

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0366
Location: 99 Bentley Street, Rochdale, OL12 6PA
Proposal: Erection of front porch, single storey side and two storey rear extension following removal of existing conservatory
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Rosalind Galton

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to 99 Bentley Street, a two-storey end of terrace residential property in the Shawclough area of Rochdale, north of the town centre. The property benefits from an existing two storey side extension and rear conservatory. The property has a detached garage.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension, single storey side extension and a front porch. The existing conservatory would be demolished as part of the works.

The plans were amended during the course of the application to reduce the width and projection of the proposed porch.

RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

94/D31135 - Two Storey Extension To Side And Rear Of Dwelling Rear Conservatory And Attached Private Garage - Approve subject to conditions

02/D40427 - Private Detached Garage - Refuse

02/D40427 - Private Detached Garage (Resubmission D40146) - Approve subject to conditions

21/00403/HOUS - Front porch and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory - Refuse

21/00994/HOUS -Front porch and single storey rear extension, alterations to fenestration on front and rear elevations, following demolition of existing conservatory - Resubmission of 21/00403/HOUS - Approve subject to conditions

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local Guidance

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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)

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: Sent 19/06

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None applicable or received

ASSESSMENT

Design, character and appearance

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF (henceforth, the Framework) states that the fundamental aim of the planning system is the creation of high quality, sustainable places.

Paragraph 135 adds that new development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout, and appropriate and effective landscaping.

At Paragraph 139, the Framework makes clear that development, which is not good design, should be refused – especially where this fails to raise the standard of design more generally in the area.

Policy JP-P1 of PfE states that new development should be distinctive, 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 Council’s adopted Core Strategy states that development proposal should 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...”

The street scene is relatively uniform however it is noted an existing two storey side extension is present on the application dwelling, as is a rear annex on the property. The proposed side extension would be single storey and include a front facing gable feature that would be largely glazed. The extension would be set back approximately 9m from the front boundary and this would ensure that the proposal would appear as a subservient addition that would not unbalance the terrace row. Furthermore, whilst the large extent of glazing is not typical of the existing property frontage and street scene, the setback would ensure that this feature would be unobtrusive and would instead nestle comfortably against the existing property. Furthermore, given the location of New Street, which runs parallel to the property, it is not considered the proposed single storey side extension would remove gaps within the street scene or result in an overbearing impact on the street scene.

The proposed two storey rear extension would project 3m in depth from the rear elevation wall of the existing two storey side extension, set away 4m from the shared side boundary with the adjoining property. The proposed extension would accommodate a larger rear bedroom. It is not considered the rear extension would have an unacceptable visual impact from Bentley Street, and given the distance to the side boundary, would not result in a visually intrusive impact upon the adjoining neighbour at No 97.

The proposed porch, as amended, and side extension would be proportionate in scale. While the extent of the glazing and fenestration of the porch is not aligned with the fenestration of the main dwellinghouse, and alongside the roof pitch, the design does not align with the porches seen on the adjacent properties. However, the porch as amended would fall within the remit of what can be constructed through the use of permitted development rights. There is therefore a strong fallback position in the

instance the application was refused and subsequently appealed. As such, while the design of the porch could be more in keeping with the pattern of porches on the adjacent properties in the terrace row, it is not considered the proposed porch would result in an unacceptable visual impact to the street scene, or form an incongruous addition contrary to the aims of the NPPF and refusal of this feature could not be reasonably defended.

In conclusion, subject to a condition securing matching materials, the proposed development is in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding properties, and the wider setting. As such it is considered that the proposed extension and alterations would be acceptable, in accordance with CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Residential amenity

The proposed two storey rear extension would fall within the guidance stated within 5.8-5.9 of the SPD, due to the 4m distance to the side boundary and 3m projection. It is not considered the rear two storey extension would cause an unacceptable overbearing impact, or loss of light on the neighbouring property at No 97. Regard has been had to the relative positions of windows, separation distances, the orientation and height of buildings and boundary treatments. It is considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on health or quality of life, having particular regard to residential amenity. It is not considered the ground floor side window would have an unacceptable privacy impact given the existing boundary treatment in the rear garden area of the property.

It is noted that all habitable rooms within the application property would continue to receive an adequate amount of natural light and that a sufficient garden space would be retained. As such, it is considered proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of both the occupiers of the application property and the neighbouring properties, in accordance with CS policy DM1, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Highways and parking

The application property would retain two off-street parking spaces and would have no unacceptable impacts upon highway safety in accordance with CS Policy T2 and CS Appendix 5.

Conclusion

Subject to the conditions set out below and taking into account the provisions of the development plan and all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason – To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents hereby approved. : -

- Location plan
- A2357 AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
- A2357 AMENDED PROPOSED FLOORPLAN
- Application Form

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 saved Unitary Development Plan, 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 the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.