

Application Number:	22/01604/HOUS
Location:	406 Bury Road Rochdale OL11 5EU
Proposal:	Part two, part single storey front and side extensions and a two storey rear together with alterations to fenestration to all elevations including alteration to existing window to additional patio door to rear
Applicant:	Mrs Samina Saleem
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

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. 406 Bury Road, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a prominent location on the B6222 in Bamford. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 404 Bury Road to the east, adjacent to Oakland Care Home to the west, and faces the highway to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders two large football pitches. Across the road from the property lies Pegasus Court, an apartment complex to the south. The dwelling benefits from a large garden and driveway to the front of the property, the access of which is shared with adjacent no. 404.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements to the host property, comprising of the following:

- Part-two, part-single storey front extension of the south-western section of the host dwelling which projects 5m from the ground floor and approx. 1.65m and 1.96m respectively from the first floor;

- ② Part-two, part-single storey front and side extension of the south-eastern section of the host dwelling which projects approx. 2.25m from the front elevation of the ground floor and approx. 3.5m from the side elevation of the first floor; and
- ② Two-storey rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling.

The proposals are characterised by a mix of roof forms, including hipped roofs on the front, side and rear extensions, two dual-pitched roofs on the first-floor front extension, and a lean-to roof to the single-storey front extension.

The application also proposes the addition of windows to the ground floor of the west-facing side elevation, and the addition of French doors to the ground floor rear elevation in lieu of the existing windows.

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

Relevant History

06/D47522 - Single and two storey front extension, first floor side extension and two storey rear extension to dwelling - Grant subject to conditions

20/00722/FUL - Land fronting 404 and 406 Bury Road, Rochdale, OL11 5EU - Erection of one dwelling - Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

This is a substantial extension to the existing dwelling and therefore we would expect that the application includes two off-street parking spaces, which are not shown on the submitted plans. If this can be provided we would have no concerns regarding parking provision.

The servicing of the extended dwelling would remain unchanged.

If approved the application would have no impact on road safety or highway capacity.

In conclusion, Highways raise no objection to this application and request no 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

N/A

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.*”
- ❑ 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 host dwelling and adjacent no. 404 were constructed around the same time period, and are identical in its built form, scale, massing, style and

materiality. As such, the pair of dwellings are considered to be read together and it is this uniformity in style which establishes their character.

- ❑ The proposal seeks to drastically overhaul the appearance of the front elevation through substantial enlargements of the host dwelling, most notably, a 5m front projection on the ground floor and a 3.5m side projection from the first floor. The proposed extensions would project beyond the building line of nos. 404 and 406 and constitutes a non-subservient, obtrusive and disproportionate additions which would only appear more conspicuous in the context of this pair of dwellings.
- ❑ It is noted the proposals would be set back approx. 26m from the highway. However, given its siting by a classified road, the proposed development would remain visually prominent and would result in undue visual harm to the street scene.
- ❑ Moreover, the excessive use of roof forms, in particular, the large single-storey hipped roof and two irregular gable front roofs would create a discordant and cluttered façade that would be incongruous and unsympathetic to the appearance to the street scene.
- ❑ Concerns are also had with the alteration of the front door to the side elevation of the proposed front extension, which would make the building lack legibility and would appear as a poorly thought-out and uncharacteristic feature.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of design and would result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord 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.”*
- ❑ Given the host dwelling does not directly face any properties to its front and rear, and the approx. 30m intervening distance between the proposed first-floor front bedroom window and the curtilage boundary of front-facing Pegasus Court, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity harm in this respect.

- ❑ Additionally, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ❑ *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ❑ Section 5.9 of the SPD also 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.
- ❑ It is noted the above SPD guidance also applies to front extensions. The proposed front extension projects a maximum 5m from along the common boundary measured from the front elevation of adjacent no. 404. However, the extension is sited away from the common boundary and does not project beyond a 45 degree line drawn measured 4m from the adjacent front elevation. As such, the amenity impacts would be acceptable in this regard.
- ❑ The proposed front extension does not project beyond the front elevation of the adjacent Oakland Care Home. However, it is noted the adjacent property comprises only three windows on the side elevation facing the host dwelling. Whilst it is considered the proposed single-storey front extension would result in some overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the side elevation of Oakland Care Home, the affected windows are not adjudged to be habitable room windows, therefore, on balance, the amenity impacts would be acceptable in this respect.
- ❑ The proposed two-storey rear extension would project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 404, by approximately 0.7m. Given the relatively limited existing rear garden space of no. 404, it is considered the proposed rear extension would constitute an oppressive addition which would result in undue overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the rear amenity space of the neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout to the front and rear would be retained.
- ❑ The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would not be 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.”*
- ❑ By virtue of its substantial setback from the highway, the proposed development would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, form, massing and design, the proposed extensions would constitute an overdevelopment of the host dwelling which would cause unacceptable visual harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene. The proposals therefore represents a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design and therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its siting, the proposed two-storey rear extension would result in undue overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the rear amenity space of adjacent no. 404 Bury Road. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ☐ Location Plan
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 1701/1 B
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan and Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 1701/2 B
- ☐ Existing Site Plan and Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 1701/3 B

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	15/03/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	15/03/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen