

Application Number:	23/01125/HOUS
Location:	10 Datchet Terrace Rochdale OL11 2LQ
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and detached garage
Applicant:	Mr Abid Mohammed
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 31.01.2024	EXT OF TIME
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

10 Datchet Terrace is a two storey semi-detached property located within a cul-de-sac and an estate of similar properties within the Balderstone and Kirkholt ward of Rochdale. The property benefits from generous front and rear amenity space and hosts on-site parking to the front of the dwelling.

The dwelling adjoins to no.12 Datchet Terrace to the south, sits adjacent to no.8 Datchet Terrace to the north and borders a dense woodland to the rear.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension hosting a projection of 6m from the existing rear elevation, spanning 5.6m in total width, a shallow lean-to roof, 2no roof lights and matching materials to the host property.

Development is subject to the demolition of the existing detached garage to the rear of the dwelling and the single storey rear extension.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No public comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy requires new development to be of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.

The rear extension, 6m in total projection, is not considered to project a sensible distance relative to the depth of the host property (7m) and is not considered an extension of which visually respects the proportions of the existing dwelling therefore appearing as an incongruous addition. The development itself is not considered to be of high quality design and would seek to diminish the proportionality and built form of the host property.

Where section 5.1 of the SPD states extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally subservient to it, the proposed scale of the extension is considered to undermine the presence of the existing dwelling by presenting a scale which would otherwise appear disproportionate to the existing scale of the host property therefore unacceptable.

The proposed material palette of the extension is considered suitable and would match that on the host property. It is preferable for the roof lights on the roof of the extension to be better aligned however, given this would be largely out of view from public viewpoints, this is not seen as such a design concern it would warrant to seek amendments.

As existing, the rear of the property is largely out of view from public viewpoints and would remain out of view post-development with the only public viewpoint of any

additions at the rear being from the front of the property. However, given the dwelling is sited within a cul-de-sac with minimal activity around this section of the estate, it is acknowledged that in comparison to the existing extension, the new rear extension would appear incongruous by virtue of its projection but is not considered so visible that it would warrant any further investigation into the impact to the street scene therefore the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

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

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Residential amenity is considered under both policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the SPD. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties and should satisfy the space standards set out in Section 4.

Paragraph 5.6 sets out the following maximum standard for single storey extensions;

- ☐ For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);
- ☐ For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

Paragraph 5.7 then goes on to state that where the extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary.

Measured along both common boundaries shared with nos.12 and 8 Datchet Terrace, the relationship created by the presence of the rear extension is not in accordance with the above guideline as the proposed projection distance would exceed that permitted within the SPP.

The shallow pitch on the lean-to roof of the extension is considered an attempt at reducing any overbearing impact to surrounding properties however, noting the projection distance when viewed in the context of the PD fall back in relation to maximum height, it is noted the extension as proposed, would not accord with PD limitations and would therefore present a maximum height greater than that which can be carried out without the need for planning permission. It is considered that the height would unduly harm the neighbouring occupiers by presenting an unacceptable overbearing impact by virtue of the overall height of the extension, especially where noting the extension is only marginally constructed away from the common boundary shared with no.12 therefore sufficient to warrant a refusal on this basis.

In relation to Section 4 Space Standards, most habitable rooms are considered to be in accordance with permitted separation distances where appropriate. Where the proposed kitchen within the extension hosts a window to the side elevation which would directly face the boundary shared with no.8, this room also hosts largely glazed bi-folding doors to the rear therefore is considered sufficient in both outlook and light terms.

The existing dining room is considered to suffer a loss of light by virtue of the extension being constructed around the existing window. Noting the roof lights and large bi-folding doors, the presence of these alone are not considered to be sufficient in providing light to this room. However, when considered that which can be carried out without the need for planning permission, the harm presented by the presence of

a rear extension under PD would equate to the same of that under this application therefore on balance, acceptable under this application.

Sufficient garden space is to be retained post development for the enjoyment of the occupiers.

By virtue of the development not being constructed in accordance with SPD maximum projection distances and presenting undue harm to neighbouring occupiers by virtue of its overall height posing an overbearing impact, the rear extension is therefore contrary to policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its scale and siting, the design of the proposal would constitute a poorly designed addition and is not considered to respect the proportions of the existing dwelling and would appear as an incongruous addition to the host property as a result of a 6m projection distance. 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' and the National Planning Policy Framework
2. By virtue of its siting and projection distance relative to the host property, the proposed development is not constructed in accordance with paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7 of the SPD in relation to maximum projection distances and would also present a maximum height close to the common boundaries which is considered to present an unacceptable degree of overbearing impact to surrounding occupiers. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	29.01.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	31.01.2024	Signed: TH

Notes for the Applicant

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

- Location Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- A102 Proposed

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo