

Application Number:	23/01109/HOUS
Location:	1 Fenwick Drive, Middleton, M24 4SN
Proposal:	Single-storey side and rear extension and alteration to existing boundary wall facing from Lowther Crescent
Applicant:	Mr N. Saranut
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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

This application relates to no. 1 Fenwick Drive, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the corner where Fenwick Drive meets Lowther Crescent in Middleton. The property faces the highway to the north, is adjoined by no. 3 Fenwick Drive to the west and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders no. 13a Lowther Crescent to the south. The host dwelling benefits from a modest wraparound curtilage, with a front and side garden area which is enclosed by a low-level brick wall and a rear garden enclosed by a 1.8m high fence set in approximately 3m from the rear of the footway fronting Lowther Crescent. It also benefits from two off-street parking spaces to the front/side and an original two-storey outrigger to the rear with a depth of approx. 2.77m.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey side and rear wraparound extension which would project 3.26m from the existing side elevation and 2.7m from the existing rear elevation. It would have a part pitched, part flat roof with a brick upstand against the boundary with the neighbouring property. The extension would have a maximum height of approx. 3.97m and a height to eaves of approx. 2.84m.

The plans also include alterations to the existing boundary wall facing Lowther Crescent. The existing brick piers would be built up to a height of 2m and infill timber fence panels are proposed. The submitted site plan indicates that the proposed

boundary treatment would span most of the length of the side boundary, finishing at the point where the boundary begins to curve onto Fenwick Drive.

Materials for construction are proposed to match existing.

Relevant History

05/D45075 Erection Of 1.8M High Fence And 0.6M To 1M High Perimeter Railings (Resubmission -D43850)
Refuse

04/D43850 Erection Of 1.3M-1.8M High Boundary Fence
Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

It is unclear from the submitted plans if development proposals include two viable off street parking spaces which would be required to meet Council standards. If the applicant can demonstrate that parking can be provided in line with Council standards Highways would raise no objection on this issue.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

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

Subject to the required parking provision, Highways would raise no objection to this application and we request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response 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

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring that development is “*sympathetic to local character.*” Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states, “*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.*”

Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*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.*” In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”

The proposed side and rear extension would be of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed roof design and pitch would be appropriate and the proposed materials would complement those used externally on the existing building. In addition, the window proportions would not detract from the character of the host dwelling.

Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states “*residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid dominating residential streets.*” The proposed extension would remove the space currently used for bin storage. However, given that the garage would not be capable of accommodating a parked vehicle due to its internal dimensions, it would be able to serve as a storage area for bins out of view of the street in accordance with the SPD.

Therefore, by virtue of its materials, scale and design, it is considered that the proposed extension would be compatible with the character of the existing dwelling and would not harm the appearance of the street scene.

The proposed boundary treatment would be considerably larger in scale than the existing low level wall. Given the open aspect of Lowther Crescent, it is considered that anything greater than a low level wall would likely be visually intrusive. Furthermore, as the land is at the end of a run of open front gardens and towards the road junction with Fenwick Drive, the degree of visual intrusion would be particularly noticeable. In addition, the degree of intrusion at the southern end and return section of fencing, close to the neighbouring property at no. 13a Lowther Close, would be particularly marked. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed boundary treatment would have an unduly harmful impact on the character and openness of the street scene.

As detailed in the site history, the sensitivity of this site for increased height boundary treatment was identified with the refused 2004 and 2005 applications. While there has been changes in local and national planning policy since that time, it is considered that the material concerns in respect of increased height boundary treatment have not significantly altered and the 2m height proposed would, as detailed above, appear overly dominant and detrimental to the open character of the street scene.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*

Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 notes the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);

The above guidance is considered relevant in relation to the adjoining dwelling, no. 3 Fenwick Drive. Given the presence of an existing two-storey outrigger to the rear of the application property, the proposed single-storey rear extension would exceed the 3m maximum standard by approx. 2.83m. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be located to the southeast of no. 3 Fenwick Drive. Therefore, the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and light, particularly in the morning hours. It is also considered to have an overbearing impact on the rear garden of no. 3 Fenwick Drive.

The proposed fenestration to the rear would face the blank gable elevation of no. 13a Lowther Crescent and measure 10.75m to the rear boundary of the curtilage. The proposed fenestration to the side would be obscurely glazed and measure a

substantial distance to the nearest neighbouring properties on the opposite side of Lowther Crescent. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an undue loss of privacy for nearby neighbours.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample 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.

In light of the above, the proposed single-storey rear extension would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of no. 3 Fenwick Drive, contrary to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*

A property of this size would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

The proposed side extension would reduce the length of the existing driveway and would not provide sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces. The application has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate how two off-street parking spaces can be accommodated.

While it is acknowledged that on-street parking is prevalent in the estate, given the prominent position of the host property close to the junction with Lowther Crescent and as a turning point towards properties in Fenwick Drive, it is considered the displacement of vehicles onto the highway would further restrict the width of the carriageway and pose a threat to highway safety, to the detriment of highway users and pedestrians.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore unacceptable and would not accord with Policies T2 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Other Matters

The proposed floor plans indicate the erection of a terrace to the rear of the proposed extension. Given the downward slope of the rear garden, it is assumed that this aspect of the development is to provide level amenity access. While the extent of the terrace is shown on the proposed ground floor plan, it is unclear as to whether the proposed terrace would be raised and, if so, to what height. Given the close proximity of the terrace to the common boundary with no. 3 Fenwick Drive, a raised terrace may result in an undue levels of overlooking.

As such, in the absence of sufficient detail, the application would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed boundary treatment would constitute an obtrusive form of development which would appear incongruous and cause undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would not be well-designed or result in a satisfactory standard of visual amenity and would be contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed single-storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing and loss of outlook for the rear facing windows of no. 3 Fenwick Drive to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. It would also have an overbearing impact on the rear garden space of no. 3 Fenwick Drive. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed extension would result in the loss of one off-street parking space for the proposed three-bedroom property, and would potentially result in the displacement of vehicles onto the section of the carriageway close to the junction between Lowther Crescent and Fenwick Drive. The proposed parking arrangements would be detrimental to the safety of highway users and pedestrians and is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed terrace would retain an acceptable level of amenity for no. 3 Fenwick Drive and not result in a loss of privacy through undue overlooking. As such the application fails to accord with the residential amenity aims of 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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan. Sheet 01. Dated 06.10.2023
- Block Plan. Sheet 02. Dated 06.10.2023
- Site Plan. Sheet 03. Dated 06.10.2023
- Existing Floor Plans. Sheet 04. Dated 07.10.2023
- Existing Elevations. Sheet 05. Dated 07.10.2023
- Proposed Floor Plans. Sheet 06. Dated 07.10.2023
- Proposed Elevations. Sheet 07. Dated 07.10.2023
- Proposed Side Fence Alteration Details. Sheet 08. Dated 07.10.2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	01/12/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	04/12/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling