

|                            |                                                             |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | 22/01220/HOUS                                               |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 11 Eskdale Avenue Rochdale OL11 3JX                         |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Two storey rear & single storey side extensions to dwelling |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr Naeem Ahmed                                              |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Bob Melling                                                 |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>     | <b>Refuse</b>                                               |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>N</b> |

|                   |                                                                             |            |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>CONDITIONS</b> | <b>Pre-commencement conditions proposed?</b>                                | <b>N</b>   |
|                   | <b>Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?</b> | <b>N/A</b> |

**Location**

The application relates to no.11 Eskdale Avenue, a two storey semi-detached property located in a residential area in Castleton. The dwelling occupies a corner plot at the junction between Eskdale Avenue and Meadway and faces west onto the highway, adjoining to no.13 Eskdale Avenue to the south. The rear boundary of curtilage borders the side boundary of no.63 Meadway to the east. The property benefits from off road parking sited to the rear of the dwelling and a sufficiently sized rear and side garden.

**Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for a single storey side and two storey rear extension. The proposed side enlargement would project 3m from the side elevation and sit flush with the front and rear elevations of the original build. The side extension would have a maximum height of 4.31m and a height to eaves of 2.61m. The proposed rear extension would match the eaves height of the original build and would be set down from the existing ridgeline with a maximum height of 6.88m. It would sit flush with the north-facing side elevation and would be sited 1.6m from the boundary of no.13 Eskdale Avenue.

**Relevant History**

08/D50907

Use Of Land To Provide Extension To Private Garden  
Including Erection Of 0.9 Metre High Wall To Boundary With

Eskdale Avenue And 1.9 Metre High Fence To Boundary With Meadway.

Decision: **Grant subject to conditions.**

### **Township/Member comments**

Not applicable.

### **Consultee responses**

#### **Highways And Engineering**

The development site is directly on the junction of Meadway and Eskdale Avenue so we would have concerns regarding any additional on street parking created as a result of the development because of its potential impact on road safety.

The submitted plans indicate some parking provision for the existing property which is accessed from Meadway, we would support this application if the applicant can provide two viable off street car parking spaces with appropriate access arrangements as part of the development proposals. These spaces are required to meet Council parking standards for the size of the extended property to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on road safety and to maintain the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

We do not envisage any change in the servicing requirements for the extended dwelling.

### **Representations**

Letters of notifications were sent to the neighbouring properties, no representations were received relating to the proposed development.

### **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 19<sup>th</sup> 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

- Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires “*development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.*”
- Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all

new development must *“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.”*

- ② The application relates to a single storey side and two storey rear extension. The proposed development would be constructed in a material palette coherent with the original build and wider street scene. The proposed single storey side extension would incorporate a gable roof to match the existing roof form, whilst the two storey rear extension would incorporate a hipped roof form.
- ② Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that all new developments *“should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”* Whilst the proposed two storey rear extension would not occupy the full width of the original build and would be set lower than the existing ridge line, it would project 4m from the original build and increase the width of the original build by approx. 75 percent. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed enlargement would not be a subservient addition to the host property.
- ② This issue would be compounded by the wide ranging views of the extension afforded by its prominent position at the junction of Eskdale Avenue and Meadway. Furthermore, the subsequent erosion of space caused by the extension would also harm the overall character and appearance of the street scene.

#### Summary

- ② In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

#### Amenity: DM1 and SPD

##### *Overbearing and Overshadowing Impact and Privacy*

- ② DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not *“adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ② Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD outlines 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).”* Whilst the proposed two storey rear extension projects 4m beyond the rear elevation of no.13 Eskdale Avenue, the submitted plans indicate that the extension would be sited 1.6m from the boundary, ensuring it does not project beyond a 30 degree line. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the adjoining property.
- ② Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD documents the minimum spatial standards all new developments must comply with to ensure they do not result in a loss of light

or privacy to any neighbouring occupant. The proposed two storey rear extension would contain new fenestration on the rear elevation. The plans confirm that the new principal bedroom windows would measure approximately 8.55m to the opposing boundary of curtilage and would not comply with the 10.5m SPD standard. It is also noted that the new fenestration would measure approx. 11.06m to the side elevation of no.63 Meadway and would not accord with the 14m SPD requirement.

- ② The planning history for no.63 Meadway (83/D14965) only has details of the ground floor layout, which shows that the two ground floor windows serve a dining room. It is unclear as to what the two windows serve at a first floor level. However, given the size of the larger window at a first floor level and the planning history obtained for no.57 Meadway (81/D12119), it is considered likely that the window is a principal window to a habitable room. With this in mind it is considered that the proposed rear enlargement to the application property would provide insufficient separation between the development and no 63 Meadway, and this would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, contrary to the requirements of policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

#### *Occupier Amenity*

- ② The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

#### *Summary*

- ② In view of the above assessment, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of no.63 Meadway and would not be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

#### **Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5**

- ② Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'
- ② Whilst it is noted that the proposed development would not remove the off street parking space for one car to the rear of the property, it is considered that the proposed addition of two bedrooms combined with the limited on street parking available by the junction between Eskdale Avenue and Meadway would necessitate the provision of two off street parking spaces. Therefore, the proposal would not adhere to the requirements of Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS and it is considered that the failure to provide two spaces would result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, and would not be in accordance with the NPPF.

#### **Recommendation: Refuse**

1. By virtue of its size, scale and design, the proposed development would constitute poor design and would be an incongruous addition to the host

property. The extensions would dominate the original build and would have a prominence which would harmfully alter the character and appearance of the host property and wider 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, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its siting and proximity to no.63 Meadway, the proposed two storey rear extension would result in a detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring side elevation. As such, the proposal would not comply with the SPD spatial standards and would fail to adhere to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development will increase the number of bedrooms at the house from two bedrooms up to four bedrooms. The submitted plans do not show how an additional parking space could be accommodated within the curtilage to meet the Council's adopted standards, and would lead to an increase in on-street parking around the junction between Eskdale Avenue and Meadway, forcing pedestrians into potentially unsafe situations and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 'General development Requirements' of the Rochdale Core Strategy of 2016 as it fails to provide adequate parking to serve the development, to the detriment of highway safety.

#### **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.

#### **INFORMATIVE:**

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision is based on the following plans:

- Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations. Dated August 2022
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan
- Location Plan

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 03/11/2022  | Signed: BM     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 08/11/2022  | Signed: RC     |

Report Author Bob Melling