

Application Number:	24/00185/HOUS
Location:	2 Tern Close Rochdale OL11 5QU
Proposal:	Single storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Annam Arshid
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 09.05.2024	EXT OF TIME N/A
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	NO

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

2 Tern Close is a two storey detached dwelling located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale and on a corner plot between the Tern Close, Petrel Close, Bittern Close and Snipe Avenue junction. The property faces west onto the highway and sits adjacent to no.4 Tern Close to the north. The rear curtilage borders the side elevation and driveway of no.1 Petrel Close and the property benefits from on-site parking and a sufficiently sized private rear garden.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a pitched roof single storey side extension, including 3no roof lights to the front roof slope, projecting 8.5m from the south side elevation with a total depth of 5.5m.

Relevant History

15/01409/HOUS

Erection of timber boundary fence 1.9m high (retrospective)
Granted

22/00531/HOUS

Conversion of existing garage to living accommodation including alterations to front elevation, two storey rear extension, first floor front extension, single storey side extension, construction of terrace and installation of canopy to rear, formation of vehicular access including hardstanding and alterations to existing rear fenestration and boundary treatment
Refused

1. By virtue of its design, scale and size, the proposed development would significantly alter the proportions and form of the original dwelling and would amount to an overdevelopment of the plot. The proposed extensions would dominate the host property and would have a prominence which would harmfully impact the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework

23/00702/HOUS

Part first floor, part two storey / part one and a half storey side extensions with alterations to front, side and rear elevations, alteration to existing boundary fence, extension to existing hardstanding and addition of raised platform to the rear.
Resubmission of 22/00531/HOUS

Refused

1. By reason of its form, design and exposed siting, the extension would form an incongruous and alien feature which would fail to sit sympathetically with, and would respond poorly to, the established character of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development proposals ultimately fail to amount to a satisfactory standard of design and the application is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. No representations were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub Regional

Places for Everyone (PfE) JDP 2024:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

Amended plans were sought by the case officer however no correspondence was received. The proposal was therefore recommended for refusal.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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.

SPD paragraph 5.14 sets out guidance to side extensions to dwellings on a corner plot and is therefore relevant:

Extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension.

With reference to the overall design approach of the scheme, it should first be noted and acknowledged that the dwelling is sited within a highly prominent location within the street scene where surrounding dwellings have sought large additions at single and two storey level therefore no concerns are raised to an extension to this portion of the dwelling. The overall form of the extension is also comparable to that found elsewhere within the street scene.

The application proposes a single storey side extension providing additional living space on the ground floor. The scale of the development would present proportionality concerns resulting from the overall projection of the extension relative to the width of the parent dwelling. The extension would project 3.4m from the existing garage single storey element and sit 0.3m higher than the garage roof ridge. These elements together would present an addition which would be discordant to the scale and existing elements of the host dwelling.

The siting of the dwellings along the highway within the vicinity do not present a strong building line to be adhered to in relation to any new development on corner plots. The siting of the extension, which extends close to the southern boundary therefore weighs neutrally in the overall planning balance.

The material palette of the development would be in keeping with the existing visual amenity of the host dwelling raises no concern.

By virtue of the scale and siting of the proposed development, the proposal is not considered to be constructed in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy to which it states "All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings" and "proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties".

The NPPF advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The development does not present any immediate neighbour amenity concerns to be further assessed as it is concluded no harm would arise from the presence of the proposed development.

The plot would retain an appropriate expanse of private garden space and all habitable rooms are to receive adequate light and outlook.

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

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed plans indicate adequate on-site parking arrangements which would remain in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy. The development is not considered to give rise to any highway or pedestrian safety concerns and bin storage would remain unaffected by the works.

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

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, scale and siting, the proposed development would appear discordant to the proportions of the host dwelling and would present a disproportionate addition which would not relate well to the existing plot or surrounding street scene by virtue of its highly prominent location. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', Places for Everyone JDP and the National Planning Policy Framework

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	30.04.2024	Signed: C.Petrillo
Authorisation	02.05.2024	Signed: TH

Notes for the Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, the above decision relates to the following plans;

- Rev B LOCATION & EXISTING SITE PLAN
- SITE PLAN as PROPOSED

- Rev F ELEVATIONS as PROPOSED
- Rev F PLANS as PROPOSED

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo