

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01385/HOUS

Application Number:	23/01385/HOUS
Location:	The Boundary, Harold Lees Road, Heywood, OL10 4DR
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, alterations to existing fenestration and removal of chimney.
Applicant:	RHIAN DEVEREUX
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 04.03.2024	EXT OF TIME 11.03.2024
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 'The Boundary', a two-storey, detached dwelling fronting Harold Lees Road in Heywood. The subject property is set within a substantial wraparound curtilage and occupies a level threshold on lower lying ground with access to the site from the cul-de-sac of Connell Way. The difference in levels with Harold Lees Road, combined with the screening provided by the boundary hedge alongside the highway, mean that only the roof of The Boundary is visible from vantage points on Harold Lees Road.

No. 27 Harold Lees Road is adjacent to the east and nos. 23 Harold Lees Road and 11 Connell Way are adjacent to the west. It is notable that the building line is staggered, with no. 27 Harold Lees Road set forward of the application property. The Boundary is set back some 13m from Harold Lees Road and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders All Souls' Primary School which is located in an area of Green Belt to the north. Pitched and flat roofed single-storey enlargements protrude to the front (south-facing) elevation and southwest corner of the property. A detached garage lies to the northwest corner of the dwellinghouse.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension that would project 3m from the existing rear elevation and sit flush with the existing side elevations. The single-storey extension would be characterised by a flat roof with a roof lantern and the two-storey extension would be characterised by a dual-pitched roof with a lower eaves height than the main roof of the host property. The submitted plans also indicate several alterations to the existing fenestration and the removal of the existing chimney on the west-facing side elevation. The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match existing.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

No objections.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 131 and 135 of the NPPF state that *"good design is a key aspect of sustainable development"* and that *"planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping."*

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that house extensions should be *"in keeping with the host dwelling and generally should be subservient to it."*

The proposed extension is appropriately designed and would broadly adhere to the design principles of the host dwelling. Given the substantial size of the existing plot and the moderate rearward projection of the proposed extension, it is not considered to appear overbearing or out of character with the host property or surrounding street scene. Further, the use of materials to match the existing is considered acceptable.

In light of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is acceptable and in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

DM1 (c) of the 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."*

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."*

Additionally, section 5.6 states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

- ☐ *"For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);"*

Section 5.7 explains that:

- ☐ *"If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary."*

In respect of two storey rear extensions, section 5.9 states that:

- ② *“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).”*

Firstly, it is noted that the application property is set forward of no. 11 Connell Way and the proposed rear extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of the adjacent property. Moreover, the extension would measure some 18.5m to the side elevation of no. 11.

In respect of no. 27 Harold Lees Road, however, the proposed extension would fail to comply with the projection standards for both two-storey and single-storey rear extensions outlined in the SPD. Nevertheless, a number of other circumstances are pertinent in this case which are considered to offset the development's impact on the residential amenity of no. 27.

The staggered position of the application property in relation to no. 27 means that the existing relationship between the two properties would fail to comply with the projection standards contained within the SPD. Furthermore, given the level change between the properties, it is noted that the flat roof of the proposed single-storey rear extension would not exceed the cill level of the ground floor windows of no. 27.

Whilst the extension may result in some additional overshadowing of the rear garden and basement level windows of no. 27, it is not considered that this would result in undue harm beyond that which is existing given the staggered relationship between the properties. In addition, it is noted that the main source of natural light to the basement is the bi-folding doors, which are located approx. 8m from the common boundary with the application property.

Lastly, the part-two storey extension would be set approx. 6.5m from the common boundary with no. 27 and the roof would be pitched away from the neighbouring property. Again, given the staggered positioning, it is not deemed that the proposed two-storey extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook beyond that which is existing.

The proposed fenestration would comply with the space standards set out in section 4.1 of the SPD and no concerns are had regarding a potential loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

The proposals indicate that all habitable rooms would receive sufficient natural light and that a sufficient 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.

In view of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed development accords with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The existing off-street parking arrangements would not be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, the proposals would be in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Council's Core Strategy, which requires a maximum of 2 car parking spaces for a dwelling of this size.

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:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 23.3221.1
- Existing First Floor Plan. Drg no. 23.3221.2
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 23.3221.3
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drg no. 23.3221.4B
- Scheme 1 Proposed Ground Floor Plans. Drg no. 23.3221.SC1.1B
- Scheme 1 Proposed First Floor Plan. Drg no. 23.3221.SC1.2B
- Scheme 1 Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 23.3221.SC1.3B
- Scheme 1 Proposed Side Elevations. Drg no. 23.3221.SC1.4C

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 be in accordance with details provided within the submitted application form unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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	26/02/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	11/03/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling