

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01267/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01267/HOUS
Location:	30 Brookway Littleborough Rochdale OL15 8BU
Proposal:	Part two storey part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and alteration to fenestration
Applicant:	MR & MRS MARK & CATHERINE ROBINSON
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
DETERMINATION DATE 17.02.2025	EXT OF TIME
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

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 30 Brookway, a two storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential cul-de-sac. Number 30 Brookway faces southwest towards 24 Brookway. To the southeast the application dwelling adjoins 28 Brookway. To the rear and facing northeast, 30 Brookway faces the rear of 32 Brookway. To the side of the of the application dwelling, the side elevation faces northwest and towards 25, 27 and 29 Brookway.

The application dwelling along with surrounding area are located in a critical drainage area. A small proportion of the site to the front and land further to the south are located with Flood Risk Zone 2. Furthermore, a small proportion of the side and rear along with the highway of Brookway are located within an area risk of national surface water 1 in 30 chance of flooding.

Description of Proposal

The properties in the development have some slight differences in variation including The application proposes to demolish the existing conservatory to the rear and construct a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. The two storey element would have a gable roof, project out from the rear by 3.65m and would be 4.93m wide. The single storey element would attach to the side of the two storey element and would have a mono pitched roof. The single storey element would be 1.25m wide and would have depth of 3.95m. The overall width of the proposed extension would be 6.18m.

The proposed extension would be constructed using red brick for the external elevations and a tiles for the roofs. On the ground floor the application proposes a 'family room' and utility room. On the first floor the application proposes a bedroom with an ensuite.

Along with the proposed extension, the application proposes to insert a window on the first floor side elevation which would service an existing bedroom.

Relevant History

01/D39319 - Removal Of Planning Condition 7 Of D36003 Regarding Retention Of Existing Pond Within Approved Residential Development. Approved.

01/D39113 - Residential Development - 44 Dwellings. Approved.

01/D38555 - Variation Of Condition 1B Of Planning Approval D36003 To Extend The Submission Period For Reserved Matters From 3 Years To 5 Years. Approved.

00/D37244 - Residential Development - 77 Dwellings Plots 1-12, 14-78. Approved.

99/D36087 - Residential Development - 145 Plots (Resubmission Of D36003). Refused.

98/D36003 - Residential Development - 145 Plots. Allowed at appeal.

97/D34136 - Residential Development - 144 Dwellings. Allowed at appeal.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties. 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 Places
JP-S4 Flood Risk and the Water Environment

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area
EM/7 Development and Flood Risk
EM/8 Protection of Surface and Ground Water

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
G8 Managing water resources and flood risk
G9 Reducing the impact of pollution
T2 Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

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

Amendments

None Applicable.

Assessment

Design and Visual Amenity

- ☐ The adjoining dwelling of 28 Brookway has a two storey rear extension with a stepped design. The extension has a gable roof design, is constructed out of matching red brick and tiles, and has a soldier course of red brick that matches the existing.
- ☐ The dwellings in the development have some slight differences in variation including render and roof designs. However, there are similarities, including the bricks used for the elevation, roof tiles and soldier courses.

- ☐ The proposed extension would be constructed using matching materials and would include matching soldier course. The overall design would be in keeping with the host dwelling and the development as whole.
- ☐ The proposed window in the side elevation of the host dwelling and the windows on the rear of the proposed extension are considered to be appropriately designed and sited.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states planning decisions should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.'

Neighbour Amenity

- ☐ The SPD establishes minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and development which affect existing residential properties. Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD states that 'the following minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties:
 - (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;
 - (ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
 - (iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.'
- ☐ The proposed part two storey, part single storey extension would face towards the rear of 32 Brookway. No. 32 Brookway has a bedroom to the rear that faces towards the application dwelling. The proposed extension would have a bedroom facing directly towards 32 Brookway. The proposed extension would be 12.4m to the boundary and 22.6m to the rear first floor elevation. As such in regards to the rear, the proposed extension would meet the minimum standards.
- ☐ In regards to the side, the proposed extension would be in the direct line of 29 Brookway. The ground floor element of the proposed extension would be 12.4m to the front elevation of 29 Brookway and the two storey element

would be 13.7m to the front elevation of 29 Brookway. In regards distance between the two storey element of the proposed extension and 29 Brookway, it would not meet the minimum distance of 14m by only 0.3m. Additionally, it is noted that the distance between the host dwelling and 27 Brookway is 12.5m. Therefore the distance would be greater than presently experienced by the neighbouring properties. Considering the existing relationship between the host dwelling and 27 Brookway, that the proposed extension would be only slightly below the 14m distance, 27 Brookway faces Southeast and the a sufficient expanse of area would be retained to the front of 27 Brookway, it has been concluded that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amount of light and outlook of 27 Brookway.

- ☐ The application also proposes to insert a new window in the side elevation of the host dwelling for an existing bedroom. Due to the addition of the proposed extension, the bedroom would lose access to the existing window. The proposed window would face towards 27 and 29 Brookway. The proposed window would face towards the first floor bedroom windows in both dwellings. The proposed window would be 12.8m to 27 Brookway and 14m to 29 Brookway. This would be substantially below the minimum distance of 21m set out in the SPD. As such it is considered that the addition of the proposed window would unduly impact on the privacy of 27 and 29 Brookway. Furthermore, it would also lead to a reduction in the privacy experienced for the users of the bedroom.
- ☐ It is noted that the proposed window would be 9.6m from the boundary of 27 Brookway and 10.3m from the boundary of 29 Brookway. However, the distance is to the front boundary. The front is open and it is not expected that the front would receive the same level of privacy as the rear outdoor amenity space.
- ☐ Further to the above, section 5 of the SPD provides guidance on rear extensions. The proposed extension would meet the minimum standards set out in section 5 of the SPD.
- ☐ It is therefore considered that due to insufficient distance being retained between first floor habitable rooms, the addition of the proposed window on the first floor side elevation of the existing dwelling would unduly impact on the privacy of the occupiers of 27 and 29 Brookway.

Occupier Amenity

- ☐ Along with not unduly impacting on the amenity of neighbouring properties, developments must not unduly impact on the amenity of present and future occupiers of the host dwelling.
- ☐ The proposed two storey extension would see the existing kitchen/dining room lose the access to external light and outlook received from the window on the rear elevation. The kitchen/dining room is considered to be a habitable room. It is noted is noted that the application proposes to insert glazed patio doors on the rear elevation of the proposed extension. Additionally, it appears that the window would be retained and there will be no door between the proposed extension and the kitchen/dining room. Nevertheless, the rooms would not be opened up into one single room and no other windows are proposed. As such, it is considered that the habitable room would receive an insufficient amount of light and outlook.

- ❑ The Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) provide guidance on minimum space standards for new dwellings. However, the NDSS is relevant to assess the living standards for the occupiers of a dwelling. The NDSS requires a 3 bedroom 4 bedspaces dwelling set over 2 floors is required to have a minimum internal floor area of 74 m². For a 4 bedroom 5 bedspaces dwelling set over 2 floors, the NDSS requires a minimum internal floor area of 90 m². The existing and proposed meeting the minimum internal floor area requirements with the NDSS.
- ❑ The room identified as bedroom 4 on the drawing 'proposed details' is an existing bedroom that would be reduced in size to allow for the addition of the proposed extension. At present, the bedroom has a floor of area of 9.1m². The proposed development would see that reduced to 5.8 m². A room with 1 bedspace should be a minimum of 7.5 m². The bedroom identified as the master bedroom would have a floor area of 11 m² (excluding ensuite). As a master bedroom, it is expected that the room should be a 2 bed space room and as such should have a minimum floor area of 11.5 m². As such the proposed bedrooms would be smaller than the NDSS minimum standards and would lead to a poor standard of living conditions for the present and future occupiers of the host dwelling.
- ❑ It is considered sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space would be retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play.

Conclusion

- ❑ It is considered that the proposed development would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of 27 and 29 Brookway as well as providing a poor standard of living conditions and unduly impacting on the amenity of present and future occupiers of the application dwelling. The proposal would therefore not be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Drainage

- ❑ As noted above, the whole of the application dwelling is located within a critical drainage area. Additionally, small proportions of the application dwelling are located within flood risk zone 2 and an area identified within the national surface water 1 in 30 risk of flooding.
- ❑ The proposed development would only minimally increase the footprint over the existing arrangement. As such it is considered that development would be acceptable in regards to drainage and flooding risk.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of the failure to comply with the minimum separation distances outlined in paragraph 4.1 of the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the proposed first floor window on the side elevation of the host dwelling and serving a bedroom, would result in a harmful loss of privacy for the occupants of 27 Brookway and 29 Brookway. The proposal therefore does not accord with 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.

2. By virtue of its design, siting and scale, the proposed part two storey, part single storey rear extension would result in a poor standard of amenity for the present and future occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of light and outlook to the existing habitable room identified as the kitchen/dining room. Additionally, the rooms identified as 'bedroom 4' and 'master bedroom' in the drawing 'proposed details' (drawing no: 24.3478.2B) would provide insufficient floor area for bedrooms and would not meet the minimum requirements set out in the 'Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard'. This would lead to a poor standard of living conditions for the present and future occupiers of the host dwelling. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11/02/2025	Signed: MM
Authorisation	17/02/2025	Signed: RK

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Site Location Plan.
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drawing no. 24.3478.3.
- Existing Details. Drawing no. 24.3478.1A.
- Proposed Details. Drawing no. 24.3478.2B.

Report Author Majid Mir