APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00005/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00005/HOUS
Location:	8 Stonehill Crescent Rochdale OL12 7JW
Proposal:	Erection of single storey detached outbuilding to rear
Applicant:	Mr Anjum Rehman
Case Officer:	Richard Whittaker
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?	**Y**

CONDITIONS	**Pre-commencement conditions proposed?**	**N**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**n/a**

Location

The application relates to 8 Stonehill Crescent, Rochdale, a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse located within a residential area to the north west of Shawfield. The property is situated within a street scene which exhibits a predominance of semi-detached dwellings.

The property itself exhibits a conservatory to the rear.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of an outbuilding within the rear garden which would form a gym and a store.

The proposed outbuilding would exhibit a width of 7.3 metres (almost matching the width of the site itself) with a depth of 4 metres. The structure would feature a hipped gable roof which would reach a maximum height of 3 metres and a height to eaves of 2 metres.

Relevant History

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties. 1no letter of representation has been received requesting clarification on the scale of the development and also raising concern about the possibility of nearby trees falling on the proposed works.

Consultations

N/A

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
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, P3, SPD

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development, developments are visually attractive, developments are sympathetic to local character, developments establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that all development proposals are expected be of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.

The proposed outbuilding features elements of design that would be acceptable such as the hipped roof style as well as the brickworks and tile finishing materials that would be in keeping with the host dwelling. However, the scale of the proposed outbuilding would be incongruous with dwelling, the plot itself, and the pattern of density within the locality.

Whilst the height of the proposal is appropriate for an outbuilding, the footprint and width (which exceeds the width of the dwelling itself) of the structure would result in a development that cannot be recognised as subservient to the host dwelling and therefore would be contrary to paragraph 5.1 of the SPD.

With regard to the site itself and the pattern of development of the locality, the proposed works would not respect the context of the borough's sense of place through the resulting impact on the pattern of density of the area as the site would effectively lose its rear garden in its entirety. As a result the proposal would be in direct contradiction of Policy P3 of the adopted Core Strategy.

As such the proposal cannot be recognised as a design of high quality and as such would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and is in contrast to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1, SPD

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all developments should demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Whilst the SPD does not provide guidance on the erection of outbuildings it is noted that the proposed development would be positioned so close to the rear elevation of the existing conservatory that it would effectively impact the attached neighbour (no.6) in the same manner as a rear extension. Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD provides guidance on the erection of rear extensions is set out below.

"The following maximum standard will apply 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 application dwelling exhibits a rear elevation that projects 2.4 metres beyond the rear elevation of no.6. The addition of the proposed works would effectively result in a projection of 6.6 metres beyond the rear elevation of no.6, in contrast to the

guidance. However, given the relatively low height of the proposed building, the significant height of the fenced boundary treatment and the north facing orientation of the dwellings, the proposed works are not considered to result in an unacceptable impact upon the light access and outlook of the rear of no.6.

With regard to the nature of the impact the proposed works would have on the unattached neighbour (no.10), the impact is considered to be minimal as the dwellings are angled away from each other due to the two plots being located on a bend in the highway.

The adjacent neighbours to the rear (nos. 35 and 37 Stonehill Road) would also be shielded from any unacceptable amenity impact of the proposed works due to the substantial boundary treatment.

Whilst no internal plans of the house have been submitted alongside the application it was noted during the site visit that the conservatory itself is used as a sitting room and also provides a means of outlook and natural light access for a habitable room (kitchen/dining area). The SPD recognises the importance of outlook and access to natural light for habitable rooms, and the installation of an outbuilding at such close proximity would severely impact this amenity necessity resulting in a development that is in direct contradiction to paragraph 4.1 of the SPD.

The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the application property through loss of light and outlook and is therefore in contrast to Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways: DM1, SPD

The proposed works would retain sufficient off-road parking to service the dwelling. The proposal would retain sufficient space for bin storage.

It is therefore considered that the proposed works are acceptable in terms of their impact upon the surrounding highway network, in accordance with relevant policy.

Other Matters

A public response was received raising concern regarding the possibility of trees in neighbouring gardens falling onto the proposed development. After conducting the site visit it was considered that the trees in question do not constitute a size that would impact upon the proposed development.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons

1. The proposed outbuilding would constitute a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the application site by virtue of its scale and size and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene. The proposal therefore constitutes poor design and is contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed outbuilding would result in an undue loss of amenity for the current and future occupiers of no.8 Stonehill Crescent due to a loss of light and outlook to the rear ground floor windows of the house. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policy DM1 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, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Location Plan
- Existing Site Plan, Proposed Site Plan, Proposed Floor Plan, Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 1691/1

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	08.02.2021	Signed: RW
Authorisation	17.02.2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Richard Whittaker