

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01078/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01078/HOUS
Location:	9 Heights Avenue Rochdale OL12 6JL
Proposal:	Two-storey side, part two, part single-storey rear extensions, alteration to fenestration, patio at rear elevation
Applicant:	Dr Luqman Ali
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/a

Location

The application relates to no. 9 Heights Avenue; a two-storey terraced property in Rochdale. Heights Avenue forms part of a wider residential estate comprising houses of varying design and materiality. The area is typically suburban, with medium density housing, quiet streets, and a semi-verdant character.

No. 9 faces northwards, overlooking a driveway and the public highway. It is flanked by no. 7 to the east and no. 11 to the west. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces south, bordering the rear garden of no. 10 Alicia Drive.

Nos. 1-25 Heights Avenue follow a distinctive and corresponding design pattern, which is integral to the appearance of the street scene.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension, a part-two, part-single storey rear extension, alterations to the fenestration, and a rear patio.

The side extension would sit atop the existing garage (to be converted into a habitable room) and extend to the front elevation, comprising a hipped roof, and an additional front, side, and rear window.

The rear extension would be two-stories where it is adjacent to the boundary with no. 11, and a single-storey across the remainder of the rear elevation. Both forms would include a flat roof and additional windows. The two-storey form would project 1.8m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, and would measure 2.8m (width) X 4.8m (height). The single-storey form would project 1.8m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, and would measure 4.5m (width) X 3m (height).

Alterations to the fenestration include the addition of a new front access door and side access door.

The rear patio would create a level platform in front of the proposed single-storey rear extension, projecting 0.8m.

The proposed works also include the application of render to the existing pebble-dash and stonework. Other materials include matching brick, UPVC fenestration, and concrete roof tiles, to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

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

The original plans included the application of render to the entire front elevation. This has been reduced to just the existing pebbledash and stonework.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy 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. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Nos. 1-25 Heights Avenue generally comprise a front facing gable and a single-storey side projection, with blocks of stonework and pebbledash on the front elevation. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension and the application of render to the existing pebbledash and stone work which would be the most visible aspects of the development from public vantage points.

Whilst the two-storey side extension would be a marked difference from the majority of houses in the row, the retention of the front elevation's gable end, and therefore its contribution to the rhythm across the terrace is preserved. The inclusion of a contrasting render to replace the pebbledash would appear slightly more conspicuous, however the materiality of the surrounding area is considered to be of limited benefit to its character and appearance. Therefore, despite deviating in appearance from the neighbouring properties, the proposed development would still be considered to correspond with their overall form and appearance.

Further to the above, paragraph 5.11 of the SPD states that where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, and are not usually supported. To avoid the 'terracing effect', the SPD recommends setting side extensions back from the principle elevation.

However, paragraph 5.13 states that a set back is not required where there is little chance of a serious terracing effect occurring. The houses along the south side of

Heights Avenue follow a staggered building line whereby the principles elevations of each house are generally set forward of the adjacent house to the west. Given this arrangement, a terracing effect would be unlikely to occur as the principle elevations would still appear separated.

Notwithstanding, it is recognised that the side extension would contribute towards a degree of 'overlapping' with the principle elevation of the adjacent property, no. 11. However, nos. 19-23 comprise a similar 'overlapping' relationship, following the construction of two-storey side extensions to nos. 19 and 21. This arrangement again demonstrates that the proposed development would not be harmful to the appearance of the street scene and would not appear especially congested.

Regarding the rear extension, this follows a uniform design and material palette, and together with its position to the rear, it would not harm the character and appearance of the property or street scene.

Overall the proposed development would appear generally subservient and in keeping with the host dwelling. Whilst the development would deviate from the predominant design characteristics of the adjacent row of houses, it would correspond with similar extensions and would preserve key design features so as not to harm the appearance of the street scene. 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. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. 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.

In view of the above, paragraphs 5.6 and 5.9 of the SPD set maximum standards for single-storey and two-storey rear extensions. For attached houses the maximum projection is 3m and 2.8m, respectively. At both levels the rear extension projects 1.8m and therefore complies with the SPD. By virtue of its compliance, the rear extension would not be considered to adversely affect the amenity of neighboring occupants through overshadowing or overbearing impact.

The principles of paragraphs 5.6 and 5.9 can similarly be applied to the proposed two-storey side extension, in terms of its relationship with the front elevation of no. 11. The proposed side extension would project 1.9m forward of no. 11's front elevation. As such, it would not be considered to result in unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD establishes separation distances between habitable room windows, two-storey elevations, and boundaries, to ensure that new development does not cause a significant loss of privacy. The required distances include 21m between directly facing habitable room windows, 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 proposed side extension includes an upper floor habitable room

window to the rear, serving 'bedroom 3'. The plans indicate a separation distance of 10m from the window to the boundary with no.10 Alicia Drive, and 20m to the rear upper floor windows of no. 10 Alicia Drive.

However, paragraph 4.3 of the SPD states that exceptions to the separation distances may be acceptable where development would not detract from the general levels of privacy and amenity typical in the area. Whilst the proposed development does not strictly meet the required separation distances, it only falls short by 0.5m and 1m, which would not be considered to make a material difference to the existing levels of privacy. Furthermore, given that the boundary with, and rear windows of, no. 10 Alicia Drive are angled away from the proposed upper floor window, the impact on privacy is mitigated.

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 development would have no bearing on the existing parking arrangements, 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:

- H.A.2 - Proposed elevations, floor plans, location plan, and block plan
Dated January 2025

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	11/02/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	13/02/2025	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg