

Application Number:	23/00807/HOUS
Location:	11 Stopford Avenue Littleborough Rochdale OL15 8QH
Proposal:	Two storey and single storey rear extension including alterations to fenestration on existing site and rear elevations
Applicant:	Andrew Bridge
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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. 11 Stopford Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the residential suburb of Smithy Bridge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 13 Stopford Avenue to the south-east, adjacent to no. 9 Stopford Avenue to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilages of nos. 6 and 8 The Elms.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for part-two storey, part-single storey rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The two-storey extension is characterised by a hipped roof form, is set away from the common boundary of adjoined no. 13 by 2.43m and set down from the ridge line by approx. 0.94m with matching height to eaves. The single-storey extension comprises a lean-to roof and has a ridge height of 3.81m and a height to eaves of 2.85m.

In addition, the application seeks to alter existing fenestration on the side and rear elevation, alongside the addition of a window on the first-floor side elevation of the dwelling.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extension would not appear to have any impact on the current parking arrangements.

The current servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity on the wider highway network.

Highways raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

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)

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 130 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 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 proposed two-storey rear extension is set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a hipped roof form would also be in keeping.
- ☐ Likewise, no concerns are had with the proposed single-storey rear extension and its lean-to roof form, which would appear compatible to the host dwelling.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.”*

- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *“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.”*
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:
 - ☐ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey extensions projecting *“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)”* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension would be sited 23m away from the directly facing habitable room windows of rear-facing no. 8 The Elms and a minimum 10.36m from the directly facing curtilage boundary. It is noted the marginal exceedance in distance from the curtilage boundary would not result in undue levels of overlooking harm and would be accepted in this regard.
- ☐ The proposed single-storey rear extension projects 3m along the common boundaries measured from the rear elevations of adjacent nos. 9 and 13.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension does not project beyond 30 degree lines drawn from points 2.4m along the common boundaries from the rear elevations of adjacent nos. 9 and 13.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposal is not considered to result in adverse amenity impacts to the 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 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 provision of which would be retained in the proposal.
- ☐ 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 24/07/2023
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3172.2 dated 07/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3171.1 dated 06/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3171.SC4.1 dated 06/2023

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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the north-west side elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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	21/09/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	26/09/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen