

Application Number:	23/00895/HOUS
Location:	64 Fairway, Rochdale, OL11 3BZ
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and first floor side extension including front and rear dormers
Applicant:	J Campbell
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 29.01.2024	EXT OF TIME 06.02.2024
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

This application refers to no. 64 Fairway, a semi-detached dormer bungalow fronting Fairway in Castleton. The property is orientated northeast towards the highway and adjoins no. 62 Fairway to the northwest. The topography increases gradually in a northeasterly direction, with the result that the adjacent property, no. 66, is located on slightly higher ground. There are no properties to the rear and the land immediately to the southwest is designated Green Belt. The subject property is situated within an architecturally similar run of three pairs of semi-detached dormer bungalows.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension and a first floor side extension including the extension of the existing front and rear dormers. Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

94/D30584 Ground Floor Side Extension And Extension Dormer To Dwelling
Decision: **Grant subject to conditions**

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and 1 neutral representation was made in response to the proposed development.

The letter explained that the existing single storey side extension is showing signs of subsidence.

Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.

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

Following concerns raised with regards to the design of the front porch and the impact of the single storey rear extension on the amenity of neighbouring properties, amended plans were submitted to remove the proposed front porch and reduce the depth of the single storey rear extension to 3m.

Subsequently, the proposed plans were also amended to reduce the number of bedrooms from 4 to 3 to overcome concerns raised in respect to the nationally described space standards (NDSS).

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require new development to demonstrate high quality design and *“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.”*

Section 5.1 of the ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD’ states that extensions *“should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*

Section 5.11 of the SPD sets out the potential for two-storey side extensions to contribute towards a ‘terracing effect’. It states: *“Where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, which can harm the character of the property and the area. Proposals that would create this sort of ‘terracing effect’, or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.”*

As such, Section 5.12 requests that *“the first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house”* or *“the ground and first floor are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front wall of the main house”*. However, where there is no or little threat of “terracing”, exceptions can be made.

In this context, it is not deemed likely that a terracing effect would occur given the approx. 2m setback of the application property from the adjacent property, no. 66 Fairway. Given the change in ground levels and the existing setback, an additional setback would also result in the awkward formation of several different ridge heights between the application property and no. 66 Fairway, which would result in undue visual harm.

The proposed development would result in architectural balance and symmetry with the adjoining property, no. 62 Fairway, by virtue of its matching ridge height.

The proposed rear extension would be of a single storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling.

The proposed materials and architectural style would help to maintain the character of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

The proposed development would not impact the existing bin storage arrangements.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and would accord 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 requires that development proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Section 5.9 of the SPD states *“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).”*

Section 5.10 of the SPD explains that, *“Where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the 2.4m distance will be taken from a point 3m along the common boundary from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

The submitted plans confirm that the proposed side extension would be in accordance with the above guidance.

In respect of the proposed single storey rear extension, section 5.6 of the SPD states *“for attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 3m and would comply with the above guidance in relation to nos. 62 and 66 Fairway. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the neighbouring occupiers.

Section 4.1 of the SPD requires *“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.”* The proposed first floor side extension would measure approx. 27m to the front elevation of the facing property on the opposite side of Fairway (no. 63). The extension would not face any residential properties to the rear.

The proposed side extension would be set in close proximity to the blank gable elevation of no. 66 Fairway and it is not considered that the proposed extension would have an undue impact upon the levels of amenity enjoyed by the occupants of no. 66 Fairway.

The plans confirm 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.

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:

- Existing and Proposed Plans. Drg no. PL_001. Rev. B

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	31/01/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	08/02/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling