



Officers Report

Case Reference: PL/2025/1214
Location: 22 JUTLAND AVENUE, ROCHDALE, OL11 5DP
Proposal: Two-storey side, first floor rear extension and alteration to fenestration to front and rear elevations, including Juliet balcony to the front
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Majid Mir

Site Description

The application relates to no. 22 Jutland Avenue, a two storey end of terrace residential property. No. 22 is one of four properties set in a terrace of properties, with the front of the properties facing south. No. 22 adjoins with no. 26 to west. To the east, no. 22 shares a boundary with no. 20. No. 20 is also set further forward and closer to the highway than no. 22.

The external door is located to the side elevation of the host property.

No. 22 is located within a residential area and within the Defined Urban Area.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension and a first floor rear extension. The two storey side extension would project out by approximately 1.4m from the existing side elevation of the host property. The two storey side extension would be set flush with the main front elevation of the host property. The proposed first floor rear extension would sit above the part two storey part single storey extension. The projection of the first floor would be increased by approximately 0.7m and therefore would have a total projection of approximately 3m from the rear elevation of the original property.

The application also proposes to make alterations to the fenestration on the front and rear elevations. To the front, the application proposes to install a new window on the ground floor, one new window on the first floor, a new double opening glazed window with a Juliet balcony and new front entrance. To the rear, the application proposes to replace the existing two windows and rear external door on the ground floor, with two windows and double glazed door.

The application proposes to construct the proposed extensions using bricks, roof tiles, UPVC windows and glazed doors, that match the existing. The Juliet balcony will be constructed using metals that are painted in black.

Relevant History

21/01745/HOUS - Single-storey outbuilding at rear of dwelling – Retrospective.
Decision: Approve with conditions.

20/00585/HOUS - Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. Decision: Approve with conditions.

18/00669/HOUS - Part single-storey, part two storey rear extension and formation of two new window openings on existing side elevation at ground and first floor.
Decision: Approve with conditions.

16/00750/HOUS - Proposed single storey rear extension to dwelling. Decision: Approve with conditions.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no responses were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

JP-P1 Sustainable Development

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).

Assessment

Policies 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.' Additionally, section 5.1 of the SPD explains that extensions 'should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.'

No. 22 is one of four properties in a row of terrace properties. The properties on either end of the terrace (no. 22 and no. 28) are set slightly further forward and have front facing hipped roofs. The two dwellings in the middle have dual pitched roofs with the pitch of the roofs set to the front and rear. This arrangement is mimicked along this part of Jutland Avenue, with five rows of terrace properties. The rows are all set at slightly different distances from the highway. Furthermore, it is noted that no.22 is the only property at the end of terrace that does not have a door on the front elevation. As such, this is at odds with the rest of the properties on Jutland Avenue. The form of the row of terraces has stayed relatively consistent and the same, with some alterations to the front in the form of alterations to fenestration and porches.

The application proposes a two storey side extension that would have a width of approximately 1.4m. The proposed extension would project out from the side up to the shared side boundary with no. 20. It would be set flush with the front elevation of the host property, and the eaves and ridge height would be set at the same height as the host property. To the rear, the proposed extension would project approximately 3m beyond the rear elevation of the host property. When combined with the existing part two storey part single storey extension and proposed first floor extension, there would be a two storey extension that would wrap around the whole of the original property. The proposed roof would be hipped, however, the pitch of the roof would not be the same as the existing property and the ridge would be set further back than the ridge of the host property and the adjoining neighbouring properties. The roof would be at odds with the host property and the neighbouring adjoining properties.

Furthermore, it is noted that the end properties on the terraces have brick quoins detailing (excluding no. 22 which has stone quoins). The proposed two storey side extension would see this brick detailing lost.

Given the positive and cohesive characteristics shared by the host dwelling and other nearby properties and the scale and form of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed extension would not represent a subservient addition and would instead represent a standard of design which falls well below the expectations of planning policy.

Further to the above, the fenestration to the front would also sit at odds with the character of the host property and the local area. It is noted that there is variation in the positioning and number of windows sited on the front elevation, including some properties that are double fronted. The principle of a door sited on the front elevation is considered to be acceptable, however, the proposed front door opening and door would be of an overly large size, with an obtrusive design shown on the plans. Additionally, with the added large double window with Juliet balcony sited above the door opening, it would appear at odds with the host property and the local area. The proposed fenestration to the front would represent poor design that would not be in keeping with the host property or the local area. The proposed fenestration would only exacerbate the incongruousness of the proposed development when viewed from the highway and public vantage points.

Furthermore, the proposed side extension would see access to the rear of the property lost. Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states that 'residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets. Bins should be stored to the rear of a property away from the street scene and/or in a designated area that is well-designed, appropriately sited and screened.' The front of the property is used as a drive and therefore it is open from the front along the highway. The addition of the proposed two storey side extension would therefore mean that bins will need to be stored to the front. With no boundary treatment along the front to screen the bins, they would be clearly visible from the highway. This would cause further undue harm to the appearance of the host property and the character of the street scene.

The proposed first floor extension would include a small chamfered edge set to the corner of the proposed extension by no. 24. Although this form is not considered to represent good design, it would be a relatively small chamfer set to the rear of the building and would not be visible from public vantage points and would be an acceptable feature on balance.

The design of the proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, policy JP-P1 of the adopted PFE and the NPPF.

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.' Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning

Policy Framework advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 5.8 of the SPD states that 'two storey or first floor rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbouring occupiers than single storey extensions, particularly on their enjoyment of their garden area due to the potential oppressiveness of a two-storey wall close to a common boundary.' Paragraph 5.9 continues to provide guidance on first floor and two storey rear extensions. It states that '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(s).'

In regard to the proposed two storey side extension, it would be set near to the shared boundary with no. 20. No. 20 is set further forward and closer to the highway than no. 22. Therefore, the rear of no. 22 is set further back than that of no. 20. As such, it is considered that the guidance as set out above is considered applicable to this application. The proposed two storey side extension would project beyond the original rear elevation of the host property by approximately 3m and would be a total of approximately 4.4m beyond the rear elevation of no. 20. As such, the proposed extension would fail to meet the requirements as set out in paragraph 5.9. It is noted that no. 20 is set approximately 1.9m from the shared boundary. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would substantially project beyond the requirements set out in the SPD guidance and would lead to a substantial loss of light and cause substantial overshadowing to the rear windows and garden space of no. 20.

The proposed first floor rear extension would adjoin an existing extension and would have a total projection of approximately 3m. The proposed first floor extension would have a chamfered edge that is set approximately 2.47m from the rear elevation of the adjoining property. The rear edge of the extension would be approximately 0.8m from the shared boundary. The proposed first floor extension would project approximately 0.3m beyond the requirements set out in the SPD. It is considered that the slight increased in projection beyond the SPD requirements would not be sufficiently great to unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property of no. 24.

All habitable rooms within the application property would be served with an adequate level of natural light and a sufficient amount of rear garden space would be retained. As such, the proposed development would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants of the application property.

The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring property of no. 20 Jutland Avenue and therefore fail to accord policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Refusal(s) (3)

- 1 By virtue of its size, height and design, the proposed two storey side extension constitutes an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the host dwelling which fails to remain subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed extension would represent poor design and would be detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. The poor design of the proposed development is further exacerbated by the disproportionate size of the front external door and first floor window, and the addition of the Juliet balcony. The proposed development represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and constitutes undue visual harm to the character and visual appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 By virtue of its siting, size and scale, the proposed two storey side extension would fail to comply with the requirements of the Standards and Guidelines for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and therefore the proposed development would be unduly harmful to the amenity of number 20 Jutland Avenue through an overbearing impact upon the rear garden area, and rear facing habitable room windows of the adjacent property. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The failure to provide a bin store to the front of the property would leave the relevant bins exposed and in a prominent position in the street scene. This would unduly harm the appearance of the street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.