

Application Number:	22/01315/HOUS
Location:	4 Harebell Close Rochdale OL12 6XW
Proposal:	Two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and lean to pitched roof over existing front porch following demolition of existing detached garage
Applicant:	Emily Fairburn
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?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to No.4 Harebell Close, a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on a residential street in the Healey ward of Rochdale. The property is situated next to a semi-detached dwelling (No.2 Harebell Close) and is adjoined to No.6 Harebell Close. The rear of the curtilage borders the rear yard of No. 2 Orchid Way to the East. The overall street scene features predominantly detached and semi-detached properties. The property benefits from a generous rear garden, off road parking and a detached garage to the rear.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a lean to pitched roof over the existing front porch following demolition of the existing rear detached garage. The side extension projects 2.1m from the host dwelling, extending to the curtilage boundary. It features a height to eaves of 4.8m and an overall height of 7m. The roof ridge of the proposed extension is set down approx. 0.05m. The front elevation of the extension is set back 0.2m from the principle elevation at both ground and first floor level.

The single storey rear extension spans the full width of the host dwelling and proposed side extension at 6.7m wide and has a height to eaves of 2.4m with a monopitch roof form reaching an overall height of 3.6m. It projects 2.1m from the

original elevation of the host dwelling and is within 0.04m of the site boundary. The single storey extension will feature 3 roof lights, spaced evenly across the roof slope, provides an extension to the existing kitchen as well as the addition of an office space. There will be an additional bedroom as a result of the development taking the overall number up to 3.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

7 letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. No letters of representation were 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires “development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”. Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (Adopted 2016) requires that all proposed development must “enhance the boroughs 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 in general”.
- ☐ The application relates to a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and lean to pitched roof over the existing front porch, all of which will be constructed in a material palette to match the original build.
- ☐ The lean to pitched roof over the front porch would also form as an acceptable design standard by the SPD.

- ❑ Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD regarding guidance for house extension requires that “they should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally be subservient to it”. The proposed two storey extension would be a continuation of the host property and would extend up to the site boundary. The proposed two storey extension would feature a roof design to match that of the existing with a minimal set back 0.2m from the front elevation at both ground and first floor level. The overall height of the two storey side extension would be set down 0.05m from the ridge of the original roof. Whilst the proposals include a minimal setback, it is not considered that this would be sufficient to overcome the requirement for subservience within new development, and instead would sit awkwardly next to the host dwelling where it would neither be a continuation of the design of the host dwelling, nor a visibly subservient addition.
- ❑ As detailed within paragraph 5.11 of the SPD, “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”. It is noted the detached dwelling (no.2) to the south of the application dwelling has a principal elevation which is set back approx. 4m from the principle elevation of the application dwelling, which, in addition to the change in levels mitigates any concern in respect of terracing.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, the side extension would erode all space between the application property and would be sited well forward of no.2 Harebell Close. Taking into account the limited setback from the front elevation from of the host dwelling, the extent to which it would project forward of no.2, and the lack of any architectural detailing to the south facing side elevation, the extension would comprise an incongruous form of development set in a prominent position within the street scene, and, would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area as a consequence.

Summary

In accordance with policy DM1 and policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF, in line with the above assessment, the design of the overall proposal is therefore acceptable and sufficient for design standards.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires that proposals “do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy”.
- ❑ It is noted the single storey rear extension conforms to Section 4 space standards and there are no side facing windows proposed which would face towards No.2 and No.6 Harebell Close, and the any upper floor habitable room windows would comply with the space standards of section 4 of the SPD, and the amenity of surrounding occupiers would not be unduly compromised in this regard.
- ❑ Paragraph 5.5 of the SPD states single storey rear extensions must be constructed to not pose an overbearing impact on any neighbours and would not result in undue loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers. It is noted the single storey rear extension complies with the relevant standards, including a projection of 2.1m from the host dwelling, as well as being set in 0.4m from the side boundary. Additionally, the extension is not so large that it leaves an insufficient amount of garden space remaining. The single storey rear extension is therefore acceptable by SPD standards and would form as a suitable addition to the property.
- ❑ Section 5.9 of the SPD states that planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line

drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwellings.

- ☐ Whilst the guidance contained within section 5.9 of the SPD typically relates to rear extensions and rear facing habitable room windows, it can also be directly applied to comparable situations to the front of dwellings, where occupiers would have the same expectations and requirements in respect of light and outlook.
- ☐ In considering the proposed two-storey side extension against paragraph 5.9, the proposed extension would exceed the limits of this guidance by circa 1.3m, and would unacceptably reduce the amount of light and outlook from the first floor habitable room windows of no.2.

Summary

As listed above, the impact of the proposed works regarding occupier amenity on No.2 Harebell Close would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook and have an overbearing impact on the front windows. Therefore the proposal would unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would not act in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'
- ☐ It is noted that the proposed development would reduce the space currently designated as car parking spaces to the side of the dwelling as well as the demolition of the detached garage to the rear. No parking plan is provided. While on street parking is limited in this location and the proposal would not adhere to the requirements of Appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS, it is not considered the reduction of these parking spaces and the detached garage would result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, and would be in accordance with the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By reason of a lack of subservience and limited set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, excessive projection forward of No.2 Harebell Close, general lack of architectural detailing and prominent location within the street scene the proposed two storey side extension would form an incongruous and unduly harmful form of development which would not be well designed. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the NPPF and The National Design Guide.
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed two storey side extension would have an unacceptable overbearing impact and would unduly overshadow the first floor front facing habitable room windows of No.2 Harebell Close by virtue of it siting forward of its front elevation and would not comply with section 5.9 of the SPD. The application therefore fails to adhere to Policy DM1 of the 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.

Notes for Applicant:

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

- 1636 LOCATION PLAN
- 1636 EXISTING/PROPOSED SITE PLANS/SECTIONS
- 1636 EXISTING FLOOR PLANS
- 1636 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
- 1636 EXISTING ELEVATIONS
- 1636 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	13.12.22	Signed: C.Petrillo
Authorisation	21.12.22	Signed: R.Killeen

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo