APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00404/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00404/HOUS
Location:	11 Great Flatt Rochdale OL12 7AS
Proposal:	Part two/part single storey side extension, single storey front extension and part two-storey/part-single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Applicant:	Mr Asif Rashid
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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?	**Y**

CONDITIONS	**Pre-commencement conditions proposed?**	**N**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**N/A**

Location

The application relates to 11 Great Flatt, a two storey detached property located in a residential area of Rochdale. The property is located on a prominent corner plot by the junction between Great Flatt and Sheep Gap.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for construct the following:

- part two storey/part single storey side extension,
- single storey front extension which would house the porch and water closet, and
- part two storey/part single storey rear extension.

Relevant History

95/D32249 Change Of Use Of Part Of Existing Dwelling And First Floor Extension To Form Self-Contained Flat. Decision: Approved.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties. One objection has been received. Response has been summarised below:

- Overbearing
- Detrimental impact on outlook
- Impact on privacy
- Impact on light to residential and amenity space
  Officer comment: Discussed in the amenity section of the report.
- Located on prominent bend - Impact on street scene
- Not a subservient addition
- Disproportionate addition
  Officer comment: Discussed in the design section of the report.
- Impact on parking.
  Officer comment: Discussed in the highways and parking section of the report.

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

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents'. Furthermore, paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.'

The proposed part two storey and part single storey side extension would have a single storey element to the rear, with the two-storey element towards the front. The proposed extension would not represent a subservient design to the host property. The extension would have a hipped roof that would match that of the host property and the hipped roof design does help to reduce the prominence of the proposed extension. However, the ridge height of the proposed extension would be the same as the host property and the front elevation would be flush with the host property. Furthermore, the width of the proposed extension would be approximately 5.8m, whereas the host property is approximately 9.8m wide. This would represent addition of 59% increase. This would exceed the 50% limit that is considered acceptable by 9%. With the siting and design of the proposed extension, the 59% increase only helps to increase the prominence of the proposed extension.

Additionally, the design would mimic the bay windows and gable ended design of the roof. This would give the appearance of an additionally property rather than a subservient addition to the host property. Finally, owing to the host property sitting on a prominent corner plot, the negative impact on the visually amenity of the street is only exacerbated.

Moving to the proposed part two storey and part single storey rear extension. It is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension is appropriately designed and would broadly adhere to the design principles of the host dwelling. Though the lean to gable roof design of the single storey element of the extension would not be in keeping with the hipped roof design of the host property, the proposed extension would be to the rear and would be sufficiently screened from the street scene. In regards to the proposed two storey element of the proposed extension, the ridge of the proposed extension would be set at the same height as the host property. Additionally, the proposed extension would create two additional hipped roofs, which would create a slightly cluttered design. However, as noted above, that the proposed part two storey, part single storey rear extension would be to the rear and would be screened from the street scene, and as such would have limited impact the character and appearance of the street scene.

Moving to the proposed single storey front extension. The extension would house the and water closet. The proposed porch extension would see the existing porch increase in size. The width would increase from 4.1m to 4.9m. Additionally, the hipped roof design would be replaced with lean to gable roof design. This would differ with the hipped roof design of the host property. The addition of the lean to gable roof design would only exacerbate the sense of an overly prominent porch.

Additionally, the addition of the large and prominent porch of such a size would only exacerbate the visual amenity impact caused by the proposed two storey side extension.

The design of the proposal is therefore would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Looking at the proposed part two storey and part single storey side extension. The application proposes a bedroom on the first floor. The proposal would adhere to the separation distances contained within section 4.1 of the SPD. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of the property directly opposite.

No. 11 is close to the rear boundary of no.1 Sheep Gap. No. 11 Great Flatt's rear garden side boundary and No.1 Sheep Gap's rear boundary are shared. Therefore the rear of no. 1 faces towards the rear garden of no. 11. The proposed side extension would not be in the direct line of no. 1. The proposed extension would be sited towards the rear element of the rear extension and the distance between the two properties is considered sufficient to not impact on light or overshadow the windows or the main amenity space of no. 1. On the first floor, the application proposes to include a walk in wardrobe and bathroom. One window on the first floor for the bathroom would be included. A condition requiring obscure glazing would sufficiently prevent any privacy concerns.

In regards to the proposed part two storey part single storey extension to the rear. The proposed extension would not be in the direct line of no. 1 Sheep Gap. Additionally, the distance between the side elevation of the proposed part two storey part single storey rear extension and the rear elevation of no. 1 would be approximately 15m. The side elevation of the proposed extension would have a secondary window for the proposed kitchen on the ground floor but this would be set approximately 1.6m off the floor level. Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD states that '*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.'*

As the proposal would adhere to the space standards set out in paragraph 4.1, it is considered that the there is sufficient distance between the properties to not unduly impact on the amenity of no.1.

The proposed part two storey part single storey rear extension would accord with the requirements of paragraphs 5.5 to 5.10. As such the proposed part two storey part single storey rear extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the other neighbouring properties.

The proposed single storey front extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the neighbouring properties.

The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden with a functional layout.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the applicant property or the neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The SPD states that a minimum of 2.4m in width and 4.8m in length is required for one parking space, and where practicable a width of 3.6m should be required to allow for access of people with impaired mobility. The off-street parking space would amount to an area of 7m in width and 6m in length. It is considered that there is sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its size, siting and design, the proposed part two storey/part single storey side extension does not represent a subservient addition to the host dwelling, being an unduly prominent and incongruous addition that would alter the visual appearance of the host dwelling. It therefore would have an adverse impact upon the character of the host dwelling and the street scene, which is exacerbated by the prominent corner plot location of the dwelling. As such, the proposal would fail to accord with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its size, siting and design, the proposed single storey front extension would appear as an awkward, ungainly and incongruous addition, which would be out of character with the host dwelling and the existing street scene. As such the proposal would fail to accord with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

Location plan, existing site plan and proposed site plan
Sheet 1 – Existing elevations
Sheet 2 – Existing plans
Sheet 3 – Proposed elevations
Sheet 4 – Proposed plans

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	19/05/2021	Signed: MM
Authorisation	20/05/2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir