

Application Number:	23/00937/HOUS
Location:	102 Curzon Road Rochdale OL11 2RX
Proposal:	Part two storey / part single storey side and rear extension following removal of existing raised platform at rear
Applicant:	Mr Mohammad Rizwan
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?	NO

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

Location

102 Curzon Road is a two-storey semi-detached and corner plot dwelling located within the Kirkholt residential estate. A small portion of the vacant parcel of land which adjoins to the plot was purchased by the occupiers at 102 Curzon Road in 2017 to which permission has been sought and granted to turn this small patch of additional land into residential curtilage to which the original boundary wall has now been extended to include the edge of the newly occupied land. The property adjoins to no.104, sits adjacent to no.129 and benefits from on-site parking and a sufficiently sized rear garden.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension projecting 3m from the western side elevation and set back from the front elevation 0.5m at ground level and 1m at first floor level. The rear extension element of the proposed works would project 3m from the existing rear elevation and be set in 0.68m from the common boundary. The extensions is constructed with a hipped roof to match that on the existing and would wrap around the rear and western side of the dwelling, surpassing the existing depth. Materials are to match those on the original build.

The most recent approval granted permission for a single storey rear extension of a similar scale and siting of that proposed under this application however with a projection of 2.5m and an inset of 0.48m from the common boundary.

See below for previous attempts at a two-storey side extension for this property to which previously refused permissions proposed a 4m two-storey side extension which was deemed unacceptable by virtue of disproportionate additions.

Relevant History

18/00972/FUL

Two storey side and rear extension to dwelling together with alterations to windows on side and rear elevations including change of use of land to facilitate extension to garden (part retrospective)

Refuse December 2018

1. Due to the scale and design of the proposed two storey side/rear extension and the partial loss of the existing green space resulting from the garden extension, the proposal would result in an unsympathetic form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area. As such the proposal would fail to comply with policies G6, P1, P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the relevant parts of the NPPF and the guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (2016).
2. By virtue of the proximity of the first floor habitable room windows to the shared boundary, the proposed two storey side/rear extension would result in a loss of privacy to the rear amenity space belonging to 1 Devonshire Road. Furthermore, the proposal would result in an unacceptable standard of living for the occupants of the application dwelling through poor outlook and insufficient light to habitable rooms due to the limited distance to the two storey side elevation of 1 Devonshire Road. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

19/00321/FUL

Two storey side and single storey rear extension together with alterations to windows on side and rear elevations and change of use of land to facilitate extension to garden (re-submission of 18/00972/FUL)

Refuse June 2019

1. Due to the scale and design of the proposed two storey side extension and the partial loss of the existing green space resulting from the garden extension, the proposal would result in an unsympathetic form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area. As such the proposal would fail to comply with policies G6, P1, P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the relevant parts of the NPPF and the guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (2016).
2. By virtue of the proximity of the rear habitable room window and the side elevation of 1 Devonshire Road, the proposal would result in an unacceptable standard of living

for the occupants of the application dwelling through poor outlook and insufficient light to the habitable room. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

22/01691/FUL

Single storey side and rear extension to dwelling and change of use of land to facilitate extension to garden (part retrospective)

Granted April 2022

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extensions would seem to have no impact on current parking provision for this site, which is in line with current Council parking standards.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

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

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

Representations

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

Various amendments were sought as the initial plans proposed a 3m wide two storey side extension which was not considered at all subservient to the host dwelling.

Further to this, initial plans proposed the change of the roof form on the original dwelling from hipped to pitch with the extension being a continuation of this altered roof form. The change in roof form was considered incongruous and not considered to respect the character of the pair of semi-detached dwellings.

Reference was made to the adjacent dwelling, no.129, which obtained permission in 2017 for the construction of a two storey side extension however, it is noted this extension has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans therefore cannot act as a suitable precedent for this application in this regard.

Further amendments were sought for the removal of the wraparound element given the additional massing was considered unacceptable for the size of the dwelling as well as the repositioning of the upper floor window of the extension (and labelled as obscurely glazed to reduce any loss of privacy) given the large expanse of blank elevation on the upper floor was considered a design concern.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape.

It is first noted the most recent application approved development for a single storey rear extension at similar projection and scale to that proposed under this current application, the minor difference being the extension onto the two-storey side extension which is not considered to give rise to any additional design concerns therefore remains acceptable.

Paragraph 5.14 of the SPD states "*Extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension.*" (5.15) "*Factors that will be taken into account when determining what constitutes 'sufficient space' include the presence of a strong building line and any overriding need to protect it, the proximity of neighbouring buildings, and the space surrounding other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site and the contribution this space makes to the overall character of the street scene.*"

The dwelling itself is not considered as a corner plot dwelling however, the prominent nature of its siting next to a parcel of vacant open green space means that the dwelling is highly visible in the street scene. Plans indicate the extension would not extend beyond the front elevation of both the adjacent house to the rear or that at the host property therefore constructed to preserve the existing building line.

Paragraph 5.11 and 5.12 relates to two-storey side extensions and is therefore relevant;

(5.11) *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. Proposals that would create this sort of 'terracing effect', or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.

(5.12) 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:

- (i) The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house (Figure 8); OR*
- (ii) 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 (Figure 9).*

Whilst there is no dwelling to the immediate east of the application property, in line with the above principle, the extension is set back from the front main wall of the house in order to not unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings and would therefore retain the form of the semi-detached nature.

The removal of the existing raised platform is not considered to impact upon the visual amenity of the property.

Limited details on the material palette of the extension has been provided however, the application states the external materials on the extension will match those on the host dwelling therefore acceptable.

By virtue of reducing any overlooking impact, as raised in previous applications, the upper floor rear window on the two storey extension has been removed which now presents a large portion of blank elevation at the rear. However, it is considered that this element would appear incongruous and would not adhere to a standard of high quality design therefore unacceptable given its prominent nature from the adjacent highway.

In line with previous applications for this property, the single storey rear extension remains acceptable however, to extend the width over the side extension to form a wraparound element is considered to significantly increase the massing of the dwelling to which when viewed from the adjacent highway, is not considered to be visually sympathetic to the original scale and massing of the dwelling.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and not considered to be constructed in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Any impact to residential amenity is considered under the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets out the following guidance in relation to single storey rear 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 single storey rear extension projects 3m from the original rear elevation. As such, the proposal in this regard would not cause an undue loss of light to any windows to neighbouring properties. Although the extension is tall in overall height, it is constructed approx. 0.68 away from the common boundary shared with the adjoining property therefore is not considered to have an overbearing impact on outdoor amenity space.

The SPD does not explicitly outline guidance in relation to side extensions however previous applications raised concern to an overlooking impact by virtue of a rear window located on the upper floor rear elevation of the two storey extension. This window has now been removed thus eliminating any overlooking impact to the rear garden of 1 Devonshire Road.

It is not considered for the upper floor window located on the side elevation at 1 Devonshire Road to host a habitable room given previous applications did not flag the limited separation distance as a concern therefore the side extension is acceptable in this regard.

The separation distance between the front elevation and the adjacent dwelling to the front, 129 Curzon Road is approx. 22m. Further to this, the principal windows on the front elevation of both the side extension at no.102 and the previously approved side extension at no.129 would not directly align which is considered to reduce any impact. The side elevation of the side extension contains an upper floor window, similar to the siting of those on the existing side elevation to which it would directly face another dwelling however at an approx.37m separation distance.

All habitable rooms are to receive adequate lights and outlook and a suitable sized rear garden is to be retained post development.

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

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, scale, siting and additional massing, the proposed development is not considered visually sympathetic to the original dwelling and would present an incongruous addition which is not considered to be high quality design. The wraparound element at ground floor level at the rear is considered to create a massing which is unsympathetic to the form of the original dwelling and would undermine the nature of the existing dwelling. As such, the proposal would not 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

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. Advice was provided to potentially overcome the reasons for refusal, including suggested amendments to the proposals, but no acceptable amended plans were received. It was therefore not possible to approve the application.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	07.11.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	22.12.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant:

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

- Sheet 1 Location Plan
- Sheet 4 Proposed Plans (Received on email 06.11.2023)
- Sheet 5 Proposed Elevations (Received on email 06.11.2023)
- Sheet 6 Existing and Proposed Site Plan (Received on email 07.11.2023)

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo