

Application Number:	23/00944/HOUS
Location:	7 Greenwich Close Rochdale OL11 5JN
Proposal:	Single-storey side and rear extension - Retrospective
Applicant:	Mr M Muther
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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

7 Greenwich Close is a two-storey detached residential property located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale to which it benefits from substantial rear garden space, off-road parking and an attached garage. The property is sited between nos.5 and 9 Greenwich Close and the rear curtilage is bounded by substantially large vegetation which provides a degree of screening between the application property and no.49 Bamford Way to the rear.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a wraparound rear and side flat roof extension measuring approx. 4.7m from the rear elevation and approx. 3.5m from the south side elevation. The extension is built up against the common boundary shared with no.9 as well as both the existing rear conservatory and previously approved single storey side extension and hosts a gym and store.

Relevant History

15/01370/HOUS Two storey side extension and single storey side extension
Granted January 2016

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties in relation to this application to which one letter of objection was received.

Objection Letter

- Disregarding of excess materials into neighbouring properties
- Gutters of extensions encroaching over neighbouring properties
- Dismantling neighbour's driveway

Officer Response The above concerns are civil matters and should be resolved between the applicants and neighbours through the appropriate channels

- Loss of light to neighbouring windows

Officer Response Any impact to neighbouring properties are assessed in the 'Amenity' section of the report

- Concern surrounding 'illegal construction' and Council accepting an application after development has taken place

Officer Response The application is marked as retrospective and a site visit has been undertaken to assess the development. An attempt to regularize an already constructed development is accepted by the Council in any case

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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states "Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities". Further to this policy DM1 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they *(a) are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area;*

The proposed development is not considered to be built compatible with the existing dwelling by virtue of its overall design and scale. Whilst the plot can be considered generously large in its overall scale, the siting of the extension, including the wraparound element would be over half the width of the existing dwelling (including elements previously approved) to which, when viewed

from the rear, appears as a disproportionately large addition in conjunction to the existing house and would therefore not be subservient to it.

The siting of the extension is not considered to impact upon the existing streetscene or pose significant visual harm when viewed from the front elevation. Further to this, the dwelling lies within a cul-de-sac with the only through access being to 49 Bamford Way off a small side road. This together with substantial vegetation running along the rear boundary does not give rise to any concerns regarding visibility of the extension. However, the property is detached therefore affords excess amenity space around the dwelling. Previously approved permission granted the existing side extension to which it retained a small space between the side elevation of the extension and the common boundary shared with no.9. With the extension being built off this side extension and along the common boundary, the visual break between the two properties becomes void therefore appears discordant to the detached nature of these properties therefore compromising the form.

As existing, the roof form of the dwelling incorporates both pitched and hipped roof forms therefore to build an incongruously large extension with a flat roof raises concern to the overall form of the dwelling and would vastly compromise the visual amenity of the existing house.

The proposed materiality of the extension would significantly contrast that on the existing build with large white UPVC window frames to which the existing build features grey UPVC, as well as a grey brick buff wall along the common boundary whereas the original house is constructed in red brick. The material palette is not considered acceptable in this regard.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF by virtue of its overall design, scale and materiality.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy to which it states that new development is expected to demonstrate that it is “compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users”

The SPD states house extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. Paragraph 5.6 sets out the following guidance for single storey rear extensions;

For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

When measured along the common boundary, the rear portion of the extension does not extend beyond a point 4m of the neighbouring dwelling close to the boundary, no.9, therefore acceptable in this regard. It is acknowledged the extension will be constructed up to the common boundary which may pose a slight overbearing impact to the occupiers at no.9 as a result of the variation in ground levels, however, given there is already a large fence between both properties and no.9 hosts substantially large garden space away from the boundary, the additional impact is not considered to be so severe that it would warrant an additional reason for refusal.

It is noted the adjacent property, no.9 hosts a ground floor window on the side elevation facing no.7 to which it hosts a kitchen. The window as existing, does not receive much light by virtue of its siting therefore given this room hosts a second window to the rear which is where most light would be received, the impact of the extension close to the boundary is not considered to pose any additional or detrimental loss of light to this window.

There is not considered to be any additional amenity concerns to the neighbours to the rear and north-west by virtue of sufficient separation distances away from the extension.

Post development, all habitable rooms are to receive a sufficient degree of adequate light and outlook. The room contained within the extension itself, labelled as a store/gym, is to receive light through the provision of large sliding doors to the side and rear. The existing dining room is to suffer a minor loss of light with the extension being built around the existing rear window however, the conservatory is relatively open-plan therefore it is considered much of the light would pass through to the dining room at the rear. Further to this, the dining room hosts a window to the front elevation.

The plot is of substantial size in comparison to the extension therefore post-development, a large portion of the garden will be retained for the enjoyment of the occupiers.

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

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, scale, siting and materiality, the retrospective extension has not been constructed sympathetic to the existing dwelling and would have an unacceptable impact upon the built form and existing visual amenity. The extension would be discordant to the character of the existing building and appear as a disproportionate and incongruous addition. 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	12.10.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	18.10.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for the Applicant

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

- Location Plan
- 2038/3 Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Site Plan
- 2038/4 Proposed Elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo