APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01590/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01590/HOUS
Location:	35 Phyllis Street Middleton M24 2AQ
Proposal:	Part two storey/ part single storey rear extension with roller shutter door, including conversion of loft into office space and addition of roof lights to existing roof
Applicant:	LEANNE LEACH
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?	**N**

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

Location

The application refers to no.35 Phyllis Street, a two storey terraced dwelling located on a row of architecturally similar terraced properties in East Middleton. The property faces south-west on to the highway, situated opposite a row of semi-detached dwellings. The applicant dwelling is adjoining to no.33 to the north-west and adjoining to no.37 to the south-east. The rear boundary of curtilage borders an alleyway which leads to the rear of the dwellings on Butterworth Street and a row of garages. The rear of the dwelling is therefore visible at public viewpoint. The dwellinghouse currently benefits from a front garden, single storey rear extension which is featured on the majority of the properties on the terrace and a modestly sized rear yard.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a part two storey/ part single storey rear extension. It will feature the conversion of the loft into an office space, with the addition of two roof lights to the existing roof. The proposed development will be constructed in matching materials to the host dwelling.

The proposed two storey rear extension extends 2.7m from the rear wall of the host dwelling. It sits below the eaves level of the host dwelling and will be constructed

with a pitched roof. The first floor rear elevation will feature two windows, one being obscure glazed and leading to a bathroom. The first floor ground elevation will feature a patio door.

The proposed single storey rear extension will extend from the rear of the proposed two storey rear extension by 2m on the north-east side of the dwelling. This means that the proposed development projects 4.7m in total from the rear of the host dwelling. The proposed single storey rear extension will also be constructed with a pitched roof and will feature a roller shutter door on the rear elevation.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding neighbours but no representations were received.

Policy

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 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host dwelling and should generally be subservient to it. The proposed development will be constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling and is therefore considered to be in keeping with the design language of the property.

The proposed two storey rear extension is set down from the roof ridge of the host dwelling and therefore appears subservient to it. This means it is considered that the proposed development does not overwhelm the character of the host dwelling. The proposed pitched rooves are considered to be appropriate within their design and in keeping with the visual amenity of the host dwelling.

The proposed fenestration is considered to be appropriate within its size and positioning and is in keeping with the design language on the host dwelling. The proposed shutter roller door on the rear elevation of the single storey rear extension is not considered to be typical of the local character. However, due to its positioning to the rear of the dwelling it is not considered to unduly harm the design language of the dwelling.

Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states that residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets. The applicant dwelling currently stores bins to the front of the dwelling, alike to the neighbouring properties. This is therefore not considered to unduly harm the character of the street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords 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. This is supported through Paragraph 5.5 of the SPD which advises that it is important that extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupants.

Paragraph 5.6 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development states that for attached properties, single storey rear extensions should not extend past a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling. The proposed single storey rear extension extends 4.7m from the rear of the neighbouring dwelling at no.37 Phyllis Street. Paragraph 5.7 of the SPD states that 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. However, the proposed single storey rear extension is projects along the shared boundary of curtilage with no.37. For this reason, it is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would have an overbearing impact to the rear garden at no.37 Phyllis Street, meaning that it is considered that it will unduly harm the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states that planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey extensions to 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 dwelling. The proposed two storey rear extension projects 2.7m from the rear of the adjoining dwelling at no.37, exceeding the standards providing in the SPD. It is therefore considered that the proposed development may unduly harm the amenity of the rear of the dwelling at no.37, providing an overbearing and overshadowing feature.

Furthermore, paragraph 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD outlines the standards for new developments, including the space standards which new residential developments must adhere to. Notably, section (ii) states that there must be 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room. The applicant dwelling sits opposite the gable end wall at no.12 Butterworth Street, with the proposed two storey extension being situated approximately 10m away from the directly facing two storey elevation. As this is not in accordance with the minimum space standards, there are concerns that the amenity of the applicant property will be impacted, with limited light and outlook from the proposed bedroom window. It is therefore considered that the proposed development will also unduly harm the amenity of the applicant, with the large expanse of bricks on the two storey gable end being situated within an unduly close distance to the proposed habitable rooms.

Paragraph 5.4 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. As a result of this, an extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable. Whilst it is noted that there is limited space to the rear of the property in its existing form, there is still sufficient space to the rear of the dwelling for sitting out and drying clothes. The proposed development results in there no longer being sufficient space and therefore is considered to cause further harm to the applicants' amenity.

Overall it is considered that the proposal would unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of the applicant property in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed part two storey/ part single storey rear extension would have an undue overbearing and overshadowing impact to the rear windows and garden at No.37 Phyllis Street. 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.
2. As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed development would result in the amenity of the applicant property being unduly harmed. The close positioning of the proposed two storey rear extension to the two storey gable wall at no.12 Butterworth Street will result in the rear windows receiving limited light and outlook, therefore unduly harming the amenity of the occupiers. The proposed development also results in the applicant dwelling being left with limited garden space, hence causing further harm to the

amenity of the occupiers. 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:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Floor Plans (20.2410.1)
- Proposed Details (20.2410.2C)
- Existing and Proposed Block Plans (20.2410.3)

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	12/02/2021	Signed: ES
Authorisation	12/02/2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Emily Sykes