APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01343/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01343/HOUS
Location:	13 Hartford Avenue Heywood OL10 4XH
Proposal:	Two storey side extension following demolition of existing side conservatory
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Greenwood
Case Officer:	Richard Whittaker
Recommendation:	**Grant subject to conditions**

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**

Background

This application proposes a scheme similar to those set out in refused cases 18/00422/HOUS and 17/01302/HOUS. These previous schemes proposed two-storey side extensions which projected 4 metres from the existing side elevation.

Location

The application relates to 13 Hartford Avenue Heywood OL10 4XH, a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the northern side of Heady Hill in Heywood. The property is situated within a residential area which predominantly exhibits semi-detached dwellings which feature brick or render clad finishes.

The application property is located on a corner plot at the convergence of Hartford Avenue and Hartford Close with the principle elevation of the dwelling fronting Hartford Close. The dwelling itself features an existing flat roofed porch to the front and an existing conservatory projection from the side elevation fronting Hartford Avenue.

The application property features an unattached garage for parking to the rear of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory to the side and the subsequent erection of a two storey side extension in its place allowing for the formation of a dining room and third bedroom.

The proposed extension would project 3.6 metres from the existing side elevation with a depth of 6.3 metres. The side extension would be set 2.2 metres back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling and would be flush with the existing rear elevation.

The proposed extension would feature a pitched roof continuing the theme of the existing building. The ridge of the proposed extension would be set down from that of the original building reaching a total height of 6.5 metres with a height to eaves of 4.6 metres.

Relevant History

07/D49792 – Conservatory Extension To Side Of Dwelling (Retrospective) – Approval 24.10.2007

17/01302/HOUS – Two storey side and single storey rear extension and erection of 2m high boundary wall following the demolition of the existing conservatory and removal of the timber boundary fence – Refusal 21.12.2017

Reason for refusal –

> *The proposed two storey side extension would be incompatible with its surroundings in terms of scale, massing, layout and design and would result in a significantly incongruous and harmful form of development on this corner plot that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of both the host dwellinghouse and the street scene. Therefore the application is contrary to the relevant parts of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

18/00422/HOUS - Two storey side and single storey rear extension and erection of 1.8m high boundary fence following the demolition of the existing conservatory and removal of the existing boundary fence - Resubmission of 17/01302/HOUS – Refused 05.06.2018

Reason for refusal –

> *The proposed two storey side extension would be incompatible with its surroundings in terms of scale, massing, layout and design and would result in a significantly incongruous and harmful form of development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of both the host dwellinghouse and the street scene. Therefore the application is contrary to the relevant parts of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework..*

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties. No letters of representation have been received.

Consultations

N/A

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1, P3, SPD

The Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' contains advice in respect of extensions to properties on corner plots, the SPD States:

Extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension.

Factors that will be taken into account when determining what constitutes 'sufficient space' include the presence of a strong building line and any overriding need to protect it, the proximity of neighbouring buildings, and the space surrounding other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site and the contribution this space makes to the overall character of the street scene.

Whilst it is noted that the proposed extension has been reduced in projection from the side elevation by 0.4 metres from the previous two proposals, the side elevation of the existing dwelling currently contributes to a strong building line shared with the front and side elevations of the odd numbered dwellings along Hartford Avenue. The proposed two storey side extension would project beyond this building line, contrary to the requirements of the SPD.

It is acknowledged that the existing conservatory at the application dwelling and the single storey side extension of the similarly situated No. 15 Hartford Avenue breach this building line at present, but it is noted that these features are single storey and as such do not dominate and their impact on the street scene is less pronounced than would be the case with a two storey extension.

Whilst it is noted that the side projection is reduced from that of the two previous applications, the proposed works would still result in a narrow strip remaining alongside the proposed two storey side extension providing a hard edge to the public highway which is considered to be unacceptable in this location.

Whilst it is noted that the side projection is reduced from that of the two previous applications, the proposed two storey side extension would amount to a substantial addition to the dwelling and would not considered to be a subservient and proportionate addition. As a result the scale of the proposed extension would be out of character with this type of dwelling and the surrounding properties.

As with the previous proposal it is noted that an attempt has been made to denote the subservience of the proposed extension by means of lowering the ridge height and setting back the front elevation behind the existing, but the significant and disproportionate width serves to undermine this effect.

The blank two storey side elevation immediately adjacent to the highway would be an incongruous feature in this suburban setting characterised by the presence of garden areas lining the street.

Therefore, in light of the above assessment, the proposal is not considered to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance by reason of the scale, massing, positioning and design of the two storey side extension. As such the proposal would have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene and the application stands contrary to the relevant parts of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning Document ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1, SPD

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all developments should demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

With the proposed bedroom window being set to the rear a distance of 25 metres between the application dwelling and the nearest elevation of its rear neighbour (no.15 Hartford Avenue) the proposed works are acceptable with regard to the guidance set out in the SPD.

With regard to adjacent neighbour no.24 Hartford Avenue, a distance of 20 metres would be retained which would be acceptable in terms of the SPD.

The front elevation of the proposed extension would be set at a distance of 25 metres away from adjacent neighbour no.11 Hartford Avenue. This accord with the guidance set out in the SPD.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the application property or that of neighbouring properties and is therefore in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons

1. The proposed two storey side extension would be incompatible with its surroundings in terms of scale, massing, layout and design and would result in a significantly incongruous and harmful form of development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of both the host dwellinghouse and the street scene. Therefore the application is contrary to the relevant parts of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 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.

Informatives

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-
- Location Plan – Drawing No. 2020_10_01_00
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 2020_10_01 - 01
- Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 2020_10_01 - 02
- Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 2020_10_01 - 03
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 2020_10_01 - 04
- Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 2020_10_01 - 05
- Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 5 – 2020_10_01 - 06

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	21.01.2021	Signed: RW
Authorisation	21.01.2021	Signed:AT

Report Author Richard Whittaker