APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01101/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01101/HOUS
Location:	6 Cotaline Close Rochdale OL11 3PH
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr. Tabriz Tahir
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**

Location

The application relates to 6 Cotaline Close, a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in architecturally similar estate in Middleton. This property is west facing, with No.4 Cotaline Close located to the north and No.8 Cotaline Close located to the south.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. This will be constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling and will have a set of double windows on the ground and first floor at both the front and rear elevation of the property.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Neighbouring occupiers were notified but 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 developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions must ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history. The host dwelling forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which are in keeping with the street scene throughout the estate, with the vast majority of dwellings on Cotaline Close being of the same built form. The proposed fenestration and materials to be used in the construction of the enlargement are acceptable in scale, size and appearance. The gable roof of the side extension is appropriately located and in keeping with both the host dwelling and other surrounding dwellings. The flat roof of the rear extension is not in keeping but would not be visible from the street.

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. Whilst the side extension will be widely visible from public viewpoints, it is set back from the front wall of the dwelling by 1.2m, making it subservient and meaning terracing is avoided as per paragraph 5.12 of the SPD.

The proposed development spans across the curtilage meeting the boundary with No.4 to the north of the property. Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states that bins should be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating the street scene, which would not be possible due to this development. However, many of the surrounding dwellings store their bins to the front of their properties, meaning this would not be unacceptable in this instance.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and is in accordance 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.

Paragraph 5.5 of the SPD advises that it is important that extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupants. The maximum standard that applies for single storey extensions for attached properties is a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear of the adjoining or adjacent property. For this reason, the proposed enlargement would not have undue impact on No.8 Cotaline Close, which has a rear extension which extends approximately 4m from the rear of the existing dwellinghouse at No.6 Cotaline Close. However, as the dwellings are staggered within their arrangement in Cotaline Close, the proposed development would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent dwelling at No.4 Cotaline Close, due to the two storey enlargement running alongside the garden of this dwellinghouse.

No.6 Cotaline Close is set back by 7m from the adjacent dwelling at No.4 Cotaline Close. The proposed enlargement will extend approximately 6.5m from the rear wall of No.4, running adjacent to the boundary of No.4 with 4m of this consisting of the two storey side extension and 2.5m of this being the single storey rear extension. Paragraph 5.8 of the SPD states that two storey rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbouring occupiers than single storey extensions, particularly on their enjoyment of their garden. The proposed enlargement would offer an oppressive two-storey wall less than 1m from the boundary of No.4 which leaves the garden with only 1m of the boundary not facing the proposed blank wall.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states that planning permission is not normally granted for two storey extensions that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjacent property. Whilst it is important to consider the staggered nature of the dwellings, the two storey enlargement projects past the 30 degree line drawn from 2.4m from No.4 Cotaline Close and therefore is considered to result in an overbearing impact to this dwellinghouse.

The location of windows on the front and rear of the proposed development mean that there is no undue loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers, as no dwellinghouses meet the boundary at the rear of No.6 Cotaline Close. However, the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the windows at neighbouring properties must be considered.

No.4 Cotaline Close has principal windows to the south of the rear wall which are within close proximity to the boundary which the proposal runs adjacent to. The proposed two storey enlargement would result in these habitable rooms in the adjacent property being overshadowed and having an undue loss of light.

Therefore, the extension would be considered to result in an overbearing impact which would cause undue loss of light to this neighbouring property and its garden. The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of No.4 Cotaline Close in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two-storey side and single-storey rear extension would have an undue overbearing impact and result in loss of light and outlook to the rear windows and garden at No.4 Cotaline Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines & 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:

- Existing and Proposed Plans (1639/1, 1639/2, 1639/3)

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	12 October 2020	Signed: Emily Sykes
Authorisation	23 October 2020	Signed: Alison Truman

Report Author Emily Sykes