

Application Number:	22/01443/HOUS
Location:	7 Shaftesbury Drive, Heywood, OL10 2PH
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and alterations to existing fenestration on front and side elevations - part retrospective
Applicant:	MR CHRISTOPHER CULLEN
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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 refers to no. 7 Shaftesbury Drive, a detached, gable-fronted dwelling with an attached pitched roof garage and front porch situated in a residential area in Heywood. The immediate dwellings on the south-east side of Shaftesbury Drive, notably nos. 5 and 9, are of a similar style and size. On the adjacent street setting of Winchester Avenue, the dwellings on the east side are also of a similar style and size to the application property, with several having had first floor side extensions over the attached garages. The application property benefits from a small front lawn, off-street parking to the front and a sufficiently sized rear garden.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor side extension over the existing attached garage/kitchen. This extension would incorporate a gable roof design and would be set down from the existing ridgeline. It would be similar in scale and appearance to those first floor side extensions seen on the east side of Winchester Avenue.

The application also proposes a two storey rear extension which would sit flush with the existing side walls and have a depth of 3m. It would represent a continuation of the existing roof design.

Alterations are also proposed to the fenestration to the front of the property.

The extensions are to be finished in materials to match those evident on the existing dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and 2 representations were received objecting to the application on the grounds of:

☐ The development will not be in-keeping with the existing street scene.
Officer's response: This will be addressed in the 'design' section of the report.

☐ Loss of light
Officer's response: This will be addressed in the 'amenity' section of the report.

☐ Impact on property value
Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.
- ② The application property is primarily viewed in the context of the two adjacent dwellings, nos. 5 and 9 Shaftesbury Drive. Whilst the trio of dwellings share a high degree of uniformity with regards to their scale, massing and materiality, it is also acknowledged that on the adjacent street setting of Winchester Avenue, several dwellings have implemented similar first floor side extensions to the one proposed under this application. Although it is recognised that previous development should not be seen to set a precedent for future development, the presence of these extensions give a clear indication of what the proposal would look like once constructed. Therefore, whilst acknowledging that the proposed first floor side extension would create some imbalance between the immediate dwellings, it is considered that the extension would be appropriately scaled and designed for the host property. The ridge height of the extension would be set below that of the host dwelling, ensuring that it does not appear overly dominant against the host property and the design, with a side facing gable, would sit comfortably against the original form. With the above factors in mind it is not considered that the first floor side extension would appear inconspicuous and incongruous in its setting, particularly given the number of similar developments on the adjacent street setting.
- ② Further to this, the proposed site plan indicates that the extension will not be sited within 1m of the side boundary with no. 5 Shaftesbury Drive, which is considered sufficient to avoid any risk of a terracing effect.
- ② Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that all new developments should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. Whilst the proposed two storey rear extension would have a relatively large scale and massing and the proposed ridgeline to the gable element would not be set down from the existing ridgeline, there would be limited views of the extension from the public realm and it is to be constructed in a material palette coherent with the original build. On this basis, it is considered that the development would not unduly harm the character of the host property or the visual amenity of the surrounding street scene.
- ② In view of the above assessment, 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

- ❑ DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not *“adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 5.9 states that *“planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project 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).”* The proposed first floor extension would not surpass the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling at no. 5 Shaftesbury Drive. Further to this, the facing side elevation of no. 5 is a blank gable. Therefore, it is not considered to unduly harm the neighbouring amenity.
- ❑ The proposed two storey rear extension would surpass the rear elevation of no. 5 Shaftesbury Drive by 3m and project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary. However, given that the exceedance is minimal at approximately 0.1m, it is not considered that the rear extension would result in an undue overbearing or overshadowing impact with regards to no. 5.
- ❑ Paragraph 5.10 states that *“Where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the 2.4m distance will be taken from a point 3m along the common boundary from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”* No. 9 Shaftesbury Drive benefits from a small single storey rear extension close to the common boundary. Therefore the proposed rear extension would be in compliance with the SPD and is not considered to result in an undue overbearing or overshadowing impact.
- ❑ The plans confirm that the first floor side extension would contain a new bedroom window on the front elevation. It is noted that the window would measure approximately 24m to the directly facing neighbouring property and would measure approximately 6.2m to the opposing boundary of curtilage. Whilst this would not comply with the 10.5m SPD standard, it is acknowledged that the proposed window would not result in a level of harm to the facing neighbours beyond that which is already existing. As such, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties to the front.
- ❑ Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD documents the minimum spatial standards all new developments must comply with to ensure they avoid a significant loss of privacy or light to any neighbouring amenity. The first floor rear windows would measure approximately 20m to the directly facing boundary of curtilage. It is therefore considered that this distance would minimise any undue harm to the neighbouring amenity.
- ❑ The proposed first floor extension would contain a landing window facing the blank gable of no. 5 Shaftesbury Drive and an en-suite window to the existing side elevation facing no. 9 Shaftesbury Drive. The proposed floor plans indicate that these windows would be obscurely glazed and, on this basis, it is considered that the windows would not unduly impact on the neighbouring properties and would be acceptable. A condition has been applied to ensure that the first floor side windows remain obscurely glazed thereafter.
- ❑ The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the

proposed works would ensure acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

- ☐ In view of the above assessment, 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

- ☐ Whilst the proposals would see the removal of the existing garage, it is noted that the garage would not count towards the existing provision of off-street parking due to its internal dimensions. Therefore, the proposed development would not impact the existing provision of off road parking available at the property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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
 - Existing Floor Plans. Drg no. 22.3021.1
 - Existing Elevations. Drg no. 22.3021.2A
 - As Built Floor Plans. Drg no. 22.3021.3
 - As Built Elevations. Drg no. 22.3021.4A
 - Proposed Floor Plans. Drg no. 22.3021.5
 - Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 22.3021.6A
 - Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drg no. 22.3021.7

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 obscure glazing shown on the drawing 'Proposed Floor Plans. Drg no. 22.3021.5', prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted all first floor side windows shall be fitted with a textured glass with an obscuration level of 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	11/01/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	18/01/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling