APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01597/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01597/HOUS
Location:	6 Greenwich Close Rochdale OL11 5JN
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension including steps leading to garden, Juliet balcony and additional windows to east and west elevation (Resubmission of 20/00264/HOUS)
Applicant:	Mr Akhtar Shah
Case Officer:	Richard Whittaker
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**

Background

This application is submitted following the refusal of 20/00264/HOUS with the application proposing the same development.

Location

The application relates to 6 Greenwich Close, Rochdale, OL11 5JN, a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse in Bamford. The property is situated within a residential area which exhibits a predominance of two-storey detached dwellings.

The application site exhibits a rear garden which slopes downward from the dwelling toward the rear elevations of nos.17, 19, and 21 Wordsworth Way.

The boundary treatment to the rear comprises of a 1.8 metre boundary fence and 4no mature trees.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

The proposed extension would project 4 metres from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling at the full width of the dwelling (11.5 metres). The extension would feature a lean-to roof which would reach a maximum height of 4.4 metres (when measured from the floor level of the existing dwelling – 5.3 metres from the ground level of the proposed rear elevation) and a height to eaves of 3.2 metres (4.1 metres when measured from the ground level of the proposed rear elevation).

The proposed extension would feature a Juliet balcony to the rear.

Relevant History

06/D47719 - Single Storey Front Extension To Dwelling – Approved 13.09.2006

91/D27019 - Single Storey Extensions To Side Of Dwellinghouse And Rear Of Attached Garage And Formation Of Canopy To Front Elevation – Approved 10.09.1991

20/00264/HOUS - Single storey rear extension including steps leading to garden, juliet balcony and additional window to north west facing elevation – Refused 16.06.2020

> Reason - By virtue of its siting and design, the proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity, due to loss of privacy to the rear windows and rear garden area of neighbouring 21 Wordsworth Way. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties. No letters of representation have been received.

Consultations

N/A

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1, P3, SPD

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development, developments are visually attractive, developments are sympathetic to local character, developments establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that all development proposals are expected be of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should enhance the borough's identity and sense of place, 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.

Whilst a 4 metre extension does noticeably increase the footprint of the dwelling, the proposed works do show subservience to the existing building with design features that are sympathetic and in keeping with the host dwelling thereby according with paragraph 5.1 of the SPD.

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, SPD

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all developments should demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD sets out the following guidance for space standards in terms of distances between dwellings.

"4.1 Although it is expected that most new development will have some impact on neighbours, it is important to ensure that the impact is not so significant that it results in unacceptable harm. All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings. The following minimum space standards will be applied to all new

residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties:

> (i) 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;
>
> (ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
>
> (iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room."

Paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7 of the SPD sets out the following guidance for single storey rear extensions.

"5.6 The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions:

- For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);
- For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

5.7 The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any extension if one exists close to the common boundary. 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."

With regard to the relationship between the application property and its north western neighbour (no.4 Greenwich Close), it is noted that no.4 exhibits a conservatory to the rear projecting 3.4 metres from the rear elevation of the original building. As a result the proposed works would be in accordance with the guidance and would result in very little loss of light for the neighbouring property.

With regard to the relationship between the application property and its south eastern neighbour (no.8 Greenwich Close), it is understood that no.6 and no.8 share a near-uniform rear elevation, however the proposed extension would project a distance slightly further than 4 metres (0.2 metres) beyond the rear elevation of no.8. It is recognised that a 45 degree angle taken from the relevant point along the common boundary would be interrupted by the proposed rear extension by a matter of centimetres. This is not considered sufficient enough of a reason to warrant refusal, furthermore the orientation of the locality ensures a sufficient level of sunlight would still be enjoyed by no.8 due to its south west facing angle.

The relationship between the application dwelling and its rear neighbours (to the south west) is unorthodox due to the topography of the area which results in a disparity in ground level. The proposed single storey extension would effectively impact the rear elevations of nos. 17, 19, and 21 Wordsworth Way in the same way a two-storey rear extension would impact its rear neighbours in a locality that exhibited a flat topography. As such it is appropriate to use the guidance from paragraph 4.1 of the SPD that states that there should be 21 metres 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 application site exhibits a rear boundary treatment that features 4no mature trees and a 1.8 metre fence. Whilst these trees do interrupt the distance between

the properties they do not form a consistent barrier with the windows of habitable rooms visible from the application dwelling. This situation is exacerbated by the elevated the application site is located upon.

The proposed works would result in a 9.5 metre distance between the rear elevation of the application dwelling and the boundary treatment which does not comply with the guidance.

Whilst the proposed works would retain a 22 metre distance between the application dwelling and no.19 Wordsworth Way which does accord with the guidance, the extension would result in a distance of 17 metres between the proposed Juliet balcony and the rear bedroom window of no.21 Wordsworth Way which does not comply with the guidance.

The application proposes the installation of a window along the north-west facing side elevation of the application dwelling at ground floor level. This window would service a dining room and would be the sole window the room would benefit from. The level of light and outlook reaching this room would be limited, however this is not considered sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal of the application.

When considered in the context of the locality the proposed works are concluded to result in a loss of privacy for the rear first floor windows of no.21 Wordsworth Way. Whilst the trees along the boundary treatment provide a screen between the dwellings their inconsistent nature would not provide a sufficient barrier to ensure the privacy of no.21 is maintained. The works would also result in a loss of light and outlook for a habitable room within the application property.

The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of no.21 Wordsworth Way through loss of privacy. The proposal is therefore in contrast to policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways: DM1, SPD

The proposed works would retain sufficient off-road parking to service the dwelling. The proposal would retain sufficient space for bin storage.

It is therefore considered that the proposed works are acceptable in terms of their impact upon the surrounding highway network, in accordance with relevant policy.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons

1. By virtue of its siting and design, the proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity, due to loss of privacy to the rear windows and rear garden area of neighbouring 21 Wordsworth Way. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the residential amenity aims of 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.

Informatives

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Site Location Plan, Block Roof Plan (Proposed), Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. 1 of 6 Rev E
- Site Location Plan, Block Roof Plan (Proposed), (Proposed) Roof Plan – Drawing No. 1 of 6 Rev E
- Existing Elevations and Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 2 of 6 Rev A
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan, Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans – Drawing No. 3 of 6 Rev E
- Proposed Side and Rear Elevations – Drawing No. 4 of 6 Rev B
- Proposed Side Elevation – Drawing No. 5 of 6 Rev C
- Drawing Notes – Drawing No. 6 of 6 Rev 0

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	01.03.2021	Signed: RW
Authorisation	04.03.2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Richard Whittaker