APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01271/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01271/HOUS
Location:	35 Walsingham Avenue Middleton M24 1SR
Proposal:	FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION
Applicant:	MR THOMAS SEFA-SARPONG
Case Officer:	Emily Sykes
Recommendation:	**Refuse**

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.35 Walsingham Avenue, a detached two-storey dwelling located in the defined urban area. The dwelling is located in a corner plot form by the road junction with Brackley Drive and is open plan in nature to its front (west) and side (north) elevations with a detached garage standing adjacent to its southern elevation to which a single-storey extension has been added. The property to the eastern side of the plot (no.2 Brackley Drive) is set forward of the application house by approximately 1.9m and shares the common boundary with the rear boundary of curtilage. No.37 Walsingham Avenue is situated adjacent to the applicant property to the south-west and is set forward approximately 3.9m from the front wall of the applicant dwelling.

Description of Proposal

The proposed development is the re-submission of that proposed under planning application 15/00584/HOUS. The application proposes a first floor side extension above the existing single-storey side extension. The proposed enlargement sits flush with the front and rear wall of the host dwelling and is constructed with a partially hipped roof to match the style of the roof on the existing dwelling. The proposed development will be constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling, with a window on the first floor front elevation and one on the first floor south-west side elevation.

Relevant History

97/D34608 – Detached Private Garage – **Granted Subject to Conditions**

03/D42307 – Single Storey Rear Extension to Dwelling – **Granted Subject to Conditions**

15/00231/HOUS – Single Storey side extension – **Refused**

Reason for refusal:

1. *The application relates to a detached, two storey dwellinghouse occupying a prominent corner plot at the junction of Walsingham Avenue and Brackley Drive, Middleton. A strong building line extends around the front and side of the property and continues along the road, maintaining a spacious, open aspect to the street scene which is accentuated by the open plan nature of garden areas to properties within the estate. The area of open garden space to the north side of the application property makes a significant contribution to visual amenity in a prominent position adjacent to the road junction. The proposed extension would encroach into this garden area and by virtue of its size, siting and close proximity to the adjacent highway, would result in the introduction of an obtrusive and incongruous feature at this prominent corner location. The proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the street scene by detracting from the spacious, open aspect of the junction and would set an undesirable precedent for future development in the locality. The development is of a poor design which would fail to improve the character and quality of the area and is therefore contrary to the requirements of Unitary Development Plan Policies BE/2 (Design Criteria for New Development) and H/11 (Residential Extensions), the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

15/00584/HOUS – First Floor Side Extension – **Refused**

Reason for refusal:

1. *The proposal, by virtue of the size, scale, height, massing and projection of the extension and its proximity to the side and rear boundaries, would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent occupiers due to its overbearing impact and overshadowing. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy H/11 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding neighbours and no representations were received.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Within the Council's adopted Core Strategy, policies DM1 and P3 require that development proposals demonstrate high quality design which take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area. This is supported in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in paragraphs 124 and 127 which advise that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD advises that house extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. The proposed development is constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling with an appropriately located pitched roof. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in its scale and massing, with in keeping fenestration to that on the host dwelling. The design of the proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the design language of both the host dwelling and surrounding local area.

Access between the front and rear of the dwelling is retained, meaning that it is possible for bins to be stored at the rear of the dwelling and out of public viewpoint.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy states that all development proposals must not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. This is supported through Paragraph 5.5 of the SPD which advises that it is important that extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupants.

Paragraph 5.14 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings. It notes that 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. The impact of the proposed development on the surrounding neighbouring occupiers will be assessed within this section.

Paragraph 4.1 outlines space standards which new residential development must follow. The following minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties:

(i) 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;
(ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
(iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

The proposed development is not in accordance with the above guidance on its south-east side elevation, relating to the dwelling at no.37 Walsingham Avenue. The proposed development results in the proposed bedroom window on the first floor side elevation being approximately 8.2m away from the glazed window found on the side elevation at no.37, hence not meeting the above listed standards which state there must be 14m between a principal window and a directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window. Furthermore, this proposed principal window is sited approximately 6.6m from the common boundary of curtilage with no.37, being situated approximately 3.9m too close as per the guidelines in section 4.1(i) of the SPD.

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed first storey side extension acts as a two storey rear extension in relation to no.2 Brackley Drive due to the dwellings' positioning. Paragraph 5.9 outlines the standards which this must follow in order to not have a great impact on the neighbouring occupiers' enjoyment of their garden. It is considered that first floor rear extensions can cause the oppressiveness of a two-storey wall close to the common boundary.

Paragraph 5.9 states "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". As the proposed development exceeds these standards in relation to no.2 Brackley Drive, it is considered that it would result in a loss of amenity to the adjacent occupiers due to the overbearing impact of the proposed enlargement and the resultant overshadowing.

By virtue of the adequate supply of natural light to all habitable rooms and the retention of a suitably sized outdoor amenity space with a functional layout, it is considered that the proposal would promote a satisfactory standard of living for all existing and future occupiers.

However, overall it is considered that the proposal would unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposal, by virtue of the size, scale, height, massing and projection of the extension and its proximity to the side and rear boundaries, would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent occupiers due to its overbearing impact and overshadowing. The application therefore fails to accord with the policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD 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.

INFORMATIVE:
For the avoidance of doubt, this decision is based on the following plans:
- Location Plan
- Block Plan
- 20/1033

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	11/12/2020	Signed: E.Sykes
Authorisation	14/12/2020	Signed: KN

Report Author Emily Sykes