Application Number:	19/00192/HOUS
Location:	102 Compton Way Middleton M24 2BY
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr Bell
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
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

This application relates to a semi-detached dormer bungalow located within the Middleton Township. The adjoining property has a two storey side extension.

Description of Proposal

This application seeks permission for the erection of a two storey side extension. It would be built in exterior materials matching those to the host dwelling. It would have a ridge height and eaves height equal to those of the host dwelling and would have front and rear dormer windows which adjoin the existing dormers.

Relevant History

No.104 Compton Way: 91/D264980- Two Storey Side Extension To Dwellinghouse. Approved.

No.100 Compton Way: 03/D42228- Two Storey Side / Rear Extension. Approved

Township/Member comments

n/a

Representations

One letter has raised concerns that the proposed side extension will reduce the levels of natural light to the kitchen of the adjacent property, which has one side facing window only.

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

The host dwelling is one of a group of 6 similarly designed, semi-detached dormer bungalow properties within the immediate street scene. The proposed side extension would have a ridge height and an eaves height, equal to that of the host dwelling and a front elevation which sits flush with that of the host dwelling.

The adjoining property, No. 104 Compton Way, has a two storey side extension of similar appearance to the one proposed in this instance, giving the pair of properties an unbalanced appearance. The proposed extension would visually rebalance the properties.

To ensure that a 'terracing effect' does not arise as a result of two storey or first floor side extensions being built close to shared side boundaries, the Council's adopted Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document dictates that where a side extension is within 1 metre of the shared boundary, the front elevation of the side extension should be set back 2 metres from the front elevation of the main house at first floor level or the extension should be set back 1 metre from the front elevation of the main house at both first floor and ground floor level.

The proposed extension would be positioned immediately adjacent to the shared boundary and would not be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling. As such, it would be contrary to the SPD guidance and it is considered that it would contribute to a terracing effect with the neighbouring No.100.

It is considered that whilst the proposed extension would visually rebalance the pair of semi-detached properties to which the application property belongs, this benefit would be significantly outweighed by the visual impact that a terracing effect would give rise to and resulting in the appearance of this row of properties as a terraced row. As such, on balance, it is considered that the proposed extension would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the character of the existing street scene and would therefore fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The kitchen within the neighbouring No.100 Compton Way has a side facing principal window which faces towards the boundary shared with the application property. The kitchen is also provided with a very limited level of natural light through the rear facing window which leads on to the existing utility room.

If the proposed extension was built it would be positioned approximately 2.5m from the common boundary and the principal window to the neighbouring kitchen.

To ensure that developments do not cause a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of nearby dwellings, paragraph 4.1 of the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD* also sets out space standards guidelines. It states that the following minimum space standards should be adhered to:

(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 (Figure 2);

(ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 3);

(iii) *10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 4).*

The proposal would not accord with the above guidance in relation to the neighbouring property's principal kitchen window.

It is considered that due to the extension's size, height, scale, massing and proximity to said kitchen window, its erection would result in a significant loss of light to and would have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of this neighbouring property contrary to policy DM1 and the SPD.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As a result of the proposed extension, the total number of bedrooms within the application property would be increased from 3 to 4. The greater level of occupancy could result in an increase in the demand for car parking space. The property is currently served by 1 off street parking space (as defined by paragraph 3.15 of the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* SPD). It is considered that this would be adequate to serve the enlarged dwelling proposed.

Recommendation: **Refuse for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed extension, due to its size, siting and design, would contribute to a terracing effect with the neighbouring No.100 Compton Way to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. As such, the proposal is contrary to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document *'Guidelines and Standards for Residential* Development', policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed extension, due to its size, scale, massing, siting and design, would severely limit the outlook from and the levels of natural light to the principal kitchen window of No.100 Compton Way. As such, the proposal is contrary to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document *'Guidelines and Standards for Residential* Development', policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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	12/04/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	15/04/2019	Signed: DR

Report Author Osian Perks