APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00553/HOUS

Application Number:	19/00553/HOUS
Location:	71 Bamford Way Rochdale OL11 5JL
Proposal:	First floor side extension with enclosed balcony to rear and single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr M Sharif
Case Officer:	Jessica Fearon
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**

Location

71 Bamford Way is a detached property located in residential area of Rochdale, and is surrounded by aesthetically similar properties. It has previously benefitted from a single storey front and side extension to the south eastern elevation and two storey side extension to the northern elevation.

The plot is triangle shaped and tapers off to the rear where it shares a boundary with no.6 Greenwich Close and shares side boundaries with no.19 Wordsworth Way to the south east, and no. 69 Bamford Way to the North. The property is orientated west towards the highway.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a first floor side extension with enclosed balcony and single storey rear extension.

The first floor side extension would be situated on the southern elevation, above the existing garage. It would be set flush with the front elevation, with a roof ridge height approximately 0.3m lower than the peak of the existing ridge. It would project 5.1m from the side elevation to meet the edge of the ground floor side elevation. It would add 3.5m measured from the ridge of the canopy that runs across the full length of the house. The rear elevation of the proposed first floor extension includes an enclosed balcony, with the walls flush with the existing rear elevation.

The first floor side extension will be finished with red brick to match existing and the gable roof will be completed with concrete tiles to match existing.

The rear extension would project 2.15m from the rear elevation, to a height of 3m and spanning 9.7m across the original rear elevation. It would be fitted with a lean to roof. It would be a glass extension, as the roof and walls would be made up of windows or bi-fold doors.

Relevant History

79/D08281 – Extension to Dwelling – Granted subject to conditions
03/D42484 – Single storey front and side extension and Conservatory to rear – Granted subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

Not applicable

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbours and two letters of objection have been received as summarised below:

- Building work to the rear of the property would block light and outlook
- Overbearing impact on rear amenity space and block direct sunlight
- Loss of privacy to rear amenity
- Impression of crowdedness which may impact value and ability to see
- Disturbance to day to day lives.

Officer's comments: these objections have been considered in the Assessment below.

- Implications for the amount of light and outlook for open space in the garden.
- Potential of the nature of the balcony to be intrusive
- With the large out house in the next door neighbour's garden, further building would appear imposing.

Following review of the development plans this correspondent stated there are now no objections from them.

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

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

The SPD provides guidance for side extensions in sections 5.11-5.13, where they extend close to the boundary. However due to the layout of the street, adjacent pairs of semi-detached dwellings are angled away from each other and the terracing effect is not of concern.

Whilst there are no concerns regarding terracing, the property is sited in a prominent position on the corner of Wordsworth Way and Bamford Way. The development must therefore be appropriate in regards to the design and scale, and should respect the character of the existing property and surrounding street scene.

The property has already benefitted from a two-storey side extension on the Northern elevation and a single storey side (garage) extension on the southern elevation. The proposed development on the southern elevation above the existing side extension would result in an overbearing and incongruous development. This is due to the dwelling appearing much bigger in comparison to the neighbouring properties and as such would not improve or positively contribute to the character of the street scene.

Further to this, paragraph 5.1 states "*Extensions and alterations to existing properties, including dormer extensions, should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties. Additionally, they should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it."*
The proposed dual pitched roof design is in keeping with the side extension on the opposite side of the house, and the ridge height is set slightly below the ridge of the original dwelling. While the front elevation of the first floor extension would be flush

with that of the existing dwelling, the lower ridge height is considered to make the development subservient.

The building line of the corner of Bamford Way would be maintained by the new development due to the angle of the property. The building line of Wordsworth Way is also already broken by no.19 being set forward of the rest of the properties and is already further broken by the situation of no 71.

The conservatory based design of the rear extension is a departure from the original design values if the host property. However, as it would be situated to the rear of the property and unseen from the public realm this feature would not be considered as a reason for refusal on its own.

In addition to the above assessment, the height, scale and massing and materials of the proposed extension, are considered to contribute negatively to the townscape and to therefore do not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD sets out the minimum space standards for developments and point (ii) states that there needs to be "*14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room".* It is considered that the first floor windows on the side elevation of 19 Wordsworth Way are principal windows, and while this property and the applicant are angled away from each other, the space between these windows and the side elevation of the extension is only 4.5m, which decreases to 3m at the narrowest point. Due to such a difference between the guidelines and the proposal, it is considered that this development would block light and outlook to the windows on the side of no.19 Wordsworth Way, therefore rendering the application unacceptable.

The application also includes an enclosed balcony to the rear of the first floor extension, paragraph 4.4 of the SPD states that "*balconies and elevated terraces can result in adverse overlooking of neighbouring private garden areas or habitable room windows if they are located in close proximity to the boundary of the curtilage. They should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties*". Due to the proximity between the balcony and boundary with no. 19 Wordworth Way, it is likely that there will be some overlooking from the balcony to the rear amenity space. On balance however, the angling of the two properties means that is likely that anyone on the balcony would be looking onto the roof of the rear and side extension, and there is only a small amount of rear amenity space which would not be unduly visible from the balcony.

As the balcony is enclosed it is also not considered to negatively impact on the rear amenity space of no. 69 Bamford Way from overlooking. The sight line from the balcony would be mainly limited to the rear of the garden space.

The rear extension is small in design (2.1m) and set away from the boundary with no. 69 Bamford Way and no. 19 Wordsworth Way. It complies with spatial guidelines set out in points 5.5 to 5.7 of the SPD and despite its modern conservatory design, it

is not considered to impact the privacy of neighbours either side, due to the boundary fences separating the rear extension from both properties, and would therefore not constitute a refusal.

The proposals are therefore considered to unduly impact upon the amenity of surrounding occupiers and the does not comply with the relevant parts of Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed development would appear as an overbearing addition to the street scene, and erode the sense of space on the corner, therefore constituting poor design. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with 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.

2. As a result of its scale and siting, the proposed extension would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of number 19 Wordsworth Way through loss of light and outlook and an overbearing impact on the side first floor windows. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not accord with Policy DM1 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.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following plans:

- Location and Site Plan – Dwg. No.: - 6
- Proposed ground floor plans – Dwg. No.: - 3
- Existing floor plans – Dwg. No.:- 1
- Existing elevation – Dwg. No,: - 2
- Proposed elevations – Dwg. No.:- 4
- Proposed first floor plans – Dwg. No.: - 4

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	JFearon	Signed: 25/02/2020
Authorisation	A Truman	Signed: 09/03/2020

Report Author Jessica Fearon