

Application Number:	23/00111/HOUS
Location:	20 Lincoln Drive, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 0NE
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension
Applicant:	Miss Beth Brierley
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. 20 Lincoln Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 18 Lincoln Drive to the north-west, adjacent to no. 22 Lincoln Drive to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilages of nos. 42 and 44 Abbey Drive to the south-west. The dwelling is sited on a lower level than the highway and comprises a front driveway which rises steeply towards the north-east. As it stands, the dwelling comprises a stone clad front elevation and an existing single-storey rear extension in light grey render.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension which projects approx. 2.22m from the side elevation of the host dwelling and approx. 2.52m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, flush with the existing single-storey rear extension. The proposed side extension is characterised by a dual-pitched roof and is set down from the ridge line by approx. 0.37m and set back from

the front main wall by approx. 0.73m. The proposed rear extension is characterised by a lean-to roof and has a ridge height of approx. 5.32m and an eaves height of 7m.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main Highways concern regarding this application is parking provision.

The side extension over the driveway will sever the existing driveway and reduce off street parking provision for the extended dwelling to one space. Council standards require that for the size of the extended dwelling that two off-street parking spaces should be provided and taking into account the layout of Lincoln Drive and the dwellings proximity to the existing turning head we would require that two viable parking spaces be provided.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

We do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

If the requested parking spaces could be provided Highways would raise no objection to this application or ask for any 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

Amendments were made to alter the material of the proposed side extension from light-grey render to matching brickwork.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ 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 proposed two-storey side extension would be set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling by approx. 0.37m and would appear subservient. The use of a dual-pitched roof would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ❑ The proposed side extension would be set back from the front main wall of the host dwelling by approx. 0.73m, falling short of the 1m stated in section 5.12 of the SPD. However, it is considered the difference in set-back would not appear material and a visual break would nonetheless be maintained between the host property and adjacent no. 22. As such, there are no concerns with regard to the harm arising from any potential ‘terracing effect’.
- ❑ The proposed single-storey rear extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a lean-to roof to match the existing single-storey rear extension would also be in keeping.
- ❑ As it stands, the host dwelling features a mix of materiality, including the use of brick, stone cladding and light grey render. The proposed walls would

match the brickwork of the side elevation wall of the existing dwelling and would be designed appropriately in this context.

- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The proposed side extension would sever space for refuse bins to be stored out of public view. However, it is noted the locations of refuse bin storage in the immediate vicinity are not consistent and vary between the front, side and rear of dwellings. Moreover, there is opportunity for the storage of refuse bins within the front garden area in a way that would not appear visually intrusive. The applicant has also stated intention for a wall to be built between the ground-floor front window and front garden where refuse bins can be suitably stored. On this basis, on balance, it is considered the loss of refuse bin storage to the side of the host dwelling would not result in adverse harm to the appearance of the surrounding area.
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ 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);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 2.52m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, and levels with the existing single-storey rear extension.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey side extension does not project beyond the front and rear elevation of the host dwelling. As such, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity harm to neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that 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.

- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed extensions would occupy part of the existing driveway and result in the reduction of off-street parking spaces from two to one. However, it is noted that numerous adjacent properties also share similar parking arrangements, and on-street parking is common on the street scene. On this basis, it is considered the addition of one on-street parking space would not result in undue harm to highway safety. 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 – Drawing No. FO 01235811/5
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. FO 01235811/4
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. FO 01235811/1
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Section Plan – Drawing No. FO 01235811/2
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. FO 01235811/3 A

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.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	18/04/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/04/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen