

Application Number:	24/00127/HOUS
Location:	20 Phyllis Street Rochdale OL12 7NA
Proposal:	Part two storey / part single storey side and rear extension p forming rear link extension to existing detached garage and conversion of garage into habitable room
Applicant:	Leigh O'reilly
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 16.04.2024	EXT OF TIME 26.04.2024
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?	NO

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

22 Phyllis Street is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located north of Edenfield Road in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale. The property adjoins to no.18 Phyllis Street and sits adjacent to a large detached property, no.22 Phyllis Street, to the north.

The dwelling currently benefits from on-site parking, generous amenity space and a detached outbuilding currently in use as a garage

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension with a floor layout parallel to the siting of the northern curtilage boundary constructed with a hipped roof and matching materials. The extension is to project 3m from the north side elevation and form an overall length of 15m inclusive of the detached rear garage link extension.

Relevant History

18/00767/HOUS First floor side extension
Granted August 2018

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Without 5.5m in length the driveway is unviable and we object to the loss of off street parking.

Without the removal of the gates the driveway is unviable and gates will be opened onto the highway and as such will cause an obstruction of the highway.

If there remains 5.5m length of drive and 3m width along with gates either removed or replaced with a sliding gate we would have no objection to the proposals.

Note: Following receipt of amended plans which were sent to the Highways department for further review, the below comments were received:

I can confirm the proposals are acceptable.

Thank you,

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted. No public comments were received at the time of writing

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone JDP (PfE) 2024:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

Amendments were sought to ensure the plans accurately reflected that being proposed. The amended plans also solved two issues in relation to the concern of the existing gate posing highways safety issues and the initially proposed bedroom located in the existing garage posing overlooking concerns.

Assessment

Design: JP-P1, DM1 and P3

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and development that is not well designed should be refused.

Paragraph 66 of the National Design Guide states built form is determined by good urban design principles that combine layout, form and scale in a way that responds positively to the context.

With reference to the current precedents within the street scene, it is noted two storey side extensions are relatively common, albeit most of which were granted prior to the adoption of the most recent Core Strategy and Places for Everyone DPD's. The principle of extending at two storey level to the side of the property raises no concern.

With regards to the scale and siting of the proposed development, the unorthodox siting of the extension to form a link rear extension with the existing detached garage is not considered to be of high quality design, particularly where the siting runs parallel to the northern curtilage boundary which therefore puts further emphasis on the scale of the development. The incongruous nature of the scheme would arise from the design and siting of the proposal, however, regard is given to the surrounding context, that of which may give further rise to harm in design terms, particularly the design of the adjacent dwelling, no.22 Phyllis Street which gained approval in 1981. The adjacent property is unorthodox and flamboyant in its overall nature with reference to the overall shape, scale and siting of various elements within the plot, however, where it is sited close to the common boundary at one and a half storey height, an extension at no.20 is likely to give rise to concerns arising from the loss of space around the dwelling and would not make sensible use of the space within the plot, particularly in such proximity to the side elevation of the adjacent property which sits close to the common boundary. Whilst this may not be in direct relation to any terracing concerns, an extension of the siting of that proposed is not considered to respect the visual amenity of the dwelling and would create an odd relationship between both dwellings and would pose harm to the overall street scene.

The link extension to the rear is not preferable given the resulted works would be an overall length of 16m blank elevation along the boundary, inclusive of the existing garage. Concern is raised to this aspect of the development given it would be readily visible from public vantage points therefore the incongruous nature of the link extension is not considered to be acceptable in terms of high quality design expectations and would therefore appear discordant to the nature of a semi-detached dwelling and street scene.

Where policy sets out design expectations for two storey side extensions, regard is given to the surrounding context and the host property therefore where there may be scope for a two storey side extension in this location, mirroring the parallel boundary line is not considered acceptable in achieving a high standard of development.

The materiality of the proposal would respect the visual amenity of the host dwelling and would be constructed in matching materials and roof forms present on the existing dwelling.

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, the PfE and the NPPF as the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development close to the common boundary with no.22 and would therefore result in erosion of the separation distance between the two properties therefore undermining the nature of the host property and wider street scene.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy to which it states "All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings" and "proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties".

The property hosts two rear elevations, the elevation along the southern boundary projecting 1.1m forward of that close to the northern boundary. Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD sets out guidance for two-storey extensions to the rear and is therefore relevant:

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)

Submitted plans indicate the proposed development would be in accordance with the above guideline in relation to the adjacent property, no.22 Phyllis Street. There is not considered to be any concern to the adjoining neighbour, no.18, in terms of overbearing impact by virtue of its proximity away from the boundary.

Section 4 sets out minimum separation distances for principal windows which the development is considered to be constructed in accordance with. The adjacent property, no.22, hosts a secondary window to the first floor south side elevation which would host a separation distance of approx. 1.4m from the side elevation of the extension. Given this window is not the principal window of this habitable room, there is no concern raised in this regard. In addition, no amenity concerns are raised to the properties to both the front and rear.

The initial plans indicated the existing garage to the rear of the property to host a bedroom, following receipt of amendments this was changed to a playroom. In the interest of any avoidance of harm arising from a window in this location which would directly face the rear amenity space of no.18 at a separation distance of 7m and the siting of the window higher than the adjacent boundary fence, in the event of an approval, it would have been necessary to impose a condition requiring for this room to not be used a habitable room to avoid any imposing or overlooking concerns.

Post development, occupier amenity is considered sufficient where habitable rooms would receive adequate light and outlook. A functional private garden space would also be retained to the rear of the dwelling 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

In assessing the acceptability of the proposed development in reference to impact to the highway and existing serving arrangements, the Council's highway department were consulted and raise no objection to the scheme upon review of amended plans which sought to solve an issue raised in the initial consultation response.

The development would be in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy and would retain off-street parking for a maximum of two spaces as per the existing arrangement.

No concerns are to be pedestrian or highways safety. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

- 1. By virtue of its design, siting and scale, the proposed development would present an incongruous layout which is considered to negatively impact upon the existing street scene. The proposal would not be constructed visually sympathetic to the host dwelling or take into account the scale and siting of surrounding properties. 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	23.04.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	26.04.2024	Signed:TH

Notes for the Applicant:

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

- Location Plan
- 2088/2 Proposed Site Plans and Elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo