

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00190/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00190/HOUS
Location:	4 Bridge North Drive, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 0ES
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension together with front porch extension following demolition of existing outbuilding
Applicant:	Mr Terry Allen
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 01.05.2024	EXT OF TIME 29.05.2024
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. 4 Bridge North Drive, a detached bungalow located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge, Littleborough. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 2 Bridge North Drive to the south-west, adjacent to no. 6 Bridge North Drive to the north-east, and faces the highway and Smithy Bridge Primary School to the north-west. The rear curtilage boundary borders the rear curtilage of The Bridge Centre to the south-east. The property is sited on an elevated position to the highway and benefits from a detached garage to the rear of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for single-storey side and rear extension which projects 4.3m from the side elevation and 3.55m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing outbuilding. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with matching ridge and eaves.

The application also proposes a front porch extension which projects 1.56m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with a ridge height of 3.9m and a height to eaves of 3.28m.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objection to this proposal.

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)

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

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

Amendments were made to alter the front porch window from a gable-end window to a regular window to match the height of the existing fenestration.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 135 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.*”
- ☐ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ☐ 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 enlarge the property to the side and rear to accommodate additional kitchen space and an additional bedroom. Whilst it is noted this constitutes a considerable enlargement of the host dwelling, by virtue of its massing and siting perpendicular to the existing roof, it is considered the extension would not dominate the host dwelling and the resultant development would not appear disproportionate in scale to the adjacent dwellings, especially when read with adjacent no. 2, which was recently subject to a substantial first-floor extension.
- ☐ The application also proposed a front porch extension which occupies a footprint of 3.31m² above an existing raised platform. Notwithstanding the

absence of front-projecting porches on the immediate street scene, the proposed porch is of a modest scale that would not result in undue harm to the appearance of the street scene 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 noted the proposed side extension would remove space for refuse bins to be stored away from public view. Notwithstanding this and the existing limited curtilage space, the visual harm of refuse bins stored in view from the street scene is not considered to be so significant as to warrant refusal 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 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 Section 5.6 and 5.7 of the SPD, the proposed side and rear extension and front porch extension are not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring habitable room windows.
- ☐ 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 increase the number of bedrooms from two to three and would partially remove the existing hardstanding, resulting in only one off-street parking space; this would fall below the maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy. Notwithstanding, it is noted the existing parking arrangement for properties along Bridge North Drive is partly accommodated by designated on-street parking spaces. The Highways Officer was also consulted and raised no objections to the proposed plans.
- ☐ On this basis, it is considered the proposed parking arrangements would be 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 28/02/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3258.3 received 28/02/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3258.1C received 06/03/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3258.2E received 09/05/2024

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 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	29/05/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	29/05/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen

