

Application Number:	23/00459/HOUS
Location:	69 Boundary Street Rochdale OL11 3TG
Proposal:	Single Storey Rear Extension and alteration to fenestration on the side elevation
Applicant:	KASHIF JAVAID
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	No

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

69 Boundary Street is a two-storey terrace dwelling located in the Milkstone and Deepish ward of Rochdale sited between 67 and 71 Boundary Street to which all three dwellings currently host development to the rear comprised of a similar size and scale. The dwelling hosts a generously sized rear garden and a single storey rear extension projecting approx. 4.5m from the original dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a dual-pitched roof single storey rear extension projecting 6.2m from the rear elevation, replacing part of the existing rear extension. The extension would feature a chamfered edge along the south-side elevation and be constructed in materials to match the existing. The application also proposes to change the design of an existing side-facing window in the existing rear elevation.

Relevant History

84/D16730 SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLINGHOUSE
Granted 27.06.1984

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours however, no letters of representation 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

G/D/2 Green Belt

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

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

Amendments

Amendments were sought to ensure the proposed development was SPD compliant in terms of maximum projection in relation to surrounding neighbours. Further amendments were sought to solve minor discrepancies between projection distances between the submitted plans to ensure they all reflected the same development.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape.

Whilst it is noted the scale of the rear extension is large for a dwelling of this size, it is considered to be an improvement to the existing arrangement in terms of visual amenity. Additionally, the dwelling hosts substantial garden space to the rear which will be partially retained, post-development.

The extension is not considered to be significantly harmful to the overall street scene at the rear by virtue of the presence of existing rear extensions, most notably those along Ellesmere Street, considered to be part of the original builds.

Limited details on the proposed materials have been provided on the submitted PA. However, the matching materials in order to be in keeping with the existing dwelling would therefore respect the visual appearance of the host dwelling.

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 the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy to which it states "All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings" and "proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties".

The proposal adheres to SPD paragraph 5.6 which sets out the following maximum standard in relation to attached properties; *"a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);"*.

Further to the above and in relation to the adjoining property to the south, no.71, paragraph 5.7 states the above distance can be increased providing it does not extend beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary. By virtue of the chamfered edge along the southern elevation, the proposal does not surpass a 45 degree line in relation to the rear elevation of no.71.

It should be noted the rear extension at the rear of the adjoining property to the north, no.67, is considered informal. Nonetheless, the proposal would remain compliant in terms of maximum projection standards given the proposal would project 2.6m forward of that at the neighbouring dwelling.

The separation distance between the rear elevation of the extension and the adjacent dwellings at the rear is approx. 35m therefore the development does not present any overriding need to protecting the privacy of the adjacent occupiers.

In relation to occupier amenity, the proposed works ensure the provision of a suitably sized rear garden would be retained post-development. The works would also not pose any detrimental impact to the provision of adequate light and outlook to existing internal rooms of the host property. It is acknowledged the existing ground floor rear dining room would suffer a minimal loss of outlook as a result of the siting of the extension, however, the harm is not considered to be so significant it would warrant a reason for refusal on this basis. Similarly at no.71 Boundary Street, the window on the ground floor rear elevation of the existing dwelling and window to the north-side elevation of the extension (hosting a kitchen and dining room) are not considered to be so severely impacted by the works that it would pose an unacceptable impact and is not considered to be a significant change to the existing arrangement.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:
 - Location Plan
 - 23.3110.3C Existing and Proposed Block Plans
 - 23.3110.2C Proposed Details

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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	03.08.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	09.08.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo