

Application Number:	23/00669/HOUS
Location:	331 Shawclough Road Rochdale OL12 7HL
Proposal:	Two storey side extension including front and rear dormer and rear balcony extension following demolition of existing detached garage, single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, garage conversion including alteration to existing garage door, and addition of gable wall to first floor front elevation
Applicant:	Mr Imran Manzoor
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. 331 Shawclough Road, a 20th century two-storey detached dwelling of render and stone cladding construction located in a predominantly residential area in Shawclough. The property forms part of a building line of individual detached dwellings, surrounded by clusters of modern housing developments. The dwelling occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction between Troughbeck Way and Shawclough Way/B6377, a classified road. It is adjacent to no. 329 Shawclough Road to the south-east, adjacent to no. 333 Shawclough Road to the north-west, and faces the highway to the north-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto the private driveway of nos. 2, 4 and 6 Troughbeck Way. To the north-east, the property directly faces Duffins Cottage, a Grade-II listed building circa 1717.

The property benefits from a large rear garden, front driveway, a detached single garage and extensive soft landscaping around the curtilage boundary.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which, as amended, projects 4.6m from the side elevation of the dwelling to accommodate an attached garage and additional bedroom, following the demolition of the existing detached garage. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof and is set down 0.94m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves. This is accompanied by a gable-fronted dormer to the front roof slope which measures 2.2m in length, 2.5m in height and 2.9m in depth, and a flat roof dormer and balcony to the rear which measures 4.56m in length, 2.64m in height and 3.07m in depth.

The proposal also seeks to construct a single-storey rear extension which projects a maximum 6m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 3.05m.

The submitted plans also indicate the alteration of the existing front garage door, the addition of fenestration to the ground floor rear elevation, and the addition of a gable wall to the existing front dormer window.

The plans do not show details of any proposed materials.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

As the application site is directly across from the Grade-II listed Duffins Cottage and impacts its setting, the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 apply. This requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

NPPF Paragraph 206 states that should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.

NPPF Paragraph 200 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

In accordance with NPPF Paragraph 202, where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The adopted Rochdale Core Strategy Policy P2 states that the borough's heritage will be protected through conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, which include conservation areas, listed buildings, and non-designated heritage assets.

GMCA's draft Places for Everyone Plan Policy JP-P2 seeks to encourage heritage place-making and states the desire to positively conserve, sustain and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets, and their settings.

The application site is across from and direct view of the Grade II listed Duffins Cottage. The Historic England listing reads:

"House. 1717 on tablet above former door. Coursed watershot stonework with stone slate roof and brick chimney stacks. 2-unit 2-storey plan with door openings to each unit (one blocked up) and a small C20 lean-to extension to the rear. Stone plinth and dripmould; 2 windows to each floor: 5-light recessed flush-faced mullion window to housepart, otherwise the mullions have been removed and a C20 porch added to the right unit."

The proposal is for a two storey side extension with garage to the front, and balcony to the rear at first floor level. The front elevation of the extension will also have a new dormer, and extend the boundaries of the building to just within the bounds of the holding.

The proposed features at the rear of the property would not have a direct effect on the significance of the heritage asset, Duffins Cottage, as it would not be directly facing the listed building and would be obscured from view at the surrounding streets - provided that the existing landscaping remains intact.

The front elevation, however, directly faces the listed building and has a direct impact on the significance of it. The overall scale and width of the extension is overbearing to the rest of the property and would create an imposing front elevation directly in the setting of the listed building, resulting in less than substantial harm. Therefore, it is proposed that the width is decreased to create a more subservient addition, which would read more clearly as an extension in width, height and scale. Resubmitted plans to this end are required prior to any recommendation for approval.

Certain features as proposed on the front elevation presently contribute to the imposing nature of the extension. The dormer dwarfs the present right side of the structure by mirroring the left gable end of the original structure. It occupies a large proportion of the roof space and is quite wide. It is therefore proposed that this

dormer is decreased slightly in overall scale; plans to this end are required for resubmission prior to any recommendation for approval.

There are concerns, as well, relating to the appearance and material of the proposed garage door. It should be ensured that the garage door is in timber, and that any glazing patterns and overall detailing are chosen to be in keeping with external timber design features to properties in the area. The details of the garage door should be conditioned for approval prior to instatement.

The proposed materials of the extension are agreeable in principle. However, it should be required that all details of the stone to clad the exteriors and roofing material are submitted to and agreed upon with the LPA prior to instatement; any new materials should be chosen to be in keeping with materials to the rest of the property and the surrounding area. Additionally, cross-sectional detailing and product specifications of any and all new windows should be submitted to and agreed upon with the LPA prior to instatement.

There are concerns regarding the proposed width of the extension in relation to the landscaping of the property in general. The proposed extension would be in close proximity to the edge of the property, where there are presently 2 no. mature trees and a mature hedgerow. Both of these aspects of the property's landscaping contributes to the significance of the listed building directly across the street. Mature trees and hedgerows are characteristic of the listed asset's surroundings, therefore the loss of these would result in less than substantial harm to the building. There has been no explicit mention of the loss of the trees/hedgerow; clarification on this point is required. Further comment should be sought on the receipt of this information.

Additionally, there has been no mention of any changes or proposed materials to the surface treatments of the property; any new material should be in keeping with the surface treatments to the property at present and to the area generally. A landscaping plan is required to provide clarification on these points; further comment should be sought on the receipt of this information.

With respect to the proposed demolition of the present detached garage, no demolition plans have been provided, and the effect on any hedgerows/trees is not known. A demolition plan and further information to this end is required for submission prior to instatement; additional comments should be sought on the receipt of this information.

UPDATE:

The most recent rebuttal seems to have misunderstood the above interpretation of the proposed being in the setting of the nearby listed building:

"The officer states that the application site is in direct view of the Grade II listed Duffins Cottage. However, this loose comment is vague."

It should be clarified that the proposed extension would directly face the listed cottage, not that the listed building would directly face onto the application site- as asserted throughout much of the submitted rebuttal. Likewise, the proposed is assessed as being within the setting of a listed building in no uncertain or “vague” terms.

Whilst it may be true that there is a road separating the two properties, the proposed extension would be directly across the street from the listed building and therefore the two developments (being the listed building as well as the application site) would be experienced and enjoyed together.

This is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework’s definition of the setting of a heritage asset: “The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral (NPPF, Annex 2: Glossary).”

The above comments requiring a more subservient addition still stand after viewing the most recently superseded plans. These comments should be absorbed and reflected in a new set of proposed plans before I am able to recommend this application for approval.

The dormer still appears to dwarf the right side of the structure; above comments stand.

The proposed material of the garage door does not appear to have changed in the most recent submission of superseded plans, nor have they been clarified as being timber on the most recently submitted plans; above comments stand.

On the front elevation, any new windows to be instated should be timber-framed, in line with comments above. This should be clarified in a set of superseded proposed plans. Comments requiring details of the stone cladding and roofing materials stand.

It is understood that the two mature trees and the mature hedgerow to the side of the property will not be affected by the proposed; this point is satisfied.

It is understood from the recent statement that no hard landscaping materials are proposed; point resolved.

In this case, the potential effects of the detached garage’s removal would most pertinently have to do with cumulative change within the setting of a designated heritage asset. This would be in line with NPPF paragraph 212, which states that the local authority should “...look for opportunities for new development... within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance...” For more information on cumulative change within the setting of designated heritage asset, please refer to Historic England’s Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets.

Full details of the garage's demolition are not fully known because of the omission of a demolition plan. The demolition or its execution could have a cumulatively negative effect on Duffins cottage should the works alter the wider site in a way which negatively impacts the significance of the heritage asset. Additionally, the demolition of the detached garage is presumed to make way for the new extension as presently proposed; this extension does not, for reasons highlighted elsewhere in this document, conserve or enhance the significance of the listed asset, and therefore the development cannot be recommended for approval. A demolition plan and further information to these ends is still required.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the submitted heritage statement does not meet the minimum requirements for such a statement under paragraph 194 of the NPPF: "In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation."

A new heritage statement should be submitted which analyses the significance of Duffins Cottage and its setting, and should make reference to the relevant historic environment records. This should be commissioned by a heritage consultant or a planning consultant with experience writing heritage statements.

Highways and Engineering

It would appear that the extended property would provide parking provision in line with Council parking standards.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extensions.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

Tree Officer

No comments were received at the time of writing.

Urban Design

The premise of the extension is suitable if changes can be made to improve the design. It is disappointing that the agent has not taken on board comments from the conservation officer; several of which I reiterate in my report.

The overall scale and width of the extension is overbearing to the rest of the property. The design generally is to a basic standard, somewhat unresolved in parts and ultimately unconvincing in meeting the expectations set out in NPPF Paragraph 135. The extension does not enhance the character of immediate urban context and in its current form I would not be supportive of this proposal.

In addition to amended drawings, further drawing information is requested:

- Demolition Plan / Scope of works drawing
- Plan in context to site and landscaping

Scale

As per earlier comments made by the conservation officer, it is recommended that the width of the side extension is reduced to create a more subservient addition. Primarily this would be less overbearing on the dwelling as a whole and increase the buffer between building and the public patch/road along Throughbeck Way. Referring to the respective officer's comments concerning landscape merits – the applicant needs to provide a demolition plan or scope of works drawing. The demolition plan should denote areas of the house which are being demolished, the garage and any trees or hedgerows scheduled to be removed.

The right hand gable roof dormer is unproportioned to the rest of the elevation: it is larger than the existing front elevation dormer yet it is hosted within a smaller, set back roof. The gable forms for both dormers are attempting to reference the existing gable faced frontage but it is ineffective and unnecessary because the scale and composition instead makes this reference weak.

Design Quality

Whilst the 3d views are helpful, the design details of the scheme are to a poor standard and misleading. This can be illustrated where the designer shows the correct colour to some building elements but not others. A small but important detail is the absence of the lower courses of brickwork (ground threshold) which appear in all elevations but are not shown at all by the designer. Without this, the building facade looks heavy and overbearing. To clarify this matter, this should be shown on existing elevations as well as proposed elevations.

The proposal would have benefitted from the designer exploring some design options and overlaying this with site photographs to perceive the impact of the extension. I have attempted to do this and it confirms the initial concern that the scale and width of the extension is overbearing to the rest of the property.

Unfortunately, the designer has simply inserted Revit family components without real consideration how the design elements interrelate with one another. In some cases, these family components are confusing i.e. window swings. This can also be demonstrated by items like the garage door which would have been helpful to visualise with an appropriate colour and design, reminiscent of the existing garage

door. Rebuttal statements asking for this to be considered as a condition instead has consequently not helped sell this scheme effectively. Other items (not limited to) include the balcony detail, doors and windows.

Materiality

The existing materiality of the timber frames along the front elevation should be maintained in the new extension (at least to the frontage). This comment also applies to the garage door. It would be impractical to expect the applicant to maintain this with the rear elevation bi-fold doors /larger glazed areas but I would advise thinner frame products to this area would improve the scheme.

There is an attractive quality to the existing roof which must be matched in pattern and materiality in the new extension. Brickwork at lower courses should be continuous to the existing dwelling.

Front Dormers

The gable roof dormers to the front elevation seem quite basic and void of architectural detail or character. It would be favourable if these maintained the style of a flat roof dormer. There is scope to supplement the existing left window framing design with the new dormer(s) but this would have to be specified to a high architectural design standard.

Rainwater pipes

These should not be in plain sight where possible. For example, on the front elevation, these could be positioned on the returns of projecting faces. Side elevations would be preferable over the front elevation. Similarly for the rear, the same concept should be apply. A progressive move would be to introduce scupper drains or similar to avoid unsightly gutter pipes, all possible with a warm roof detail.

The applicant also needs to provide a ground floor plan at suitable scale (minimum 1:100) with the landscape and site plot visible. This will help aid understanding the impact of the extension in relation to existing trees and the adjacent street.

Rear Elevation / Side Elevation 2

I have concerns this elevation is haphazard and inharmonious to the overall area (as it can be easily viewed from Shawclough Road and Throughbeck Way). The 3d views do not correlate with the plans; the rear dormer is shown in different positions. This area of the design is particularly unresolved. The ratio of glazed openings to wall is particularly incongruent and unjustified and this should be reduced. Overall this part of the elevation seems very busy and there is little lenience between roofs and curtain wall frames. The practicality of building this will further disrupt the elevation and I am apprehensive that a handrail balcony (rail or glass) would be to the detriment of the elevation. For privacy concerns, I would question if a balcony was appropriate at this corner plot of the site at all. If the planning officer deems this location suitable for a corner balcony, the balcony design most certainly should be improved. This is something I would advise not to leave open-ended until condition discharge stage as the design intent at this stage is too weak. Once again, it appears as if a standardised product has been inserted to represent a balcony but this is a

key component to the elevation and thus the quality of the product is vital in positively enhancing / preserving the urban surroundings.

Another poor detail /illustration includes the rear single storey extension parapet. This 'thick lid looks to be dumped' on to the extension and the reality of constructing this will appear very different. This could easily be improved with a warm roof detail with a slim parapet capping detail. This would then tie in well with the other existing add on elevations to the rear. The single storey extension would benefit from being constructed in a different material i.e. stone or brickwork. This will help break up the wide and monotonous elevation.

Side Elevation 2

The setback of the side extension is welcomed with much needed depth reinstated in the facade. It is advised architectural features such as the window surrounds demonstrated in the existing building are rolled out to any new areas of the proposed design.

If the bedroom dormer is flush with the gable wall side elevation why is this part of the sloping roof then visible? This demonstrates an unresolved, incoherent design, detrimental to the character of the area.

Side Elevation 1

The window strip as drawn is not justified. It is excessive in scale and creates privacy issues to the neighbouring property. A better option would be to distribute light via roof windows more effectively. If the planning officer deems it acceptable, a corner vertical slot window (as an alternative) near the corner would be aesthetically more pleasing and still offer the occupant an opportunity to experience a range of natural light in this area.

UPDATE:

The agent has not addressed the advice flagged in the initial consultation. Reducing the width of the extension by 290mm does very little to address the concerns of scale and overbearing. The drawing details are poor and I am concerned that the development cannot be built as shown, resulting in further changes down the line i.e. rear extension junction with the main roof, parapet heights etc.

Based on the internal layouts, there is a question of why there even needs to be a dormer on the front elevation. Additionally this is another element that has been incorrectly drawn as the internal wall clashes with the window. This would mean a wall / spandrel may be required thus changing the appearance of the building for the worse. Simple steps such as drawing the garage differently has been ignored. The omission of the balcony railing is welcomed and this is replaced with a parapet wall – once again drawn incorrectly and thus representing the development inaccurately.

As per paragraph 135 of the NPPF, there is no conviction that the proposal will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. The extension is not visually attractive, failing to demonstrate good architecture or layout. It is disparaging the designer has not taken

the assistance provided in the previous consultation and what results is a scheme that fails to meet the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 135, 200 and 206.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted within the immediate vicinity of the listed building, in addition to a press notice. 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:

P2	Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
T2	Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5	Schedule of Parking Standards
G6	Enhancing green infrastructure
G7	Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

The case officer engaged in extensive discussions with the applicant / agent, including written feedback and recommended changes. Amendments were made including a marginal reduction in the scale of the proposed front dormer, a minor reduction in the width of the side extension, and alterations to the proposed rear balcony. The final amendments are shown on drawing A102.C received 9 February 2024 and the application is determined against this.

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.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 134 states *“development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”*
- ❑ 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 below the ridge line of the host dwelling which whilst appearing subservient in the sense of its height, given the horizontal emphasis of the dwelling (which has been reduced only slightly), the overall scale is overbearing to the rest of the dwelling and will result in an imposing front elevation which is also directly in the setting of the listed building.
- ❑ The proposal would also introduce of two dormer extensions on the front and rear roof slope of the proposed side extension. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes *“dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.”* Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:
 - (i) *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
 - (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
 - (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
 - (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
 - (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
 - (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
 - (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*

(viii) *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.*”

- ❑ The combination of the proposed side extension plus addition of two front facing dormers results in a design that dominates the front of the dwelling and changes its character in a way that is harmful to the dwelling itself and the streetscene, including the adjacent listed building. Although dormers to the front of the dwelling could be acceptable, that is where they are modest in design and form. Although some amendments have been made, they are not to the extent necessary to reduce the harm as described above.
- ❑ Changes made to the design of the rear balcony are welcomed although there needs to be greater clarity over the use of a parapet wall design – the drawings are not fully clear. The submitted drawings provide no details of proposed materials despite being requested. In the event that the application was to be approved, this would be controlled by planning condition.
- ❑ Overall, although some changes have been made to scheme, they have failed to address the concerns raised by officers in regards to scale and design and is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Heritage: P2

- ❑ Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states, *“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority [...] shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*
- ❑ Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strives to *“protect the borough’s heritage by... conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.”*
- ❑ Designated assets such as listed buildings and the engineering heritage, including mills and canals are identified as key heritage assets of the borough.
- ❑ Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states, *“in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*
 - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”*

- ❑ Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states, *“when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states *“any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states, *“where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”*

- ❑ Significance, as defined in the NPPF, is:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”

- ❑ The setting of a heritage asset, as defined in the NPPF, is:

“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”

- ❑ The Conservation Officer’s comments are provided in full earlier in this report. In summary, the host property sits opposite to Duffins Cottage, a Grade-II listed building and the proposed extension would be directly across the road from it. Therefore the two would be experienced together. As such, the application site is considered to be in the setting of the listed building.
- ❑ It is accepted that whilst materials are not shown on the proposed plans, and certain materials are necessary including timber for the garage door, this can be controlled by planning condition.
- ❑ The combination of the proposed demolition of the garage and replacement with the extension including dormers causes less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building, which is not outweighed by public benefits. The harm is as a result of the demolition of the garage and replacement with an extension of a scale and design that is overbearing harmful to the character of the dwelling.
- ❑ The application conflicts with the NPPF and Policy P2 of the Core Strategy in this regard.

Trees:

- ☐ The proposed side extension is within close vicinity of two Sycamore trees sited to the side boundary although closest to one of the trees in particular.
- ☐ A Tree Survey was submitted during the determination of the application which states that the extension does not necessitate the removal of the two mature trees. T2 is in closest proximity to the proposed side extension and although its' removal is not necessary to construct the extension, it has been found to be of poor health. T1 is not affected.
- ☐ No mention is made of the mature hedgerow in the tree survey. The accompanying heritage statement states that the hedgerow does not need to be removed to construct the extension – this would be secured by planning condition if the proposed development was to be approved in accordance with Policies G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy.

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:
 - (i) *“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.”*
- ☐ 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.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:
 - ☐ *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ Section 5.17 of the SPD states *“dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- ☐ Notwithstanding the siting of the host dwelling on an elevated position to adjacent no. 329, the proposed single-storey rear extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line drawn 4m along the common boundary from the rear conservatory of no. 329. The properties are also separated by substantial hedging along the common boundary.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample 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 proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from four to five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ❑ The proposed plans allow for parking to take place within the existing driveway and within the proposed large attached garage. As such officers are satisfied that parking standards will be met. No objections have been received from the Council’s Highway Engineer.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposed development, comprising the demolition of a garage and construction of extensions, through their scale and incongruous design, will lead to unacceptable harm to the appearance of the dwelling and the street scene, and harm to the setting of an adjacent listed building. The harm is not justified or outweighed by public benefits. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies P1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	21/02/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	23/02/24	Signed: LA

Report Author Sam Yuen