APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00254/HOUS

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
21/00254/HOUS	Ryan Killeen	22 March 2021

Address: 15 Channing Square Rochdale OL16 5PZ

Proposal: Part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension and alterations to existing rear elevation

PUBLICITY	**Weekly list expired?**	Y	**Site notice expired?**	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	**Press Notice expired?**	N/A

DELEGATION	**Significant departure from local plan?**	N	**Contrary to national policy?**	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	**Contrary to previous decision?**	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	**Called in or Planning Panel objection?**	N

COMMENTS	**Planning Panel comments received?**	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

EIA	**Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?**	N/A

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

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: DR **DATE: 15/04/2021**

SITE

This application relates to no.15 Channing Square, a two-storey, semi-detached, post-war dwelling sited at the head of a cul-de-sac in a predominantly residential

area of Newbold, south of Rochdale Town Centre. Due to the arrangement of properties around the head of the cul-de-sac, the plot is approximately triangular.

The dwelling faces south towards the highway, along the axis of Channing Square, adjoining to no.16 to the east, with no.13 adjacent to the south west. To the rear, the property bounds an alleyway which runs parallel to St. Peter's Street, to the rears of nos.4-36 (evens only).

PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the erection of a part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extension which would project a maximum of 3.6m from the west facing side elevation, and extending flush with the rear elevation at two-storey level, and extending 3m beyond the rear elevation, at ground floor level only. Due to the triangular shape of the plot, the extension is to be set back 2.6m from the front elevation of the host dwelling and include a tapered towards the front to maximise the internal floor area.

The proposal is to be constructed with a dual-pitch roof over the two storey form, with a mono-pitch, lean-to utilised to the single storey aspect. The proposal is to be constructed from matching materials.

RELEVANT PLANNING 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).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties and a notice posted in the vicinity of the site.

Two letters of objection were received raising concern over the disturbance created during the construction phase in addition to concerns over a loss of privacy and overshadowing impact.

Officer note - It is not expected that the construction of an extension of this size would unduly affect the level of amenity enjoyed by surrounding occupiers for such a prolonged time as to justify a reason for refusal or request a Construction Management Statement.

The concerns relating to overshadowing and a loss of privacy are addressed within the 'Amenity' section of the report.

ANALYSIS

Design

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy require 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.

The application dwelling is sited within a predominantly unchanged street scene where few properties have been extended. This application proposes a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The proposed side extension would project approximately 3.6m, slightly exceeding half the width of the dwelling. The inclusion of a taper to the front elevation is considered to constitute an element of poor design and would form an incongruous feature within the street scene that has maintained a strong design vernacular to which this proposal fails to accord with.

The inclusion of a tapered front elevation would present an irregular and unsympathetic form of development that can be viewed from a considerable portion of Channing Square. The proposed side extension would sit awkwardly in the context of the street scene and announce itself as a defined attempt at maximising the additional floor area, additionally offsetting the front facing fenestration from a central position when viewed from public vantage points, therefore sitting awkwardly next to an otherwise well-proportioned host dwelling.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be formed with a mono-pitch lean-to roof which would represent an appropriate design choice, coherent with that of the dwelling. Any visual impact of this aspect of the development is mitigated by virtue of being sited to the rear of the dwelling

The proposal would maintain external access between the front and rear curtilage for the purpose of transporting and storing bins out of view from the street scene, and no concerns are raised in this regard.

The use of matching materials is considered acceptable. A suitably worded materials condition would be appended to any decision notice in the event of planning approval to ensure an appropriate finish.

In light of the above, the proposed development would constitute a poor standard of design and produce an incongruous feature and therefore fail to accord with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and P3 which seek, amongst other things, to promote a high standard of design and visual appearance in addition to Paragraph 127 of the NPPF which requires planning decisions to ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Amenity

Policy DM1 of the Councils adopted Core Strategy requires all development proposals, including extensions and alterations, to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers.

Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should seek to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which sets out objective standards which should be adhered to in order to satisfy the above policy requirements.

Overshadowing and overbearing impact

By virtue of the arrangement of dwellings around the head of the cul-de-sac, the proposed extension would be sited a suitable distance from the outdoor rear amenity space of no.13 to the southwest. Further to this, due to the orientation of dwellings, it would not extend beyond the plane of the rear elevation of no.13, and as such, would not unacceptably overshadow this property.

With regards to no.16, the adjoining dwelling to the east, the extension to the rear of the applicant property would be of a single storey form and would be sited approximately 6m from the common boundary. It is not considered that any unacceptable overshadowing impact would occur.

Privacy

The proposal would include a rear facing first floor bedroom window at a distance of approximately 19m to the rear facing properties on St Peters Street. It is appreciated that this falls 2m short of the 21 required by the SPD, however, the surrounding urban grain is typical of such distances, falling as short as 15m between properties to the east, and such reduced distances would not unduly impact the privacy of surrounding occupiers where they are already accustomed to such relationships. The distance between the existing first floor rear facing bedroom window and facing properties on St Peters Street is noted as 19m at present. With regards to the privacy of adjoining and adjacent dwellings on Channing Square, it is not considered that any unacceptable vantage points would result by virtue of the siting and design of the proposal.

Occupier Amenity

The proposed extensions would ensure the adequate provision of natural light and outlook to all habitable rooms and would preserve a suitably sized rear garden with a functional layout.

In light of the above assessment, the proposals are therefore not considered to unduly impact upon the amenity of surrounding occupiers and the application is adjudged accordingly to comply with the relevant parts of Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: REFUSE:

1. By virtue of its siting, scale and design, the proposed extension would introduce an incongruous feature into the street scene that would be unsympathetic to the design vernacular of the existing dwelling. The inclusion of a tapered elevation would be inappropriate in its context and would ultimately constitute a poor standard of design, inflicting undue harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposed development fails to improve the character and quality of the area and is therefore contrary to 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.

Informative:

In the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following list of plans/Documents:

- Location Plan
- 1709/1 – Existing Plans and Elevations
- 1709/2 – Proposed Floor Plans
- 1709/3 – Proposed Elevations

Report Author Ryan Killeen