APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00374/HOUS

Application Number:	19/00374/HOUS
Location:	8 Tern Close Rochdale OL11 5QU
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Mohammed Arshad
Case Officer:	John Van Eker
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/A**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**N/A**

Location

The application relates to a two storey detached property located in the Bamford area of Rochdale. The property is adjacent to no. 10, sited to the north of the application site and owing to a staggered relationship between properties and an end of cul-de-sac position, the property is adjacent to no. 6 Tern Close also however no. 6 is located west, to the front of the property. The property benefits from a wraparound style garden and shares the side and rear boundary with nos. 1,3, 7, 9 and 11 Petrel Close.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for a two storey rear extension to the property. The proposed extension would be sited to the north west corner of the property and site and feature a hipped roof. The proposed extension would project 4m from the rear elevation at both ground and first floor level and have an overall width of 4m when measured against the rear elevation of the property.

Relevant History

04/D42954
Two Storey Side Extension To Dwelling
Refused 17/03/2004
Reason: Policy H/11 of the Unitary Development Plan sets out criteria against which applications for residential extensions are to be assessed. It states that extensions should not unduly affect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents through overlooking, overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight. The document

'Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) - Standards for Residential Development' establishes standards for distances between and around dwellings to protect amenity. The distances between the rear elevations of 1 and 3 Petrel Close and the gable of the proposed extension would be approximately 10.5m This would be approximately 3.5m closer than that which would be considered acceptable when applying the SPG standards. This reduction in standards would result in a loss of amenity for the residents of 1 and 3 Petrel Close as the proposed extension would dominate the aspect from the rear elevation and gardens of those houses.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties and no letters of representation have been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

- The proposal includes the use of materials to match existing which is considered to be acceptable at this location.

- In addition the two storey rear extension would be sited to the rear of the property and have a limited impact on the streetscene at this location. The proposed hipped roof and ridge height, slightly lower than the original ridge, would also help reduce the impact of the proposed extension.
- Overall the two storey rear extension would have a satisfactory design that would be a compatible match to the original property and have a limited impact on the streetscene.
- The design of the proposed front extension is therefore acceptable to accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- The Council's SPD offers guidance in respect of two storey rear extensions and states that the following maximum standard applies: '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)'
- Owing to the positioning of neighbouring property, no. 10 is the only adjacent property that can be assessed against this piece of guidance. Adjacent no. 10 already has a two storey rear elevation which projects further than the existing rear elevation of the application property.
- In addition, as the proposed extension will be set away from the boundary the proposed extension would not project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjacent no. 10.
- The proposed rear extension would therefore satisfy this element of the SPD and would not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent no. 10.
- In addition to the above, the Council's SPD also provides guidance in respect of minimum space standards to be retained in relation to new householder development. Section 4.1 explains a requirement for a minimum distance of '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 extension would feature first floor habitable room windows facing towards the rear boundary sited approximately 8m from the shared rear boundary, which falls significantly below the minimum of 10.5m. In addition, the distance between the windows of the extension and those at the rear of no.9 Petrel Close, at approximately 18.5m, would not meet the minimum of 21 metres. The proximity of these rear facing windows in relation to the rear boundary would therefore result in significant loss of privacy of the windows and rear gardens of the properties to the rear.
- Whilst there are a number of evergreen trees sited directly behind the property along the rear boundary that would have the potential to screen the development to neighbouring properties on Petrel Close, there is no guarantee that these trees/hedge will remain in place to protect the amenity of current and future occupiers.

- From assessing the potential impact of the proposed extension upon the amenity of all surrounding neighbours, it is considered that no other dwellings would be significantly affected as a result of the proposal.
- The proposal would impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in therefore contradictory to policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Recommendation: Refuse

1. As a result of the proximity of the first floor windows of the proposed rear extension to the boundary shared with nos. 9 and 11 Petrel Close, the proposed development would result in a significant loss of privacy and amenity to the rear windows and garden areas of these neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

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

- Existing & Proposed Floor Plans, Drawing No. BUILDING/26158192-A
- Existing & Proposed Front & Rear Elevations, Drawing No. BUILDING/26158192-B
- Existing & Proposed Side Elevations, Drawing No. BUILDING/26158192-C
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans, Drawing No. BUILDING/26158192-D

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	09/07/2019	Signed: JVE
Authorisation	17/07/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author John Van Eker