

Application Number:	23/00050/HOUS
Location:	57 Harbour Lane, Milnrow, OL16 4EL
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Applicant:	Hannah Bentley
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. 57 Harbour Lane, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Milnrow. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 59 Harbour Lane to the south, adjacent to no. 55 Harbour Lane to the north, and faces the highway to the south-west. The property benefits from an approx. 35m deep rear garden, the rear boundary of which abuts the A640. The rear curtilage comprises of steps approx. 3m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling which leads down to a level change.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey extension which projects approx. 7.68m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory. The proposed rear extension is characterised by pitched roofs and is divided into two sections at stepped heights. The front section has a ridge height of approx. 3.3m and an eaves height of approx. 2.59m, whilst the rearmost section has a ridge height of approx. 3.19m and an eaves height of approx. 2.51m.

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

It would appear that the existing dwelling has two off-street parking spaces that would remain unaffected by the proposed rear extension. As the parking provision meets the Council's maximum parking standards we have no concerns on this issue.

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

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

As such, Highways 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

N/A

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 proposal seeks to construct an extension which projects approx. 7.68m from the rear elevation. It is noted the substantial length of the proposed extension and the two dual-pitched roofs would not appear to relate well with the form and massing of the host dwelling. However, it is acknowledged the set down of the rearmost section is to account for the difference in ground levels. Given this, the single-storey form which would be subservient, and the siting of the extension to the rear which would not be visible from the highway, on balance, the proposed development would be acceptable in this context.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately for this context.
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ 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 5.6 of the SPD 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. 3.15m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the conservatory of adjoined no. 59, marginally exceeding the maximum standard for attached dwellings. However, given the siting of the extension away from the common boundary by approx. 0.15m, the existing screening from boundary treatments between the properties, and the siting of the proposed extension to the north which ensures unobstructed natural light into the conservatory of adjoined no. 59, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity harm to the adjoining occupiers.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 7.68m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the existing rear elevation of adjacent no. 55. However, it is noted the additional projection is obscured by an existing outbuilding of no. 55 which abuts the common boundary. Moreover, adjacent no. 55 is sited at an angle away from host dwelling. For these reasons, on balance, the amenity impacts of the proposed development on adjacent no. 55 would be acceptable.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate the south-facing en suite window would be obscurely glazed. This would be secured via condition as not to adversely harm the residential amenity of adjoined no. 59.
- ❑ The proposed fenestration would provide adequate natural light into the proposed dining room and bedroom.
- ❑ It is noted the proposed rear extension may further limit the amount of natural light into the existing lounge. However, considering the current overshadowing impact by the existing projections of both the host dwelling and adjoining no. 59, it is considered the additional harm would not be significant enough to recommend refusal.
- ❑ The proposed development would retain ample garden space with a functional layout for its occupiers and 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 development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property, and as such, the proposed parking arrangements are 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
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 22.3047.2
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.3047.1C
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.3047.SC1.1C

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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the proposed rear extension hereby permitted the en suite windows on the southern side elevation facing south shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy 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	15/03/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	16/03/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen