

Application Number:	22/01459/HOUS
Location:	11 Eskdale Avenue Rochdale OL11 3JX
Proposal:	Part two-storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey side extension and insertion of new window to first floor side elevation (resubmission of 22/01220/HOUS)
Applicant:	Mr Naeem Ahmed
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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

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 a part-single, part-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 part-single, part-two storey 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. It would project 4m from the existing rear elevation at a ground floor level and 3.4m at a first floor level, with a small, lean-to pitched roof at a ground floor level.

The proposals also includes the insertion of a new window to the first floor side elevation to serve an existing bathroom. The plans also identify the provision of two off-street parking spaces to the rear of the dwelling.

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**

22/01220/HOUS Two storey rear & single storey side extensions to dwelling

Decision: **Refuse**

Reasons for refusal:

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.*

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The only issue Highways raised for a similar application for this property was parking provision. The submitted plans indicate that two off street parking spaces will be provided as part of the development proposals which is acceptable.

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

We do not envisage that there would be a detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the development.

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

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 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 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.”*

- ☐ The application relates to a single storey side and part-single, part-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 with a similar pitch to the existing roof.
- ☐ 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.*” 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. Concerns were raised under the previous application regarding the 4m rearward projection from the original build at both levels. Given that the current proposals would set back the rear extension 0.6m at a first floor level, it is considered that excessive bulk previously proposed has been removed and the rear enlargement would appear more proportionate in relation to the host dwelling. The rear extension would as such no longer appear overly prominent on the site and would satisfy the scale and design concerns raised under the previous application. It is therefore considered that the proposed rear extension would be an appropriately designed extension that would result in no undue harm to the visual amenities of the property and surrounding area.
- ☐ In respect of the single storey extension, it is considered that this would be proportionate to the scale of the host property and appear as an acceptable side addition to the property and sit comfortably on the prominent corner plot location. The additional first floor side elevation window would also result in no undue harm to the visual amenities of the property and surrounding area.

Summary

- ☐ In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and would accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Overbearing and Overshadowing Impact and Privacy

- ☐ 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.*”
- ☐ 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 3.4m 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 5.6 of the SPD states, *“for attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”* Paragraph 5.7 adds, *“If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary.”* The part-single storey rear extension would project 4m from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling. However, the extension is set 1.6m from the common boundary and would comply with the standards set out in the SPD. Therefore, it is not considered that the part-single storey rear extension would result in an undue overbearing or overshadowing impact on the neighbouring amenity.
- 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 privacy to any neighbouring occupants. The proposed rear extension would contain a bedroom window on the north-facing side elevation. The plans confirm that the new principal bedroom window would measure approximately 6m to the opposing boundary of curtilage and would not comply with the 10.5m SPD standard. However, given that this window is adjacent to a public highway and that the facing side elevation of no.9 Eskdale Avenue measures approximately 21m away, it is not considered that this window would result in an undue loss of privacy to no.9. Similarly, a new bathroom window is proposed in the existing first floor side elevation and this would have a similar relationship with surrounding occupiers as the aforementioned bedroom window, resulting in no undue loss of amenity for surrounding residents.
- ② The plans confirm the addition of a first floor en-suite window to the rear elevation of the proposed rear enlargement. This window would measure approximately 9m to the opposing boundary of curtilage and 12m to the side elevation of no.63 Meadway. Given that these distances would fall short of the requirements of section 4.1 of the SPD, a condition has been applied to ensure that the window in the first floor on the rear elevation facing no. 63 Meadway is fitted with obscure glazing and retained thereafter.
- ② The proposed patio doors to the part-single storey rear extension would act as the principal source of light to the lounge area and would measure approximately 11m to the two storey side elevation of no.63 Meadway. This would not comply with the 14m separation distance required by Section 4.1 of the SPD. Given the presence of a solid boundary fence of approximately 2m in height and that there would not be a direct line of site into the large upper floor window of no.63, it is considered that the fenestration to the extensions would not result in an undue loss of privacy.

Occupier Amenity

- ☐ 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

- ☐ In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and would be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements would increase the parking available at the property to two off-street car parking spaces and would therefore adhere to appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS.

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. The permission relates to the following plans:

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

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 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.

4. Notwithstanding the obscure glazing shown on the drawing 'Proposed Plans and Elevations' dated August 2022, prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the window in the first floor on the rear elevation facing 63 Meadway shall be fitted with a textured glass with an obscuration level of no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent), and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy 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	09/12/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	05/01/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling