

Application Number:	22/01465/HOUS
Location:	123 Hardwicke Street Rochdale OL11 1QJ
Proposal:	Two storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing store
Applicant:	Mr Asad Ali
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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?	Yes

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

Location

The application relates to 123 Hardwicke Street, a two-storey corner plot located in the Milkstone and Deeplish ward of Rochdale. The application property stands within an estate within a defined urban area comprised of semi-detached and terrace dwellings. The sites curtilage boundary borders the rear garden and side garden of 1 Arundel Avenue to the south and adjoins to 121 Hardwicke Street. The property benefits from a front porch and a generous side garden.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side and rear wraparound extension measuring 3.3m from the south elevation and 2.4m from the rear elevation.

Permission was previously sought and approved for a two-storey side and single storey rear extension at the property to which the works are in the process of being carried out.

Relevant History

19/01342/HOUS

**TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION
Granted January 2020**

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. One letter of objection was received.

Objection Letter

Upper floor windows posing overlooking and loss of privacy impacts to surrounding rear gardens due to 123 Hardwicke Street being sited on higher ground level than those surrounding

Officer Response See 'Amenity' section report

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

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 requires "development to be of a high quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area."

Section 5 of the SPD sets out guidance for house extensions to which paragraph 5.1 states extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally be subservient to it.

The two-storey side element of the proposal would remain acceptable in principle by virtue of the previous approval. To add a extension at two storey level at the rear at the scale and projection proposed would appear at odds given the overall depth would be larger than the overall depth of the dwelling itself when combined with the side extension therefore too large in this context and location.

The dwelling itself is a corner plot therefore both the front and side elevations are situated in highly prominent locations adjacent to the highway. When viewed from

the Arundel Street highway, the roof form to the rear and side would appear at odds given the form is not appropriately aligned therefore would constitute poor design and cannot be supported.

With reference to the street scene, the pair of semi-detached dwellings, nos.123 and 121 are sited at an angle by virtue of being sited along a corner plot therefore there is no overriding need to preserve any building lines. Further to this, the scale of the proposed development would appear at odds within the street scene given the house itself is sited within a setting of similar properties, none of which have sought a similar scale to the development under this application.

The fenestration of the proposal is considered acceptable given it would match the proportions of those existing. Similarly with the external materials of the development, by virtue of it matching those on the existing is considered acceptable and considered to respect the visual amenity of the dwelling in this regard.

By virtue of the overall scale and design of the proposal, the development is considered 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

The SPD does not explicitly set out guidance or projection distances relating to side extensions however, aforementioned above, house extensions are expected to demonstrate that they are subservient and in keeping with the host property. The previous permission approved the two storey side extension to which it would remain acceptable in amenity terms under this current application.

The previous permission approved, a single storey rear extension which did not considered to pose any loss of privacy impacts to surrounding dwellings given it was constructed in accordance with paragraph 5.6 of the SPD. However, given this has now changed to a two-storey rear extension, paragraphs 5.9 and 5.19 are therefore relevant;

- ❑ *5.9 Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)*
- ❑ *5.10 Where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the 2.4m distance will be taken from a point 3m along the common boundary from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)*

The proposed two-storey rear extension projects 3.4m from the existing rear elevation. When measured along the common boundary, the plans do not indicate the rear extension would extend beyond the permitted distance.

Section 4 of the SPD sets out minimum separation distances for principal windows. Paragraph 4.1(i) is relevant:

- ❑ *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*

The fenestration to the upper floor rear elevation hosting two bedrooms is considered to pose an unacceptable overlooking to the rear gardens of no.3 and 5 Arundel Avenue given the distance to the rear curtilage boundary post development would be approx. 4m. Post development, the rear elevation would directly align with the rear elevation of no.5 Arundel Avenue to which the separation distance would be approx. 12m. The existing separation distance is 15m therefore already falls short of the required standards and to erode this distance further would be unacceptable and pose a loss of privacy to the upper floor rear windows at no.5 Arundel Avenue.

The previous application acknowledged the loss of garden space to the rear as a result of development however this was permitted due to the expanse of amenity space to the side of the dwelling which would be retained post development.

In the interest of occupier amenity, all habitable rooms are to receive adequate light and outlook.

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

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The existing property has no off-street parking provision and the proposal includes an increase in the number of bedrooms at the property from a 2-bed to a 5-bed. However, it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable impact on parking, pedestrian or highway safety.

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

Recommendation: Refuse

1. **By virtue of its scale, design and siting, the development is considered to represent an incongruous form of design and has not been constructed sympathetic to the existing dwelling. The development is considered discordant to the character and scale of the dwelling's surrounding. 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, the upper floor rear windows of the two-storey rear extension are considered to pose an unacceptable overlooking impact to the rear gardens at no.3 and no.5 Arundel Avenue. Further to this, the proposal would not comply with Section 4 of the SPD separation distances for principal windows at upper floor level. As such, the proposal would not be constructed in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF**

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	22.09.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	22.09.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for the applicant:

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

- Location plan and proposed site plan
- 01 Floor plans and elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo