| Application Number: | 19/00394/HOUS |
|---|---|
| Location: | 6 Ullswater Grove, Heywood, OL10 2BL |
| Proposal: | Two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey rear extension. |
| Applicant: | Suzanne Barlow |
| Case Officer: | Osian Perks |
| 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? | N |

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

**Location**

This application relates to a semi-detached residential property sited within a residential area of Heywood. It is built in red brick with a dual pitched roof and UPVC windows throughout.

**Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey rear extension. At first floor level it would extend 3m beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling and would be covered by a hipped roof. At ground floor level it would extend 4m beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling.

**Relevant History**

N/A

**Township/Member comments**

N/A

**Consultee responses**

None.

**Representations**

None 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 |
| **T2** | Improving Accessibility |
| **Appendix 5** | Schedule of Parking Standards |

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

**Amendments**

None Applicable

**Assessment**

**Design:** DM1 and P3

It is noted that although located to the rear of the property, the proposed extension would be visible from the footways to the west of the site which run between Ullswater Grove and Walton Street. The proposed extension would be built in materials matching those of the host dwelling with a hipped roof. It would also have a ridge height which is lower than that of the host dwelling. In light of this, and whilst it is considered that a gable-end dual-pitch roof would be more sympathetic to the original form of the dwelling, it is considered that by virtue of its design and size, and given that it would not form a visible part of an established street scene, the proposed extension would appear in keeping with the character of and would be subservient to the application property.

**Amenity:** DM1 and SPD

To ensure that a single storey extension does not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents, the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document provides standards which should be adhered to. Paragraph 5.6 of the guidance document states:

'*The following maximum standard will apply 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 goes on to state:

'*The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any extension if one exists close to the common boundary. If the new 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. This is illustrated in figures 5 and 6'.*

At ground floor level, the proposed extension would measure 4m. The extension would be set away from the boundaries shared with both neighbouring properties and as such would accord with the above guidance with respect to the ground floor element.

To ensure that a two storey rear extension to a residential property does not result in the substantial loss of light to or have an overbearing impact upon adjoining properties paragraphs 5.8 to 5.10 of the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD* (2016) stipulate that planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4 metres along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s). This distance is extended to 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the neighbouring property where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary.

The extension would be set away from the boundaries shared with both neighbouring No.8 and No.4 Ullswater Grove. Due to this and its size it would accord with the above guidance. Accordingly, due to its size, siting and design, the proposed extension would not result in the significant loss of light to, the overshadowing of or have an overbearing impact upon the occupants of neighbouring dwellings at No.8 and No.4 Ullswater Grove.

To ensure that developments do not cause a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of nearby dwellings, paragraph 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD also sets out space standards guidelines. It states that the following minimum space standards should be adhered to:

- 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 (Figure 2);
- 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 3);
- 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 4).

The rear wall of the proposed two-storey element of the extension would be sited approximately 15.8m from the directly facing windows in the flats (21 & 27 Walton Close) opposite. For this reason the proposed development would not accord with the above guidance. Whilst it is noted that there is an existing element of mature vegetative screening between the two sites at present, it is not considered sufficient to rely on mitigation afforded by vegetative screening, which may be subject to pruning or removal in the future, especially in light of the reduced separation distance between bedroom windows at the application property and the hedge itself which

may give rise to pressures for pruning in order to ensure adequate provision of natural light. As the hedge lies within the site boundary it could be removed without the consent of occupiers of the adjacent flats.

It is considered that, due to the substandard separation distance between the extension and the neighbouring properties at Walton Close, the proposed extension may give rise to a loss of privacy to the occupants of the adjacent flats and may provide an insufficient standard of privacy for the occupants of the host property. As such the proposal would fail to accord with the relevant requirements of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Recommendation:**

**Refuse for the following reason:**

1. In light of the substandard separation distance between the rear wall of the extension and the adjacent flats to the south west at Walton Close, the proposed extension may result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of the neighbouring flats and would fail to provide an adequate standard of amenity for occupants of the host property. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy 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:
This decision relates to the following plans/documents:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Details drawing no. 19.1966.1
- Proposed Details drawing no. 19.1966.2C
- Proposed Elevations drawing no. 19.1966.3
- Existing and Proposed Block Plan drawing no. 19.1966.4

| | **Date** | **Officer** |
|---|---|---|
| **Report Completed** | 30/05/2019 | Signed: OP |
| **Authorisation** | 31/05/2019 | Signed: DA |

Report Author Osian Perks