

Application Number:	23/00900/HOUS
Location:	43 Heights Avenue Rochdale OL12 6JL
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension including partial demolition of existing raised platform
Applicant:	Rejimol Rakhesh
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	YES

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	YES

Location

The application relates to 43 Heights Avenue, a two-storey, detached converted bungalow at the foot of a cul-de-sac. The surrounding streets comprise similar bungalows/converted bungalows of low density with an abundance of trees and garden space.

The property faces north and overlooks a public highway. The adjacent property to the west is 45 Heights Avenue, which due to the topography of the land is lower than the host dwelling. The neighbouring property, 41 Heights Avenue is located 90 degrees to the north-east of the host property. To the south, the curtilage borders the rear access to the host property and its neighbours, beyond which is 'The Coach House' on Falinge Road.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension following the partial demolition of a raised platform. Included are a single door and two double windows to the rear elevation.

The extension measures approx. 7.9m in width and 3m in depth. The height to eaves measures approx. 3.3m and the maximum height approx. 3.6m.

External materials include brick, tiles and UPVC windows and doors to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 07/09/2023.

One objection was raised in relation to potential impact of the proposal on sunlight and daylight which would be exacerbated as no 43 Heights Avenue is described by the objection at 1.4m higher than their property.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P1, P3 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

In view of the above, the proposed extension is considered to be appropriate and complementary to the host dwelling and surrounding properties.

- The proposal follows a uniform and simple design which integrates well with the host property.
- The use of matching external materials will further help integration with the host property.
- The size and spacing of the fenestration prevents the continuous massing of brick and ensures that the rear elevation reads well with the host dwelling.
- The modest size and scale of the extension guarantees subservience in relation to the host dwelling, and will not be visually overbearing.
- The design, materials, and scale are sympathetic to the landscape and character of the setting.

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

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. 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 SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.'

The neighbour at No 45 has raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on exposure to sunlight and daylight. The concerns of the objector, are considered material considerations in the determination of this application. Specifically, they raise concern that the extension will block sunlight serving their east facing lounge window.

In relation to the objection raised, section 5.5 of the SPD asks "that single storey (rear) extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers". As such, maximum space standards are set out under paragraph 5.6 which prevent single storey rear extensions from detached

properties extending further than a point 4 metres along the common boundary with the neighbouring property, measured from the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling. Under this application, the proposed extension would project approx. 0.8m beyond the rear elevation of no.45. In addition, no 45 has a single-storey flat roofed garage along the common boundary with the host property which extends approx. 2.5m beyond the proposed extension. In both instances the proposed development complies with the SPD and is therefore considered to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

It is recognised that owing to the topography of the land, the applicant property sits higher than no. 45. However, it is not anticipated that this will result in the proposed development preventing no 45's exposure to sunlight to an unacceptable degree. Potential overshadowing towards no 45's east facing lounge window, as a result of the development, is unlikely to be anymore impactful than that caused by the neighbour's garage, particularly because the windows sits below the eaves line of the garage. No 45's lounge window is predominantly obscured by their garage, and whilst the proposed development might further reduce exposure to sunlight, it is not considered impactful enough to warrant refusal. Furthermore, both the host and objector's properties have south-facing rear gardens, therefore both receive an optimal amount of sunlight to the rear. As such, the proposed development is likely to have minimal impact on the neighbour's overall exposure to sunlight to the rear of their property.

Lastly, under the proposed plans a sufficient, albeit modest amount of private rear garden space would be remained to meet the needs of existing and future occupiers.

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

As the extension is at the rear of the property, there will be no impact on highways or parking. 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Location plan
- Proposed elevations, floor plans and site plan A 1457/2
- Existing floor plan, elevations and site plan A 1457/1

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 saved

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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.

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	05/10/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	31/01/2023	Signed: M Lewis

Report Author Hamish Rigg