

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00349/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00349/HOUS
Location:	25 Hurstead Road, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3JS
Proposal:	Proposed single storey side extension, erection of front canopy and formation of front hardstanding
Applicant:	Mr Andrew Ogden
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 15.08.2024	EXT OF TIME 19.08.2024
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 25 Hurstead Road, a two-storey end terrace dwelling located a modern residential development in Milnrow. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 27 Hurstead Road to the north-west, adjacent to no. 23 Hurstead Road to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north-east. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto an unadopted access road which abuts the grounds of St James's Church to the south-west and of which comprises the following Grade-II listed buildings:

- ☐ St James's Church
- ☐ Former meeting room of St James's Church
- ☐ Sundial in the graveyard of St James's
- ☐ Tomb associated with the Shore Family

A public right of way runs to the east of the property across Hurstead Road and the church grounds.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey side extension which projects a maximum 3.73m from the side elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a hipped roof form and has a maximum ridge height of 4.34m and height to eaves of 3.54m.

The proposal also comprises a front canopy which projects 1.1m from the front elevation of the dwelling.

The submitted plans also indicate the construction of hardstanding to the front curtilage space of the dwelling for two vehicles.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

The Conservation Officer raises no objections subject to condition.

The property backs onto the grounds of the Grade-II listed St. James Church and associated meeting room, sundial and tomb. Views which include the listed buildings and the host property are possible from the rear access road and therefore the proposal has the potential to impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets.

The extension would be seen in the context of the existing modern development. Nevertheless, matching material samples of red brick and natural slate should be required by condition as to not detract from the setting of the listed building.

Subject to this condition, it is considered that given the context and scale of the extension, it would have a neutral impact on the significance of the nearby heritage assets.

Highways and Engineering

No comments received at the time of writing.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted in the vicinity of the host property. No comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Policy JP-P2 Heritage

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

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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 side extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a hipped roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ It is noted the proposed extension comprises a diagonal side wall which adjoins the common boundary of no. 23, tapering towards the rear. Notwithstanding the irregular built form, the extension would not be sited in an overly prominent position and thus is not considered to result in adverse harm to the surrounding street scene and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ Likewise, whilst front canopies are not original features of dwellings in the locality, this addition to the dwelling would not detract from the character of the street scene to such a degree as to warrant refusal and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ 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 with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ It is acknowledged the proposed side extension would remove space for refuse bins to be stored away from public view. However, regards have been had to existing arrangements in the locality, particularly terraced properties where refuse bins are stored to the front curtilage space. With this in mind, it is considered a refusal could not be reasonably substantiated in this regard.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE 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 JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone and Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strive 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.
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ The host property is sited adjacent to the grounds of St James’s Church, which comprises four Grade-II listed buildings and structures, including the church building, the former meeting room, the sundial and the tomb associated with the Shore Family. Due to its close proximity, the host dwelling and listed buildings can be viewed together and therefore the proposal would be considered to be within the setting of the heritage assets.
- ☐ The proposed extension would be seen in the context of the existing modern residential development which surrounds St James’s Church and thus is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the designated heritage assets through their setting, subject to the submission of samples of matching brickwork and natural slate, which can be secured via condition.
- ☐ Subject to the appropriate condition, the proposed design would be acceptable in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P2 of the PfE, and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”*
- ☐ Taking into account of the SPD, the proposed side extension does not project beyond the front and rear elevation of the host dwelling and is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts 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 proposal would result in the addition of one bedroom to the dwelling and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy. The submitted plans indicate the addition of two off-street parking spaces to the front curtilage space, on top of the existing off-street parking arrangements to the rear access road, which would be acceptable.
- ☐ The applicant has confirmed the hardstanding would be constructed from permeable materials; permeable driveways do not require planning permission and as such, it would not be necessary to condition details.
- ☐ The proposed driveway would require a dropped kerb to Hurstead Road which requires separate consent from Highways; this has been noted in the informative of this report.
- ☐ 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 – received 16/04/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. AO01/0424/03 Rev. A received 30/07/2024
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. AO01/0424/01 received 16/04/2024
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. AO01/0424/02A received 16/04/2024

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, the materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development shall be in red brick and natural slate and match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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	25/07/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	19/08/2024	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

The applicant is reminded of the need to provide a standard vehicle access crossing which will require a separate permission from the Council as Highways Authority for the works. The works will be required to be approved and implemented in full prior to the first use of the approved development.

Report Author Sam Yuen