APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00345/HOUS

Application Number:	19/00345/HOUS
Location:	12 Botany Close, Heywood, OL10 4QZ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Applicant:	Mr Dale Rogers
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
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/A**

Location

This application relates to a semi-detached domestic property sited within a residential area of Heywood. It is built in buff brick with concrete tiles to roof and render at first floor level.

Description of Proposal

This application seeks permission for the erection of a two storey side extension. It would have a ridge height equal to that of the host dwelling and a front elevation which sits flush with that of the host dwelling.

Permission is also sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. It would be built with a dual pitched roof and have a depth of 3.5m.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering - I am sceptical that a car can be stored entirely clear of the highway at this location given the presence of the service strip fronting the premises. I would however conclude that this strip is not used by pedestrians and any overhang would not obstruct the highway. I could not sustain an objection to this application.

Representations

One objection has been received. The objector states that the applicant repairs cars on the driveway to sell them and this causing significant noise disturbance. They are concerned that the creation of the proposed garage may result in the intensification of this use.

Officer comments- there is no reason to assume that the erection of the extension would directly result in an increase in noise disturbance.

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):

'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 5.1 of the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that extensions to residential properties should appear subservient to the host dwelling.

The side extension would have a ridge height equal to that of the host dwelling and would have a front elevation which sits flush with that of the host dwelling. It is considered that these features of the design of the extension will result in the extension not appearing as a subservient addition to the host dwelling and thus, it would not accord with paragraph 5.1 of the SPD or policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

To ensure that a 'terracing effect' does not arise as a result of two storey or first floor side extensions being built close to shared side boundaries, the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document sets out that where a side extension is within 1 metre of the shared boundary, the front elevation of the side extension should be set back 2 metres from the front elevation of the main house at first floor level or the extension should be set back 1 metre from the front elevation of the main house at both first floor and ground floor level.

The proposed side extension would be positioned within close proximity to the shared boundary and would not be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling at both ground and first floor level, thus not according with the guidance described above and would therefore result in an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene due to potential for a terracing effect.

Further to this, the pair of semi-detached properties to which the application property belongs has a symmetrical appearance. Due to its size and lack of subservience, the proposed extension would significantly unbalance the appearance of this pair of properties.

In light of the above, the proposed two storey side extension would fail to accord with the visual amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* SPD.

The proposed rear extension would be built in materials matching the host dwelling with a dual pitched roof. It would have a height and eaves height which are significantly lower than those of the host dwelling and it is considered it would be visually acceptable.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed side extension would be built within close proximity to the first floor side facing window of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10 Botany Close. As such its erection would limit outlook and levels of natural light to this window. However, the window serves a landing only (non-habitable room) and as such it is considered that the limited outlook and levels of natural light to this window resulting from the erection of the extension would not result in a significant loss of amenity to the neighbouring occupants.

The proposed two storey side extension would be positioned approximately 11.3m from the boundary shared with No.4 and No.6 Wham Bar Drive. It would also be positioned 21.8m and 19.5m from the rear elevations of No.4 and No.6 Wham Bar Drive respectively. The bathroom is a non-habitable room not normally utilised for its outlook. In light of the above, it is considered that the erection of the proposed side extension would not overshadow, have an overbearing impact upon or result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of No.4 and No.6 Wham Bar Drive.

To ensure that a single storey extension does not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents, the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document provides standards which should be adhered to. Paragraph 5.6 of the guidance document states:

'*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).* '

Paragraph 5.7 goes on to state:

'*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. This is illustrated in figures 5 and 6'.*

The proposed rear extension would extend 3.5m measured from the rear wall of the application property and therefore the adjoining property at no. 14 Botany Close. It would therefore fail to accord with the above guidance. However, it is noted that the existing conservatory occupies broadly the same footprint as the proposed extension. It is considered, that the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of the proposed rear extension would not result in a significant loss of light to or have a significant oppressive impact upon the occupants of the adjoining property.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Whilst off street parking may be reduced as a result of the proposed extension, in light of the comments received from the Highways Authority, it is not considered that there are sufficient grounds for refusing this application on highways grounds as the impact of the proposal upon the broader highway network is unlikely to be significant.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension would not be subservient to the application property, would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties to which the application property forms one half and would create the potential for a terracing effect between the application property and the neighbouring dwelling at no.10 Botany Close. As such the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the host property and the surrounding street scene and would fail to accord with the relevant requirements of the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* SPD, Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy 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:

- Site Location Plan
- Plans & Elevations (Existing) (Drawing No. 1)
- Plans & Elevations (Proposed) (Drawing No. 2)

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	02/07/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	03/07/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Osian Perks