APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00120/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00120/HOUS
Location:	6 Cotaline Close Rochdale OL11 3PH
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extension (re-submission 20/011001/HOUS)
Applicant:	Mr Tabriz Tahir
Case Officer:	Emily Sykes
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 6 Cotaline Close, a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in architecturally similar estate in Middleton. This property is west facing, with the adjacent dwelling at no.4 Cotaline Close located to the north and the adjoining dwelling at no.8 Cotaline Close located to the south. The applicant dwelling is set well back from no.4 Cotaline Close due to where it is positioned along the curved highway. The rear boundary of curtilage borders Chevron Close.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The proposed development is considered to be the same as that proposed in application 20/01101/HOUS, except for the roof ridge on the proposed two storey side extension being set down from the roof ridge on the host dwelling by approximately 0.7m. The proposed development will be constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling. It will have a width of 2.8m, projecting along the shared boundary of curtilage with no.4 Cotaline Close.

The proposed two storey side extension is set back from the front main wall of the host dwelling by approximately 1.2m and sits flush with the rear wall of the host dwelling. The roof ridge on the proposed side extension will be set down 0.7m from the roof ridge on the host dwelling with an appropriately placed gable roof design.

The front elevation will feature a double window on the ground and first floor, with a double window also featuring on the first floor rear elevation.

The proposed single storey rear extension projects 2.7m from the rear of the host dwelling and is situated to the rear of the proposed two storey side extension. It will facilitate a study room and will be constructed with a flat roof design. The rear elevation will feature a double window.

Relevant History

20/01101/HOUS – Two storey side and single storey rear extension

Refused

Reason for refusal:

1. As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two-storey side and single-storey rear extension would have an undue overbearing impact and result in loss of light and outlook to the rear windows and garden at No.4 Cotaline Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding neighbours and one representation was received in objection to the proposal. The representation raised concern that the proposed development would block sunlight. This will be addressed under the amenity section of this report.

The representation also raised concern that the proposed development would result in the road being blocked with cars as the enlargement takes up the current driveway space. As the proposed development is located to the side and rear of the dwelling

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

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions must ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history. The host dwelling forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which are in keeping with the street scene throughout the estate, with the vast majority of dwellings on Cotaline Close being of the same built form. The proposed fenestration and materials to be used in the construction of the enlargement are acceptable in scale, size and appearance. The gable roof of the side extension is appropriately located and in keeping with both the host dwelling and other surrounding dwellings. The flat roof of the rear extension is not in keeping but is situated to the rear of the dwelling meaning it would not be visible from the street scene and therefore does not harm the visual amenity of the property or local area.

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. Whilst the side extension will be widely visible from public viewpoints, it is set back from the front wall of the dwelling by 1.2m, making it subservient and meaning terracing is avoided as per paragraph 5.12 of the SPD. The addition of the set down of the roof ridge results in the proposed development appearing even more subservient, meaning that it is considered that the proposed development does not overwhelm the character of the property on the street scene and therefore does not appear an incongruous feature on the highway.

The proposed development spans across the curtilage meeting the boundary with No.4 to the north of the property. Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states that bins should be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating the street scene, which would not be possible due to this development. However, many of the surrounding dwellings store their bins to the front of their properties, meaning this would not be unacceptable in this instance.

As also established under planning application 20/01101/HOUS, the design of the proposal is acceptable and is in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy states that all development proposals must not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Planning application 20/01101/HOUS was refused due to the proposed development unduly harming the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at no.4 Cotaline Close. No.6 Cotaline Close is set back by 7m from the adjacent dwelling at No.4 Cotaline Close. The proposed enlargement will extend approximately 6.5m from the rear wall of No.4, running adjacent to the boundary of No.4 with 4m of this consisting of the two storey side extension and 2.5m of this being the single storey rear extension. As established within the original submission, the proposed development exceeds the standards outlined in the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD for single storey rear extensions as per paragraph 5.6 and two storey extensions which are situated to the rear of the neighbouring dwellings as per paragraph 5.9.

The proposed enlargement would offer an oppressive part two storey/ part single storey wall less than 1m from the boundary of No.4 which leaves the garden with only 1m of the boundary not facing the proposed blank wall. The main amendment in this re-submission is the set-down of the two storey side extension from the roof ridge of the host dwelling by approximately 0.7m. Whilst it is acknowledged that this reduces the scale and massing of the proposal, it is considered that this does not sufficiently minimise the harm of an overbearing two storey side extension to the neighbouring occupiers' amenity. Due to the applicant property's positioning set back approximately 6.8m from the neighbouring dwelling at no.4, it is considered that the proposed addition of the two storey side extension would be unduly harmful to the amenity of both the neighbouring rear garden and the rear of the neighbouring property.

No.4 Cotaline Close has principal windows to the south of the rear wall which are within close proximity to the boundary which the proposal runs adjacent to. The proposed two storey enlargement would result in these habitable rooms in the adjacent property being overshadowed and having an undue loss of light.

The location of windows on the front and rear of the proposed development mean that there is no undue loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers, as no dwellinghouses meet the boundary at the rear of No.6 Cotaline Close.

Therefore, the extension would be considered to result in an overbearing impact which would cause undue loss of light to this neighbouring property and its garden. The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of No.4 Cotaline Close in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: **Refuse**

1. As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two-storey side and single-storey rear extension would have an undue overbearing impact and result in loss of light and outlook to the rear windows and garden at No.4 Cotaline Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines & 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.

INFORMATIVE:
For the avoidance of doubt, this decision is based on the following plans:

- Plan and Elevation (1639A/1)
- Elevation (1639A/2)
- Plan (1639A/3)
- Location Plan

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	24/02/2021	Signed: ES
Authorisation	8 March 2021	Signed: EH

Report Author Emily Sykes