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. 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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the windows at first floor level on the side elevation facing south shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such 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 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	08/11/2022	Signed: SY
Authorisation	11/11/2022	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen