APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/01349/HOUS

Application Number:	18/01349/HOUS
Location:	1 Rough Hey Walk Rochdale OL16 5SU
Proposal:	Two storey front and side extension and front dormer extension together with new first floor side window - Resubmssion of 18/00717/HOUS
Applicant:	
Case Officer:	Neil Harkin
Recommendation:	**Refuse**

Officer dealing with planning matters / Councillor app?	NO	**Representations?**	NO
Decision maker management interest in site?	NO	**Call up request?**	NO

Location

The application relates to 1 Rough Hey Walk an end terrace dwelling in Kingsway. The dwelling is at the eastern end of a block of 7 properties situated along Rough Hey Walk which is a pedestrian path off Moss Street. The principal elevations of these properties are ambiguous, with both the front and rear elevations appearing to be the principal elevation depending upon where they are viewed from.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes the construction of two storey side and rear extensions together with front and rear dormer extensions.

Relevant History

09/D51981 – Front And Rear Dormer Extensions And Two Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling Including The Addition Of A First Floor Window In The Side Elevation – Withdrawn June 2009

09/D52151 – Front And Rear Dormer Extensions, Two Storey Rear Extension And Additional First Floor Window In The Side Elevation Of Dwelling – Grant STC – July 2009

18/00717/HOUS – Two storey side and rear extensions and front and rear dormers – Refused – October 2018

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposed front extension and dormer extensions would constitute a dominant addition to the host dwelling and would erode the asymmetyrical design of the roof slope shared along the terrace of 1-7 Rough Hey Walk. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted SPD 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed two storey front extension would provide a poor level of amenity for existing and future occupiers of the dwelling due to the lack of light and outlook from the proposed first floor bedroom. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's adopted SPD 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development'.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent out to all surrounding dwellings and no representations have been 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): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

The proposed two storey side extension would be modest size with a sideward projection of 1.3m which would extend up to the side boundary of the site. However as the proposed side extension would sit flush with front and rear elevations of the original dwelling it could not be considered subservient, and could result in an unacceptable materials join. Insufficient information has been submitted with the

application to demonstrate that the proposed materials would result in a satisfactory appearance in the interest of visual amenity.

In addition, the proposed front extension coupled with the dormer extension would be visually dominant features which drastically alter the design of the original front elevation and would erode the asymmetyrical design of the roof slope shared along the terrace of 1-7 Rough Hey Walk, leading to an unacceptable impact upon the visual amenity of the surrounding streetscene.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed two storey front extension would be in close proximity to habitable room windows belonging to the adjoining dwelling, and as such has the potential for harm similar to that normally associated with a two storey rear extension. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to assess the impact of the front extension using the projection limits set by the SPD for two storey rear extensions. The proposed front extension would accord with these limits as it would not extend further than 2.4m at first floor level and 3m at ground floor level from the rear elevation of 2 Rough Hey Walk. As such the proposed front extension would not have an undue overbearing impact upon the occupiers of 2 Rough Hey Walk.

The proposed two storey front extension would include a bathroom window facing towards the blank side elevation of 2 and 4 Millfield Grove with a separation distance of approximately 7.8m. However as this window is not considered to be a habitable room window and would be obscurely glazed and as such would not be affected by the close proximity of the blank side elevation of 2 and 4 Millfield Grove.

However, the proposed two storey front extension would include windows facing towards the blank side elevation of 2 and 4 Millfield Grove with a separation distance of approximately 7.8m. This would not accord with the separation distance and would result in a less than satisfactory degree of light and outlook from the windows serving this room. Therefore the proposed two storey front extension would result in an unacceptable living standard for the current and future occupants of 1 Rough Hey Walk and would not accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

The SPD also sets a separation distance of 21m for upper floor habitable room windows facing towards opposing habitable room windows. The proposed two storey side extension would include a bedroom window facing toward the front elevation and habitable rooms of 119 Moss Street, with a separation distance of approximately 14.3m. As such it is considered that this proposed window would significantly reduce the privacy of the occupants of 119 Moss Street and the application dwelling.

Therefore the proposal is considered unacceptable and contrary to policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The application proposes a two storey front extension to the dwelling, however the properties along Rough Hey Walk utilise the rear yard for parking purposes accessed from Stuart Street. The application does not proposes any alterations to this parking provision and therefore is conceded acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: **Refuse**

1. The proposed front extension and dormer extension would constitute a dominant addition to the host dwelling and would erode the asymmetyrical design of the southern roof slope shared along the terrace of 1-7 Rough Hey Walk. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted SPD 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its close proximity to the front habitable room windows of 119 Moss Street, the proposed bedroom window within the eastern side elevation of the proposed two storey side extension would result in an unacceptable standard of privacy and amenity for the occupiers of 119 Moss Street and 1 Rough Hey Walk. Therefore the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted '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 relates to the following plans:

- Block and Site Plan – Revision B
- Elevations as Existing – Revision A
- Elevations as Proposed – Revision B
- Elevations and Plans as Existing – Revision A
- First Floor Plan as Proposed – Revision B
- Ground Floor Plans as Proposed – Revision B
- Second Floor Plan as Proposed – Revision B

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	04.02.2019	Signed: NH
Authorisation	08.02.2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Neil Harkin