

Application Number:	23/00575/HOUS
Location:	68 Fairway, Rochdale, OL11 3BZ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and extension to existing front/rear dormers
Applicant:	Barry Deegan
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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

This application refers to no. 68 Fairway, a semi-detached dormer bungalow fronting Fairway in Castleton. The property is orientated northeast towards the highway and adjoins no. 66 Fairway to the northwest. The topography increases gradually in a northeasterly direction, with the result that the adjacent property, no. 70, is located on slightly higher ground. There are no properties to the rear and the land immediately to the southwest is designated Green Belt. The subject property is situated within an architecturally similar run of three pairs of semi-detached dormer bungalows.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension complete with front and rear dormers which would be designed to be viewed as continuation of the original dwelling, with a matching ridge height, materials, roof form and dormer design.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The only highway consideration for this application would be parking provision.

The size of the extended dwelling would require the provision of two off street parking spaces to meet Council standards. We would therefore suggest that the provision of the two of street parking would benefit this application.

The servicing arrangements for the building would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Subject to the provision of parking spaces Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 outlines that all new development must "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 in general.” Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 requires “development to be of a high quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.”

The application site is a semi-detached property located on a residential street in Castleton. There are three distinct dwelling types along the street. These include semi-detached dormer bungalows, true bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses. Whilst there are variations in extensions, alterations and materials, there is a symmetry and cohesive character of development in this location. In this respect there is a balanced form and regular rhythm of development to the street.

The subject property is one of three pairs of semi-detached dwellings all with a first floor consisting of a ½ storey, with a dormer at the front and rear elevations. The dwellings are constructed in red brick with uPVC cladding. To the east of the application site the topography increases, with no. 70 at slightly higher ground compared to the subject property.

The application relates to a two storey side extension. The proposed development would be constructed in a material palette to match the original build.

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD outlines that all new development “should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.” The proposed two storey side extension would be gable roofed and would be a continuation of the host property.

The proposed two storey side extension would feature a roof design to match the main dwellinghouse. The side extension would not be set back from the dwelling’s front elevation and the ridge height of the proposed extension would not be set below the existing ridge line. As such, it is considered that the side extension would not be subservient to the host property and would comprise poor design.

Paragraph 5.11 of the SPD states that 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. To avoid the ‘terracing effect’, two storey and first floor side extensions that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary of the property will not normally be permitted unless either the first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house or 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.

The proposed two storey side extension would be designed to be viewed as a continuation of the original dwelling with a matching design, ridge and eaves height and sitting flush with the front elevation of the original dwelling. Furthermore the proposed extension would extend up to the side boundary shared with no. 70 Fairway. Therefore if this adjacent property were to replicate the proposed side extension it could lead to the two sets of semi-detached bungalows appearing as a terraced row, to the detriment of the character of the surrounding street scene.

Paragraph 3.12 of the SPD states “residential properties should include space for bins to be stored out of public view to avoid dominating residential streets.” The proposed extension would occupy the space between the original dwelling and the side boundary, a space currently used to store bins out of public view. The proposed extension would restrict any external access to the rear of the property. As such the

proposal would lead to refuse bins being stored to the front of the dwelling, resulting in a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the street scene.

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.

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.

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states “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 dwelling(s).” The submitted plans confirm that the first floor of the two storey side extension would not surpass the front or rear elevations of the adjoining and adjacent neighbouring properties.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires “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.” The proposed two storey side extension would measure approx. 25m to the front elevation of the facing property on the opposite side of Fairway (no. 67). The extension would have a 14m distance to the rear boundary of curtilage and would not face any residential properties.

The proposed side extension would be in close proximity to the upper floor window in the northwestern side elevation of no.70 Fairway, with a separation distance of approximately 2.3m. However as this is not a principal window serving a habitable room it does not require a high level of protection. It is noted that no. 70 has a front elevation window located adjacent to the proposed side extension and that the side extension would project 5m beyond this window. The proposed development would result in a loss of light and outlook to this window, however it would appear that this window is a secondary window, where the window on the rear elevation is the primary source of light and outlook to the room. Furthermore, the window on the neighbouring front elevation is already significantly overshadowed by virtue of its setback from the original front wall. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not have an undue impact upon the levels of amenity enjoyed by the occupants of no. 70 Fairway.

The plans confirm the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

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

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 drive way to one car. 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 one parking space would result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, and would be in accordance with the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, massing, scale and design, the proposed two storey side extension would be detrimental to the character of the street scene and would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling. In addition, it would contribute to a potential terracing effect between the host dwelling and no.70 Fairway that would result in the loss of a valuable break in the built form of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the visual amenity aims of 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.
2. The proposed extension would restrict external access to the rear of the property resulting in refuse bins being stored to the front of the property in public view. This would cause an unduly negative impact upon the visual amenity of the surrounding street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the 'Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy', the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD' (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework

Informative:

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

- Location Plan, Block Plan and Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations. Dated May 2023

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	10/07/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	25/07/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling

