

Application Number:	22/01357/HOUS
Location:	70 Marland Hill Road Rochdale OL11 4PQ
Proposal:	Two-storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mrs Sameena Akhtar
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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

This application relates to No.70 Marland Hill Road a semi-detached in the Bamford ward of Rochdale. The dwelling is positioned east onto the highway and is located 10m from the Sudden Brook river. The property adjoins to No.72 and No.68 Marland Hill Road and is adjacent to No.43 Marland Hill Road. The property benefits from off-road parking sited to the front and side of the dwelling and a generously sized front and rear garden as well as a garage to the rear. The rear boundary curtilage borders open land of green space corridors. The overall street scene features a combination of both detached and semi-detached properties.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part first floor, part two storey and part single storey rear extension. The extension would project 3m from the existing rear elevation at a ground floor level, would be two storey from a point 1.1m inward and be formed with a very shallow pitched gable roof that incorporates a lower ridgeline than existing and two roof lights. The part single storey extension would feature a lean-to pitched roof with two roof lights, a height to eaves of 2.9m and an overall height of 4m. The two storey extension will feature a staggered edge to the side elevation and be set in 1.1m to allow for ease of accessibility to the rear garden. The proposed roof will extend past the proposed extension to meet the side elevation. The ground floor extension will host an additional living space area and the first floor extension will project an extension to the existing two rear bedrooms.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

2 letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. 1 letter of representation was received.

1 comment received 02.12.22 in objection of the application.

- Loss of light to property
Officer Response: See amenity section of report
- Concerns to the placement of existing boundary fence
Office Response: There will be no changes to the fence.
- Existing rainwater drainage scheme to remain?
Officer Response: Not a planning matter

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires “development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”. Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (Adopted 2016) requires that all proposed development must “enhance the boroughs 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”.
- ☐ When assessing the application in relation to a design context, it is noted the overall design and scale of the extension falls in quality in terms of scale, massing and design however, does not fail to meet the requirements of those outlined in the SPD. It is also noted the extension is proposed to the rear of the property to which it borders a large greenspace corridor therefore will be shielded from public vantage points.
- ☐ Although the scale of the extension is significantly larger than those in the surrounding vicinity, the property hosts a large rear garden therefore

constructed in accordance to not overbear the dwellings curtilage and not significantly reduce the size of the rear garden.

- ② The extension to the side of the existing dwelling features a staggered edge into the rear garden to which the roof of the extension overhangs a 1.1m indentation to meet the side elevation. It is noted there is a garage adjoined onto the entrance to the rear garden therefore a 90 degree angled edge would not be sufficient and would compromise access into the rear garden therefore the design is a viable option and is acceptable when considering the additional merits of the application.
- ② The roof ridge of the proposed extension is set down approx. 0.1m down from the existing ridge height and features a different roof orientation than that of the existing. Although not set down a significant amount, the extension would be subservient to the host dwelling.
- ② Materials to be used in the construction of the extension are indicated as matching those of the existing dwelling.
- ② In relation to the overall street scene and design, many of the dwellings feature large front and rear dormers and a small portion feature a two storey rear extension therefore the application is sufficient in matching the surrounding setting.

Summary

In accordance with policy DM1 and policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF, in line with the above assessment, the design of the overall proposal is therefore acceptable and sufficient for design standards.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② Section 4 of the SPD outlines space standards for new developments and the impact they can have on neighbours. Paragraph 4.1 states “Although it is expected that most new developments will have some impact on neighbours, it is important to ensure that the impact is not so significant that it results in unacceptable harm. All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings”.
- ② As proposed, although the extension does extend up to the curtilage boundary, there are no additional side windows to both the ground floor and first floor extensions. The existing rear dormer is thought to already overlook the rear gardens of No.68 and No.72 Marland Hill therefore the addition of a two storey extension would not pose any additional privacy concerns.
- ② The proposed two-storey and single-storey extensions comply with the guidance at paragraphs 5.6 and 5.9 of the SPD, and it is not considered that an unacceptable loss of light or outlook will be caused to the rear facing windows of the neighbouring properties.
- ② The extension will see the installation of four roof lights, two to the ground floor hipped roof and two to the roof of the first floor extension. It is concluded this will not compromise the amenity or privacy of the adjoining neighbours.
- ② The side elevation of the ground floor will see the addition of a side door leading into the rear living area. It is not thought this will impact the amenity of the adjoining neighbour to the north (No.68) as a result of the existing fenestration already in place.

Summary

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

- ② As proposed, there will be no additional bedrooms to the property as a result of the extension therefore there will be no changes to parking arrangements to the front and side of the dwelling.

Summary

- 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. This permission relates to the following plans:
 - LOCATION PLAN
 - 1956 /1 EXISTING ELEVATION FLOOR PLAN AND SITE PLAN
 - 1956 /2 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
 - 1956 /3 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

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	23.11.22	Signed: C.Petrillo
Authorisation	16.12.22	Signed: A.Truman

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo