

Application Number:	22/01525/HOUS
Location:	71 Shelfield Lane Rochdale OL11 5XY
Proposal:	Two-storey side and single storey rear extension, alteration to front and rear dormers including addition of pitch roof following demolition of existing rear conservatory
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Wayne And Jenny Jakeman
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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

The application relates to 71 Shelfield Lane, a two-storey semi-detached dormer bungalow located in the Norden ward of Rochdale and in a defined urban area. The dwelling benefits from generous front and rear garden space with a detached garage to the rear together with both front and rear dormers. The dwelling currently hosts a 3m rear conservatory which is to be demolished to make way for the proposed works. The property is sited on a residential estate that comprises a mixture of dwelling types, forms, scale and design, with a medium-high degree of uniformity. The dwelling sits adjacent to 69 Shelfield Lane at the east, 73 Shelfield Lane at the west, 70 Shelfield Lane to the front, and the rear curtilage boundary borders the rear garden of 6 Highfield Road.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension projecting 2.4m from the existing side elevation to reach the common boundary shared with 69 Shelfield Lane which includes the continuation of the front and rear dormer.

Permission is also sought for a single storey rear extension in lieu of the existing conservatory projecting 3.2m from the existing rear elevation with an overall height of 3.8m at its highest point and proposed to project the full width of the rear elevation. The eaves height of the dwelling will increase from 2.9m to 5.6m to which the significant changes to the eaves would result in the dwelling effectively becoming two storey in design.

The material palette of the extension is sought to match that on the original dwelling.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. One letter of representation was received.

Objection Letter

- ☐ No planning permission obtained for existing rear conservatory

Officers Comment: *Conservatory does not extend beyond 3m and is single storey therefore can be constructed under Permitted Development Rights and will not require planning permission*

- ☐ Existing conservatory blocks light to surrounding rear gardens to which the new extension will block more light with increased height

Officers Comment: *See amenity section of report*

- ☐ Concerns to external drainage in rear extension

Officers Comment: *See design section of report*

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

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF also states “Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents...”. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape.

Paragraph 5.11 sets out guidance for side extensions to which it states “where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, which can harm the character of the property and the area”. In order to avoid any “terracing effect” paragraph 5.12 of the SPD requires that two storey and first floor side extensions that are within 1m of the site boundary will not normally be permitted unless either:

- (i) The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house; OR
- (ii) The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house

Proposed plans indicate that whilst the two-storey side extension would be constructed up to the common boundary, both the ground and first floor would be flush with the existing front elevation therefore not in accordance with paragraph 5.12 of the SPD however would principally respect the building line amongst the dwellings in immediate adjacent settings.

It is acknowledged that whilst the eaves height will be increased creating a significant height difference between the host dwelling and those other side, this is not thought to be enough to outweigh the harm the two-storey side extension will pose. Additionally, the ridge height would match that on the existing dwelling therefore not subservient to the host dwelling therefore it is considered the two-storey side extension would form an unacceptable addition to the dwelling.

The single storey rear extension will be constructed in lieu of the existing conservatory with a similar projection and also spanning the full width of the rear elevation however, with an alternative roof type. The new extension will be constructed with a lean-to roof and is considered to form an acceptable addition to the dwelling.

It should be noted the application property is situated between a cluster of six semi-detached, all with a high degree of uniformity utilizing the same material palette together with front and rear dormers and similar design features. The increase in ridge height would see the dwelling increase substantially in scale in comparison to the cluster of dwellings which would be an incongruous addition and would appear disproportionate to the adjacent dwellings either side therefore unacceptable.

The alteration the both front and rear dormers regarding a continuation onto the side extension and slight reduction in overall height would form suitable additions given will retain a similar scale to those on the surrounding street scene.

The proposed material palette is sought to match that on the existing therefore acceptable.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF. The two-storey side extension would not visually respect the form of the original dwelling as well as forming a disproportionate addition and being out of character within the surrounding cluster of semi-detached dwellings.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets out guidance for single storey rear extensions to which it requires a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

It is acknowledged the adjoining dwelling, no.73, has not been the subject of any extensions to the rear therefore the 3m rear extension would be acceptable when measured from a point 3 metres along the common boundary from the rear elevation of no.73. With the proposed plans indicating the rear extension will not project any further than the existing conservatory currently in place, the marginal increase in height would result in minimal impact to the adjoining neighbour and is not thought to be so significant that it would be unacceptable. The rear extension is also not thought to present any additional drainage concerns as a result of a projection at a similar scale to that currently in place.

Given the two-storey side extension is proposed to be constructed up to the site boundary between no.71 and no.69 Shelfield Lane, in the instance the overall scheme was acceptable, in order to avoid any potential further overlooking to the rear garden of no.69, it would have been deemed appropriate to condition the rear window of the side extension to be obscurely glazed as this window would host a bathroom.

Section 4 Space Standards of the SPD requires “21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level”. The separation distance between the first floor window on the front elevation of the two-storey side extension and the adjacent property, no.66 Shelfield Lane, would be 22m therefore in accordance with Section 4 of the SPD.

Space Standards also requires “10m between directly facing principal windows and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room”. It is acknowledged the adjacent house to the east, no.69 Shelfield Lane, currently hosts a window to the first floor of the west side elevation directly facing the hallway window of the application property. Whilst it is considered some light will be lost to the window on the adjacent house, the harm is not thought to be so severe it would be

unacceptable given it is not a principal window to a habitable room therefore in accordance with Space Standards.

Situated with the rear garden facing south, the single storey rear extension would gain a sufficient amount of light as a result of the orientation of the house as well as from the three proposed roof lights. It is also considered all rooms in both the existing dwelling and extension would receive sufficient light and have sufficient outlook.

Sufficient garden space is to be retained to the rear post development. With the extension constructed up to the common boundary, this would eliminate the existing side entrance from the front garden to the rear however the loss of space is not thought to be so significant it would be unacceptable.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Proposed plans indicate the property will increase from a 3-bed to a 4-bed dwelling. Give the dwelling currently hosts a driveway to the side sufficient for approx. 2 designated car parking spaces, the proposal would accord to Appendix 5 Scheduled Parking Standards which requires 2 spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed houses outside the town center.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: REFUSE

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed two-storey side extension would represent an incongruous form of development and not appear to visually respect the built form and character of the host dwelling. The extension would appear at odds with the character of the surrounding dwellings, resulting in visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	27.03.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	03.04.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant:

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

- 27.10.22 6 LOCATION PLAN
- 27.10.22 4 PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT

- 27.10.22 PROPOSED EXTENSIONS

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo