

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00134/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00134/HOUS
Location:	22 Seatallan Drive Hollins Middleton Rochdale M24 5AF
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Ashley Humphreys
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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?	N/A
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to 22 Seatallan Drive, a two-storey detached property in Middleton. Seatallan Drive forms part of a new residential estate comprising detached and semi-detached housing of a similar design and material palette.

22 Seatallan Drive faces west, overlooking a large driveway and the eastern elevation of no.24. It is flanked by no. 20 Seatallan Drive to the south and 14 Loughrigg Drive to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces east and borders the front driveways of 16 & 18 Loughrigg Drive.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension with a pitched roof, using red brick and grey slate roof tiles. The extension would include a ground floor window and a set of double doors, as well as two first floor windows to the rear.

The extension would measure approx. 7.2m in width, 2m in depth, 4.7m in height to eaves and 7.3m in maximum height.

Relevant History

17/00153/REM 19/09/2016:

Reserved Matters application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 90 dwellings pursuant to outline permission 16/00725/OUT.

Condition 10 – PD Rights

Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the revocation and re-enactment thereof, the dwellings at plots 64 and 88 (as identified on the approved site layout plan ref. 1439WHD/HLM/SL01 rev. W) shall not be altered or extended under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and C of the above Order except with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure an adequate standard of amenity in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 07/03/2024 – no comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable places

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The proposed extension follows a uniform and modest design and is acceptable based on the following principles:

- It would be subservient to the host property as it would not exceed the ridge line or party walls of the house;
- The windows are well proportioned and suitably arranged;
- It uses matching materials including red brick, grey slate roof tiles, and UPVC windows;
- The roof form integrates with the host dwelling.

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

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD establishes minimum space standards between properties to prevent new development from causing "a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings". As such, the SPD requires a minimum distance of 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level. The existing arrangement falls slightly below the requirements of the SPD precisely 19.7m. The proposed extension would therefore reduce this distance by 2m to below 18m to the front facing habitable room window of no.18 Loughrigg Drive. Plans under the aforementioned application - 17/00153/REM – indicate that the first floor window to the front elevation of 18 Loughrigg Drive serves the primary bedroom of the dwelling which would almost directly face the proposed rear extension.

In failing to comply with the minimum space standards set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on residential amenity by reducing the levels of privacy below that which are deemed acceptable.

It should be noted that the officer's report for application 17/00153/REM states that "relationships between dwellings within the site largely comply with the Council's SPD separation distances". The implication being that the houses were laid out in satisfactory manner with regard to the minimum standard, and any decrease in these standards would not have been deemed to be acceptable as it would lead to unacceptable relationships between dwellings.

Given the proposed extension would fail to comply with the requirements of section 4.1 of the SPD the proposal would reduce the privacy afforded to both the application property and no.18 Loughrigg Drive to an unacceptable level and would therefore fail to comply with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed extension would have no impact on the current parking arrangements which fulfil the maximum standard set out in appendix 5 of the CS and is therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed extension would reduce the separation distance between the directly facing upper floor bedrooms of both the application property and no.18 Loughrigg Drive to 17.7m and therefore fails to comply with the requirements of section 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document. By reason of the reduced

separation distance between facing upper floor habitable room windows, the proposed extension would give rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy to the existing and future occupiers of both dwellings and therefore fails to adhere to the stringent requirements of Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework which above all seek to ensure that new development creates places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Procedure 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	15/04/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	17/04/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Informative:

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

- Site location plan
- Proposed floor plans and elevations: 24.0001.SC2B
- Existing and proposed block plans: 24.0001.1

Report Author Hamish Rigg