

Application Number:	23/01323/HOUS
Location:	8 Wood Top Avenue Rochdale OL11 4BD
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Darren Wilcock
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 30.01.2024	EXT OF TIME
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

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)?	N/A

Location

8 Wood Top Avenue is a two-storey semi-detached residence within the Bamford ward of Rochdale and on an estate of dwellings similar in character and scale. The pair of semis are constructed from red brick hosting both a hipped and mansard roof as well as a two-storey pitched roof fronted twin-gable element with bay windows.

The property adjoins to no.6 Wood Top Avenue and shares a common boundary with no.10 Wood Top Avenue to the south and 10 Winsford Drive to the east.

The property benefits from generous front and rear amenity space with additional amenity space to the side of the dwelling which currently hosts a driveway. There is a single storey attached lean-to extension to the south elevation, a pitched roof rear extension and a detached pitched roof outbuilding to the side and rear of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension flush with the existing ridge and front elevation and constructed in matching materials. The extension would project 2.7m from the south-facing side elevation at both ground and first floor level and be finished in matching materials and roof forms to the host dwelling.

Relevant History

06/D48390

Two storey side and single storey rear extension to dwelling
Granted January 2007

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. One letter of neutral representation was received

Neutral Representation

- ☐ Clarity on assumed boundary line is not that shown on the proposed plans but on the existing plan and various others

Officer Response The site plan on both the existing and proposed plans depict the same drawing

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

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF emphasizes that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Paragraph 53 of the National Design Guide outlines the importance of responding to existing local character and identity stating well-designed new development is influenced by an appreciation and understanding of vernacular, local or regional character, including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents whilst considering the composition of street scenes, individual buildings and their elements including but not limited to, the height, scale, massing and relationship between buildings.

The SPD outlines how new development can minimise presenting a “terracing effect” which occurs when two-storey or first floor side extensions extend up to main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage. Paragraph 5.11 states proposals that would create this sort of ‘terracing effect’, or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.

In avoiding any “terracing effect”, paragraph 5.12 sets out the following guidance for development that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary:

- ☐ The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house; OR
- ☐ The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house

Plans indicate the side extension would be flush with the front elevation of the main dwellinghouse and would host a separation distance of 0.7m from the common boundary shared with no. 10 Wood Top Avenue therefore not in accordance with the above guidelines.

It is acknowledged the adjacent property, no.10 does not currently host any extensions to the side elevation however, the SPD takes the approach the harm should be considered if neighbouring properties are to be extended in a similar way. In the instance of this application where the side extension extends close to the common boundary, if the adjacent property, no.10, were to extend at two storey to the side, the potential undue harm is considered to give rise to an unacceptable terracing effect by virtue of the separation distance between the dwellings and erosion of space between the dwellings which would alter the nature of a semi-detached property. However, under the assumption the adjacent property may never extend to the side of the dwelling, the development is still considered to present undue harm by the lack of subservience against the main dwellinghouse as well as the erosion of a distinct visual break between the dwellings therefore presenting harm to the nature of a semi-detached dwelling.

The character of the estate is relatively unique with a fairly traditional appeal to which many dwellings in this vicinity follow a cohesive material palette. The material palette of the extension along with the proposed roof forms would be in keeping with the facing materials of the host dwelling therefore no concerns are raised in this regard.

The street scene is comprised of similar dwelling types, both detached and semi-detached, many of which have been the subject of various development, most of which pre-date the current Core Strategy and NPPF. The development is considered to follow the existing consistent material palette however, when viewed in isolation, aforementioned above it is considered to present a degree of harm to the estate by virtue of the lack of subservience against the main dwellinghouse therefore not considered visually sympathetic to the form of the row of dwellings in this vicinity.

Wood Top Avenue hosts a relatively strong building line which the extension is not proposed to surpass therefore no concern is raised in this regard.

Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD sets out bin storage requirements and states “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 plans do not indicate the development would adhere to SPD guidance for bins to be stored at the rear of the property so to be out of public viewpoints. Should the application have been an approval, amendments would have been sought to demonstrate where the plot could accommodate adequate bin storage arrangements which would be in accordance with Appendix 1 of the SPD.

For reasons mentioned above, the proposed development would not be in accordance with policy DM1 of the core strategy, the SPD and NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the core strategy and the SPD which states they should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties as well as satisfy section 4 space standards.

The SPD does not explicitly set out guidance for side extensions in terms of their impacts to neighbouring occupiers however, a sensible view can be taken that the proposed development is not considered to present any undue harm to the amenity of surrounding occupiers. Where it is noted the development would extend close to the common boundary with no.10, the neighbouring plot is generous with its rear amenity space therefore although the extension may pose an overbearing impact to the side of no.10, it is currently in use as a driveway with sufficient amenity space to the rear therefore no concerns are raised in this regard.

The proposed principal window on the first floor of the extension at the rear is not considered to present any overlooking concerns to the rear neighbouring plot, no. 10 Winsford Drive by virtue of a 43m separation distance from the rear common boundary.

All windows on the extension are considered Section 4 compliant and all habitable rooms within both the existing dwellinghouse and extension would receive adequate light and outlook. The side elevation of the adjacent property hosts an obscurely glazed window which indicates this window does not host a habitable room therefore not of any concern.

The plot hosts generous amenity space to the front and rear which is to be retained post-development for the enjoyment of the 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

The development would increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling by one and would be constructed in place of part of the existing driveway however, the plot would retain part of the driveway to the front of the property which would facilitate sufficient on-site parking which would be in accordance with Appendix 5 Schedule of parking standards of the SPD.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. By virtue of its design, siting and scale, the proposed two-storey side extension is considered to give rise to an unacceptable terracing effect when constructed close to the common boundary. The development would not be subservient to the main dwellinghouse and would therefore present undue harm to the form of the semi-detached dwellings. As such, the proposal

would not accord with 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

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	26.01.2024	Signed: CP
Authorisation	30.01.2024	Signed: TH

Notes for the Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, the above decision relates to the following plans;

- 1603.04 Location Plan
- 1603.06 Proposed Site Plan
- 1603.03 Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo