

Application Number:	24/00685/HOUS
Location:	25 Sandfield Road Rochdale OL16 5LE
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory
Applicant:	Mr Shahid Hussain
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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/A
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to 25 Sandfield Road, a two-storey semi-detached property in the inner-suburbs of Rochdale. The wider area is mixed use, comprising terraced and semi-detached housing, commercial and industrial warehouses, various public amenities, and key transport links.

No. 25 faces south on a prominent corner plot between Sandfield Road and Kings Road. It is adjoined by 25 Kings Road to the east, and the north-west boundary of the curtilage borders no. 23 Sandfield Road. No. 25 has a wraparound garden which overlooks Sandfield Road, bordered by a timber fence atop a brick wall.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension, and a two-storey side extension.

Single storey rear:

The single storey rear extension includes a dual pitched roof, a single rear door and window, a side window, and four skylights. The extension would project 3m from the rear elevation, and measure 4.5m in width, 2.4m in eaves height, and 3.5m in

maximum height. Materials include red brick, grey slate roof tiles, and UPVC fenestration.

The rear extension would replace the existing conservatory.

Two-storey side extension:

The proposed two-storey side extension would accommodate a garage, a store, two bedrooms, and a bathroom. It would include a garage door, a new front entrance, a front bedroom window, a side window at both floors, and a first-floor rear bathroom window. It would include a hipped roof, and a lean-to roof above the garage door. Materials include red brick, grey slate roof tiles, and UPVC fenestration.

The ground floor would be flush with the front elevation, and set back by approx. 0.5m at first-floor. The width would measure 4.4m, and the maximum depth 8.3m. The eaves height would measure 5m and the maximum height 7.4m.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 30/07/2024; no objections were raised.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable places

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

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping.

Extension to a corner plot:

In light of the above, paragraph 5.14 of the SPD provides guidance on side extensions to corner plots, stating that they can have an *“unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway”*. It goes on to say that *“planning permission will not normally be granted for a two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension”*. Paragraph 5.15 establishes that factors determining what constitutes *“sufficient space”* include *“the presence of a strong building line and any overriding need to protect it, the proximity of neighbouring buildings, and the space surrounding other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site and the contribution this space makes to the overall character of the street scene”*.

The proposed side extension would measure 4.4m wide, and as a result, it would extend approx. 4m beyond the building line of the houses on the east side of Sandfield Road. The houses along Sandfield Road have a strong building line, views of which are currently unrestricted when looking northwards along the road. The even building line is an important aspect of the street scene as it allows common architectural features between houses to be read collectively, and permits expansive views of the Pennines to the north.

The proposed extension would read as a conspicuous addition in the context of the existing building line and would obscure views of the houses along the east side of Sandfield Road, particularly from the pavement. Extending beyond the building line would appear irregular, and when entering Sandfield Road from the south, the extension would dominate the street scene and detract from the existing views.

Furthermore, the extension would sit on an elevated plot above the pavement on Sandfield road by approx. 1m, contributing to a more imposing and dominant appearance.

It is noted that some space would be retained around the side of the applicant property, in part due to the orientation of the application property relative to the surrounding highway network. This would however fail to fully mitigate the impact of the proposed extension as the distance between the front corner and Sandfield Drive would be obviously much less than the setback of buildings found elsewhere in the vicinity and as such would be overbearing on the street.

Overall, the proposed side extension, by projecting beyond the existing building line on Sandfield Road, would harm the character and appearance of the street scene as an imposing feature in a prominent position, and by restricting views of the street, and beyond towards the Pennines, in conflict with paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 of the SPD.

Subservience:

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the design of the host property and generally subservient to it. Measuring approx. 4.4m wide, the proposed side extension would almost double the width of the host dwelling, which currently measures 4.8m. Whilst the SPD offers no specific guidance on the width of side extensions, it is reasonable to suggest that one which doubles the width of the property would not be considered subservient.

Despite the setback at first-floor, the side extension would generally appear as a continuation of the host dwelling rather than a subservient addition. As such, the side extension would overwhelm the host dwelling and create a double-fronted property, in turn this would imbalance the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property, no. 25 Kings Road. Lastly, considering there are no other examples of two-storey side extensions seen within the vicinity, the proposed scale would appear even more excessive.

Other matters:

The proposed side and rear extensions generally follow a uniform and acceptable design. The roof form and fenestration are appropriately proportioned and arranged, whilst the matching materials integrate well with the host dwelling.

Furthermore, the proposed rear extension poses no design issues and is considered acceptable.

Conclusion:

The proposed side extension would harm the character of the street scene by extending beyond the existing building line, and appearing imposing and incongruous. Furthermore, it is not considered subservient to the host property, and would imbalance the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property. As such, the design is unacceptable and in conflict with policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the SPD, and the NPPF

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users

through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Garden Space:

In light of the above, paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable.

As the site is on a corner plot, the habitable garden space is concentrated at the side of the property, with limited space available to the rear. The proposed side extension would occupy the majority of garden space at the side, and would result in isolated patches of small garden spaces on site. Considering the proposed development would create an additional bedroom, and increase the existing bedroom sizes, it is reasonable to suggest that there would be an increase in the number of future occupants. As such, the proposed garden area would not commensurate in space or functionality for a four bedroom house and the likely increase in future occupants, and would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residents, in conflict with policies DM1 and JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Overshadowing and overbearing impact:

Due to the relationship with the applicant property, the habitable garden space to the rear of no. 23 Sandfield is limited, and a large proportion is concentrated to the south, at the side of the property. The proposed side extension would be positioned adjacent to the side garden of no. 23, to the south. The proposed side extension would therefore block a considerable amount of natural light from reaching the garden of no. 23 and reduce the amenity value of the property's already limited habitable garden space. In addition, the proposed side extension would have a considerable overbearing impact of occupants of no. 23 when using their side garden, by greatly reducing the outlook and sense of openness.

It is noted that the proposed extension would not adversely impact on habitable room windows of no. 23 through overshadowing or overbearing impact, because there are no habitable room windows on the southern elevation of no. 23, and the front windows are angled away from the development.

Notwithstanding, overall the overshadowing and overbearing impact of the proposed development on the limited habitable garden space of no. 23 would adversely affect the amenity of neighboring occupants, in conflict with policies DM1 and JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Privacy:

The proposed side extension includes additional habitable room windows to the front and side of the property. These would comply with the space standards for habitable room windows between neighbouring properties, and would therefore not undermine the privacy of occupants or neighbours.

Other matters:

The proposed rear extension would project 3m from the rear elevation, and is therefore compliant with paragraph 5.6 of the SPD. By virtue of its compliance, it would not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

Conclusion:

Overall, the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing and future occupants through insufficient habitable garden space, overbearing and through overshadowing impact towards residents of no. 23 Sandfield Avenue, in conflict with policies DM1 and JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5.

The proposed development would have no impact on the current parking arrangements and are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation

Refuse for the following reasons:

1. By virtue of the proposed two-storey side extension's siting and scale, it would extend beyond the existing building line on Sandfield Road, and would not be considered subservient to the host. The proposal would therefore have a harmful impact on the character of the street scene by appearing imposing and incongruous, and it would inherently alter the form of the host dwelling and imbalance the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property. As such, the design is unacceptable and in conflict with policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, and the NPPF.
2. By virtue of the proposed extensions scale and layout, it would give rise to unacceptable impact on occupier amenity through the erosion of the existing private garden space to an area that would be inappropriately small relative to the resultant dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed side extension would adversely affect no. 23 Sandfield Road's limited garden space through overshadowing and overbearing impact. As such, the proposed development would not comply with policies DM1 and JP-P1, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the NPPF.

Procedure 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.

Notes for the applicant

This decision relates to the following plans:

- Proposed elevations: FO 03245887/4
- Proposed layouts: FO 03245887/3
- Existing and proposed roof and site plans: FO 03245887/5
- Location plan: FO 03245887/6

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	30/08/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	06/09/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg