

Application Number:	23/00372/HOUS
Location:	12 Clarkes Lane Rochdale OL12 6PY
Proposal:	Two storey side extension including alterations to existing ground floor rear doorway to a window
Applicant:	Ms Salma Mahmood
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

12 Clarkes Lane is a two-storey semi-detached property located in the Spotland and Falinge Ward of Rochdale and in the designated Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. The property adjoins to 14 Clarkes Lane and is the last in a row of semi-detached dwellings. The house is situated on slightly higher ground level than the path adjacent and faces the grounds of Spotland Primary School to the front and shares curtilage boundaries with nos. 114 and 116 Edmund Street and 15 Chaseley Road to the side and rear.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension to the dwelling projecting 4.17m from the south side elevation, set down 0.2m from the original ridge and matching the depth of the existing dwelling. The ground floor would sit flush with the existing front elevation of the dwellinghouse and the first floor would be set back 0.45m.

Permission is also sought for the slight alteration to fenestration with the existing door on the rear elevation changing to a small window.

Relevant History

06/D48180 Two Storey Side Extension to Dwelling
Refuse Dec 2006

- The proposed extension would be 7 metres away from the principal windows in the rear elevation of 16 Edmund Street, which faces the side of 12 Clarkes Lane. At present these windows maintain 10 metres to the existing gable and this is**

already below the minimum standard of 14 metres required by the council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Not – Guidelines and Standards for Residential Developments. The size of the proposal would further reduce the separation distance and this, together with the height of the proposal, would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the amenity of 116 Edmund Street. This is contrary to policy H/11 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

As the application site is within the settings of two conservation areas, the proposed development has the potential to impact the setting of the designated heritage assets. Therefore, the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 apply. This requires that the local authority pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the designated conservation areas, or of their settings. Additionally, all heritage assets require special consideration in line with P2 of Rochdale Core Strategy and GMCA's draft Places for Everyone policy JP-P2.

NPPF paragraph 200 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

NPPF paragraph 201 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

NPPF Paragraph 206 states that should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.

NPPF Paragraph 207 states that not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 201 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 202, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

Rochdale CS policy P2 states that the borough's heritage will be protected through conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets; this includes conservation areas, listed buildings, and non-designated heritage assets.

GMCA's draft Places for Everyone Plan policy JP-P2 seeks to encourage heritage place-making and states the desire to positively conserve, sustain and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets, and their settings.

Significance Assessment

The submitted heritage statement accurately identifies Saint Edmund Conservation area as being within the setting of the proposed, but fails to recognise the Spotland Bridge Conservation area as being in the setting of the proposed. Therefore any development in this location has the potential to impact the settings of both the heritage assets.

The proposed extension would disrupt the symmetry of the property's present arrangement with the adjoining property. The proposed extension would be directly visible from within Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. Under paragraph 207 of the NPPF, it is not believed that any elements of the Conservation Areas (Spotland Bridge or Saint Edmund) which contribute to their significance will be negatively affected by the proposed. However, it should be ensured that all instated materials would be in keeping with those in place at present and in keeping with the rest of the streetscape.

Details of all bricks, roof coverings, rainwater goods, windows and doors should be submitted for approval prior to instatement. All materials should be chosen to match those which are present at the building with respect to colour, texture, shape and material.

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extension would not appear to have any impact on the dwellings current parking arrangements

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

We do not expect that there would be any detrimental impact on highway capacity or road safety as a result of the proposed development.

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

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and a site notice was posted 08.08.2023 due to the siting within a designated Conservation Area. No public 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

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design and Conservation: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. Policy P2 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development to protect and enhance character, landscape and heritage. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that all new developments "should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it".

Paragraph 5.11 states "*Where two-storey extensions to 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 have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported*". Due to the neighbouring dwelling, 116 Edmund Street, featuring a siting 90 degrees perpendicular of no.12, there is no overriding need to ensure the extension meets this requirement.

It is first acknowledged the row of dwellings in which the application property is sited do not currently host any two-storey side extensions. However, the dwelling located on the corner plot northwards of the Clarkes Lane, no. 24, currently hosts a 4.7m two-storey side extension, approved November 1999 which pre-dates the current SPD which requires extensions to be subservient to the original dwellinghouse. Whilst this precedent can be used as justification for a two-storey side extension elsewhere in the street, a projection at a similar scale is not likely to be acceptable is not considered approvable today by virtue of the lack of subservience. Further to this, although the previous permission (refused 2006) was not refused on design grounds, this application also pre-dates the current SPD and Core Strategy and if put forward today, amendments would be sought to reduce this projection to produce a scheme which respect the existing proportions of the dwellinghouse.

Aformentioned above within the conservation officer's consultation comments, the side extension is considered to disrupt the symmetry of the property's present arrangement with the adjoining property due to the overall 4.17m projection from the existing side wall. The existing dwelling hosts an overall width of 6.67m therefore given the proposed extension would be over half the width of the original dwelling, therefore cannot be considered subservient to the original dwelling house by virtue of its projection in combination with the overall scale.

The facing materials of the extension are considered appropriate and would visually respect the existing build given they would match those on the existing. In the event of approval, it is deemed necessary to impose a condition stating all materials require approval from the Local Authority prior to commencement of the works. This is to ensure the brick would be an exact match to that on the existing due to the prominent location of the extension within the conservation area.

The gable roof design is considered acceptable by virtue of it matching the roof form on the existing build. Window proportions are also acceptable given they would also match those on the existing however, in the event of an approval, amendments would be sought to configure the positioning of the ground floor window on the front elevation of the extension as it does not match existing proportions and it not appropriately aligned with those on the existing.

Prior to the assessment on residential amenity being carried out, it is noted amendments were requested in order to solve the concerns surrounding the design of the proposal however, as these amendments were not received by the specified date, in order to meet the agreed EOT deadline, the application was put forward for refusal.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable by virtue of its overall scale and design and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy to which it states "All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings" and "proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties".

It is first acknowledged the previously refused permission, 06/D48180, stated a scheme of a reduced projection to that in the current application was unacceptable due to the existing separation distance between the application property and that adjacent, 116 Edmund Street, not meeting SPD Space Standards for upper floor principal windows.

At present, these windows maintain 9m to the existing gable which as stated in the previous application, is already below the minimum standard of 14m, which is still applicable today by the 2016 SPD Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development. The side extension proposed at both ground and first floor level projects 4.17m from the existing side wall which would host a separation distance from the windows at 116 Edmund Street of 5m therefore is considered to pose an unacceptable overbearing impact on the amenity of the upper floor principal windows at 116 Edmund Street located on the rear elevation.

There is not considered to be any unacceptable residential amenity posed to any other surrounding properties which share curtilage boundaries with the host properties given a characteristic of the properties in this area is substantial rear garden space therefore the extension is considered to be constructed a sufficient distance away from those surrounding.

It is noted the side extension would compromise much of the amenity space to the side of the dwelling however this is not thought to be unacceptable given the dwelling hosts substantial garden space to the front, side and rear of the dwelling.

The proposed works ensures the provision of a suitably sized rear garden would be retained post-development. The works would also not pose any detrimental impact to the provision of adequate light and outlook to existing internal rooms of the host property.

In view of the above assessment, the presence of a side extension close to the rear principal first floor windows at 116 Edmund Street are considered to pose an overbearing impact by virtue of a 5m separation distance which is considered to worsen the already insufficient distance therefore not constructed in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

In line with comments from the highways officer, the property does not currently host any on-site parking arrangements therefore the development is not considered to impact current arrangements and therefore are acceptable. The extension is also not proposed to encroach onto any adjacent path or highway therefore not considered to pose an issue to highway or pedestrian safety.

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

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, design and scale, the proposed two-storey side extension is considered a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling house by virtue of the overall projection when viewed in conjunction with the overall scale. 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
2. By virtue of its siting, design and scale, the proposed two storey side extension would reduce the separation distance between the upper floor rear windows on 116 Edmund Street and the gable end of the extension posing an unacceptable overbearing impact to these principal windows. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	14.09.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	18.09.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant:

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

- Location Plan
- Proposed Block Plan
- A102 Side Extension

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo