

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00404/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00404/HOUS
Location:	331 Shawclough Road, Rochdale, OL12 7HL
Proposal:	One and half storey side extension with front and rear dormers, alterations to front elevation to facilitate garage conversion together with a single storey rear extension and formation of double doors to existing rear elevation following demolition of existing detached garage and rear conservatory - Resubmission of 23/00669/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr Imran Manzoor
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 17.07.2024	EXT OF TIME
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. 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 a one and half-storey side extension which projects 3.6m 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 form and is set down 1.3m from the ridge line with a height to eaves of 3.13m. The extension comprises a gable-fronted dormer on the front roof slope which measures 2.2m in length, 2m in height, and 2.2m in depth, and a flat roof dormer and balcony which measures 3.08m in length, 2.26m in height, and 2.65m 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 3.35m. It would be constructed in brickwork matching the brick course on the base of the dwelling.

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 front-gable roof to the existing front dormer window.

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

The application is a resubmission of a previous application 23/00669/HOUS with amendments made to reduce the proposed side projection by 1m in width and 0.36m in height and the scale of the proposed dormers. Minor amendments have also been made in external detailing and materiality.

Relevant History

23/00669/HOUS - 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 – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

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.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

This application follows on from a refused scheme for side and rear extensions. Following on from the refusal, the scheme has been amended; the main change relates to the side extension, which has been reduced in height and width.

As a result of the changes, the revised extension would read as a subservient addition to the host property and would not appear unduly dominant within the street scene. Details of materials should be required by condition. Subject to this, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the nearby Grade-II listed Duffins Cottage.

Urban Design

No comments received at the time of writing.

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objection to these proposals which are unlikely to impact upon the highway.

Tree Officer

No comments received at the time of writing.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted within the vicinity of the host dwelling. 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

G6 Enhancing green infrastructure

G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

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 revised scheme comprises a one and half-storey side extension, the width and height of which have been considerably reduced to a degree where

it would read as a subservient addition to the host dwelling, which would sufficiently address concerns raised in the original submission.

- ② Notwithstanding its substantial footprint, the proposed rear extension would remain somewhat subordinate to the host dwelling due to its single-storey form. The proposed flat roof form and dark grey brickwork would contrast with the dual-pitched roof form and render of the dwelling. However, due to its siting to the rear, the extension would not be readily visible from public vantage points and thus the visual impact would be limited.
- ② The proposal would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling. Notwithstanding, suitable materials can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the street scene and to protect the significance of the adjacent listed building (the assessment of which is set out in the following heading.)
- ② It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ② The proposal would also introduce 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.”*

- ② The host dwelling sits within a mixed street scene of various scale, built forms and massing. Numerous surrounding dwellings comprise front dormers of varying sizes, namely nos. 254, 258 and 329 Shawclough Road. Given this context, it is considered the proposed front dormer would not detract from the established appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable in principle.

- ☐ The proposed front dormer has been considerably scaled down from its previous submission and is sufficiently sited away from the ridge, eaves and side walls. As such, the front dormer would constitute a modest and non-intrusive addition on the roof slope.
- ☐ The proposed rear comprises a flat roof form that is set against the eaves of the proposed side extension, which would fail to comply with point (ii) and (iv). However, it is noted the form of the dormer is in part, to accommodate double doors access to the rear balcony. Amendments have also been made to reduce the scale of the dormer to an appropriate size contained within the roof of the side extension. The dormer would also not be readily visible from the highway and would be screened from view by the existing boundary treatments. Taking the above into account, it is considered the visual impact of the rear dormer would not be unduly harmful and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, notwithstanding the irregular built form and horizontal emphasis of the dwelling, the revised proposal represent an improvement upon the previously refused plans and would constitute an acceptable standard of design and appearance. 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. Designated assets such as listed buildings and the engineering heritage 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.”

- ② 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.”*
- ② 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.”*
- ② The host dwelling sits opposite Duffins Cottage, a Grade-II listed building, with the proposed side extension directly facing the building. The two properties are experienced together on the street scene and thus the proposal would be considered within the setting of the listed building.
- ② The revised plans have significantly reduced the width, height and overall scale of the proposed side extension. The proposed dormers have also been reduced in scale. As a result, the proposed extension would not have an overbearing impact on the host dwelling and would not appear imposing against the setting of the listed building.
- ② The submitted plans indicate matching fenestration and the use of timber for the proposed garage door, both of which would appear in keeping with the existing materiality of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene. It is recommended that the details of the materials and garage doors are secured via conditions in the interest of visual amenity and the safeguarding of the significance of the listed building.
- ② The proposed landscaping plan indicate the existing boundary landscaping and trees adjacent to the proposed side extension would not be altered as a result of the proposal. The retention of the landscaping can be secured via condition as to prevent less than substantial harm to the heritage asset.
- ② With the above in mind, the proposed side extension would read as a subservient addition to the host dwelling and would not be imposing to the Duffins Cottage. The proposal would therefore have a neutral impact on the setting of the designated heritage asset and would be acceptable, in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P2 of the PfE, and the NPPF.

Trees: G6 and G7

- ② 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.
- ② A submitted Tree Survey states 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.
- ② No mention is made of the mature hedgerow in the tree survey. Notwithstanding, the accompanying heritage statement and proposed landscaping plan indicate that the hedgerow would not be removed to construct the extension. The retention of the landscaping would be secured via condition.

- ☐ The proposed development would not result in undue harm to the trees within the host curtilage and would be in accordance with Policies G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy.

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.”*
- ☐ The proposed side extension and front dormer does not project beyond the front and rear elevation of the dwelling and does not directly face any habitable room windows.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.6 of the SPD, the proposed single-storey rear extension would comply with the space requirements outlined.
- ☐ As such, the proposed development would not result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The proposed rear balcony is sited a minimum 18m from the nearest neighbouring rear curtilage space and would be substantially screened by existing hedging to the north-west boundary which abuts an adopted highway. As such, no concerns are had with regard to any overlooking impacts in this regard.
- ☐ 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 three to four 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 the arrangements would meet the parking standards. 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: 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 02/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – received 02/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – received 02/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Roof Plan – Drawing No. A101 received 02/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. A102 received 22/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Landscape Plan – Drawing No. A103 received 02/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Landscape Plan – Drawing No. A104 received 02/05/2024

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 specification of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to protect the significance of the designated heritage asset, in accordance 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.

4. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials of the proposed doors, garage door and windows have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed garage door shall be constructed in timber. Such details shall include detailed elevation and cross-section drawings, and the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to protect the significance of the designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policy 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.

5. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the hedgerows and landscaping along the north-west and north-east curtilage boundary of the host dwelling as shown on “Proposed Landscape Plan Drawing No. A104” received 02/05/2024 shall be retained and maintained thereafter. Any shrubs which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased shall be replaced within the next planting season by shrubs of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to protect the significance of the designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policy 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	17/07/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation		Signed:

Report Author Sam Yuen