

Application Number:	23/00304/HOUS
Location:	6 Dunster Avenue Rochdale Rochdale OL11 3RD
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Mohammad Yaseen
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	Yes

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to 6 Dunster Avenue Rochdale, a two-storey terraced dwelling located within a residential area approximately 0.5 kilometres to the south west of Rochdale town centre in the Milkstone and Deeplish ward of Rochdale. The property is situated within a locality that exhibits a classic red brick terrace theme. The terrace hosts a 3.8m two-storey rear outrigger, 2.7m in length, considered to be part of the original build, as seen throughout the row of terraces.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey flat roof rear extension projecting 3.8m from the existing two-storey outrigger, considered to be part of the original build. The extension has a total height of 2.7m and a total width of 2.6m built with a material palette that matches that on the existing dwellinghouse. The total ground space coverage of the proposed extension together with the two-storey outrigger would be 7.5m

Permission was previously sought and refused for a pitched roof single storey rear extension projecting 3.7m from the rear elevation of the two-storey outrigger with a width of 2.7m and a total height of 3.3m. Together with the two-storey outrigger, the accumulated ground space was proposed at 7.5m

Relevant History

20/01268/HOUS

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
Refused 09.12.2020

By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of amenity for the occupiers of no.4 Dunster Avenue due to a loss of light and outlook to the rear ground floor windows and an overbearing impact on the rear outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties, one letter of representation was received in support of the application for the adjoining neighbour at no 4.

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

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.

With reference to the previous application which raised no design concerns, the slight reduction in overall projection and the change from a pitched roof to a flat roof is not considered to be visually harmful to the appearance of the original dwellinghouse as the extension is modest in size and development would be to the rear therefore largely out of view from public vantage points.

The matching of the existing material palette is considered to respect the character of the original build and therefore remains acceptable.

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 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.

Further to the previous application to which the scale of the new extension would be similar to that of the one previously refused, the principle of extending beyond the existing 3.8m outrigger to form a 7.5m projection along the common boundary shared with no.4 Dunster Avenue would remain unacceptable by paragraph 5.6 of the SPD which requires "*a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*" for single storey rear extensions. It is concerned the 7.5m projection would negatively impact upon the natural light and outlook being received to the ground floor rear windows at the neighbouring property.

Furthermore, as per the previous application, the 7.5m facade would ultimately result in diminished openness for the rear garden of 4 Dunster Avenue with the presence of an extension adjoining to the two-storey outrigger along the common boundary considered to pose an overbearing impact. It is acknowledged the change in roof form would reduce the overall height slightly. However, the change is not considered to be so significant it would conform to residential amenity standards.

With reference to occupier amenity, although it is considered the extension would erode a large portion of garden space, enough space is retained for occupier needs and enjoyment as well as bin storage.

Whilst the supporting comments from the occupants of the neighbouring property are noted, it is considered that the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants at 4 Dunster Avenue posing a loss of natural light and outlook to the ground floor rear windows and an overbearing impact to the rear garden therefore is not recognised to be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of amenity for the occupiers of no.4 Dunster Avenue posing loss of natural light and outlook to the rear ground floor windows and an overbearing impact on the rear outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	15.05.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	31.05.2023	Signed: TH

Informative

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

- FO/03235825/1 LOCATION PLAN
- FO/03235825/2 PROPOSED LAYOUT AND SECTION
- FO/03235825/3 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS, EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROOF AND SITE PLAN

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo