

Application Number:	23/00514/HOUS
Location:	4 Coleridge Drive Littleborough Rochdale OL15 0RA
Proposal:	Single storey rear/side extension following demolition of existing conservatory and detached garage
Applicant:	A Dawson
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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 Coleridge Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the residential suburb of Smithy Bridge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 2 Coleridge Drive to the north-east, adjacent to no. 6 Coleridge Drive to the south, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilages of nos. 23 and 25 Laurels Drive. The property comprises a detached flat roof garage to the rear curtilage and a driveway to the side elevation of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey wraparound extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory and detached garage. The extension comprises an attached garage, utility room and living room space and projects 6m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling and approx. 2.59m from the side elevation of the host dwelling, with a total width of 8.09m and a total depth of approx.

9.01m. It is characterised by a gable-fronted roof and has a ridge height of 3.79m and an eaves to height of 2.55m.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

82/D13507 - Car Port - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

It would appear that proposals include an internal garage and adequate external parking provision for the size of the extended dwelling.

The servicing arrangements for the building would remain unchanged.

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

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments 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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 134 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 such as design guides and codes.”*
- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“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.”* In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ❑ The proposal seeks to construct single-storey wraparound extension to accommodate additional living space, a utility room and to replace the existing detached garage. The resulting development would have a width of 8.09m and a maximum depth of approx. 9.01m. Notwithstanding the single-storey form, the additional floor space constitutes a 123% increase of the original building and would appear an overly dominant and incongruous addition to the dwelling.
- ❑ By virtue of the substantial 6m projection and the extension occupying the full width of the host curtilage, the resulting form of the proposed extension would also relate poorly to the proportions and regular built form of the existing dwelling and would not appear in keeping.
- ❑ Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed development is largely to the rear of the host dwelling and only the side projection would be visible from the

street scene, the proposed extension would nevertheless be prominent from the rear elevations of surrounding properties along Coleridge Drive, Laurels Drive and Little Clegg Road given the open aspect nature of the rear curtilage space.

- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development is not considered to be well-designed and would result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does 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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ❑ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* In particular, Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard 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).”*
- ❑ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 4m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the existing rear conservatory of adjoined no. 2. As such, it is considered the proposed extension would result in undue amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers by means of loss of light to the rear conservatory windows.
- ❑ Along the common boundary with adjacent no. 6, the proposed side and rear extension would occupy the footprint of the existing detached garage. Given this, and owing to the fact the eaves height of the proposed extension is marginally below the ridge height of the existing garage, it is considered the proposal would not result in significant additional amenity impacts to the occupiers of no. 6 in this respect.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, it is considered the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ❑ The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring no. 2 and would not be in accordance with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to “*provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.*”
- ❑ Notwithstanding the proposed side extension which would remove part of the existing driveway, the proposal would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, massing and design, the proposed extension constitutes an overly dominant, incongruous and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling which would result in adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to 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.
2. By virtue of its size and siting, the proposed extension would result in undue loss of light to the rear habitable room windows of adjoined no. 2 Coleridge Drive. As such, the proposed development constitutes undue harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and therefore fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ❑ Location Plan – Drawing No. 2313-01 dated 05/2023
- ❑ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 2313-04 dated 05/2023
- ❑ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 2313-02 dated 05/2023
- ❑ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 2313-03 dated 05/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	26/07/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	26/07/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen