

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00815/HOUS

CASE OFFICER

DETERMINATION DATE 14.10.2024 **EXT OF TIME** 13.12.2024

Address: 73 Friars Crescent Rochdale OL11 2SF

Proposal: Two storey rear extension.

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION	APPROVE
----------------	---------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: Melanie Hale **DATE:** 10th April 2025

SITE

The application relates to 73 Friars Crescent, a two storey semi-detached dwelling in Rochdale. The dwelling faces south onto the highway, the dwelling benefits from off street parking and has a rear garden.

The site is within the Defined Urban Area and a residential area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a two storey rear extension with a pitched roof. The ground floor would project 3.5 metres from the rear elevation and would be approximately 5.2 metres wide. The first floor would essentially be in two sections. It would project 2.4 metres from the rear elevation adjacent the common boundary with 75 Friars Crescent for a width of 1.9 metres and a further 1.1 metres for the remaining width of the dwellings. The overall projection of this section would be 3.5 metres as per the first floor extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

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).

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. An objection has been received stating that the extension would block out too much sunlight particularly for children playing in the rear.

ANALYSIS

The Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD set out that extensions should be carefully designed to be in keeping with the host dwelling and generally be subservient to it. The SPD notes that two storey rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbours than single storey extensions. It states '*planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project 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*'.

The proposed first floor extends 2.4m from the common boundary and 3.5m from the existing rear elevation on the outside. This complies with the standards set out in the SPD and the illustrative drawing contained therein.

No 75 Friars Crescent adjoins the application dwelling, but within the context of the above, is considered to be acceptable. No 71 Friars Crescent would have a view of the side elevation of the extension. The dwelling is set at an angle from the boundary and is set back approximately 1.75 metres from it, such that in terms of amenity, the impact also meets the requirements of the SPD.

The rear elevation of properties fronting Kildare Crescent, specifically no80 directly faces the rear elevation of the application site. The SPD sets out that there should be 21 metres between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms and 10.5 metres between a principal window and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.

The resulting distance between the rear elevation of 80 Kildare Crescent and the application site would be approximately 21.5m, the current distance being 24 metres thus meeting the relevant guidance. The distance from the rear elevation to the common boundary is approximately 11.5 metres. As a result of allowing the extension, the distance would be reduced to 8.5 metres, thus failing the requirement.

Notwithstanding this last point, there would be no demonstrable harm to the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. Although the garden area would be reduced, this in and of itself is not sufficient to justify refusal of the application on the grounds of impact on privacy. In particular, there are a number of mature trees located on the boundary in any case.

In terms of design, it is accepted that it is a large extension. However, it is typical of a two storey rear extension to many properties and cannot be viewed from the public realm.

In relation to the objection received, the matter is raised in relation to the rear of 82 Kildare Crescent. The rear garden is located to the north east of the application site. The only time of day that the extension could impact on light and thus create overshadowing, would be mid to late evening. However, there is unlikely to be any impact from the extension itself given the existing impact of existing dwellings on Friars Crescent to the south.

The development accords with the development plan and SPD and thus it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Time
Plans
Materials

Procedure Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following list of plans:

- Location Plan
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan
- Proposed Elevations GF, FF and Roof Plan