APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/01277/FUL

Application Number:	**18/01277/FUL**
Location:	7 Sunningdale Drive Heywood OL10 2DB
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey front extension and alterations to existing front and rear elevations
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Bendix
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
Recommendation:	**Grant subject to conditions**

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**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**N**

Location

This application relates to a detached, domestic property, sited within a residential area of Heywood. It is built in buff brick with a partially clad front elevation and a single storey front projection. A single storey, attached garage adjoins its North West side elevation.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Alterations to the front elevation of the host dwelling to create an additional front gable. This would be clad in a material not as yet specified. Two additional windows would also be inserted into the front elevation.
- A single storey front extension. This would project beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling.
- A two storey side extension. This would be built with a hipped roof and would incorporate the existing garage

Relevant History

78/D07368- Extension to Dwellinghouse. Approved

Township/Member comments

None received

Representations

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

The existing dwelling has a large gable roof where half of the gable is set further forward than the other. A significant proportion of the properties within the street scene also have front elevations with this design feature.

The proposed alterations to the front elevation of the property to create an additional projecting front gable would substantially alter the appearance of the host dwelling making it appear at odds with the character of the built forms in this locale.

The proposed two storey side extension would have a height equal to that of the host dwelling and would have a front elevation which sits in line with that of part of the front elevation. Its roof would have a considerable width. Due to its overall size and siting, the proposed side extension would compete for prominence within the street scene with the host dwelling. Furthermore, its hipped roof form would not appear in keeping with the dual pitched roof form of the main dwelling

The proposed front extension would be of a considerable width; the proposed alterations to create a split gable to the front of the property would substantially alter the appearance of the dwelling and compete for prominence in the street scene with the host dwelling. It is considered that cumulatively these proposed alterations and extensions would overwhelm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the resulting property would appear out of character with the built forms within the street scene.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

To ensure that a two storey rear extension to a residential property extension does not result in the substantial loss of light to or have an overbearing impact upon adjoining properties paragraphs 5.8 to 5.10 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (2016) stipulate that planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to semi-detached dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4 metres along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s). This distance is extended to 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the neighbouring property where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary.

The above SPD guidance is designed to be used to assess the impact of two storey rear extensions to residential properties upon neighbouring properties. However where properties are built upon a staggered building line, the impact of a two storey side extension can be analogous to that of two storey rear extension, as in this instance. Therefore, it is considered appropriate for the SPD guidance to be used:

The proposed side extension would extend approximately 6 metres beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring No.5 measured along the common boundary. As such it would not accord with the SPD guidance. It is considered that due to its considerable height, depth and siting in relation to the neighbouring No.5, it would substantially overshadow and have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of this property when viewed from its rear facing windows. It would therefore not accord with the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

By virtue of their small scale and design, the proposed front extension and alterations would not significantly overlook or overshadow any nearby properties.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

1. Due to their size, siting and scale, cumulatively, the two storey side extension, alterations to the front elevation and front extension would overwhelm the character and appearance of the application property. As a result of these alterations and extensions, it would appear out of character with the existing built forms within the street scene and would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Due to its size, siting and design, the erection of the proposed, two storey side extension would result a significant loss of light to and would have a significant oppressive impact upon the occupants of No.5 Sunningdale Drive when viewed from the rear facing windows. As such, it would fail to accord with the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document, policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy 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.

Informative

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

- Existing & Proposed Roof Plans (2018 10 01-12)
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan (2018 10 01-01 Rev A)
- Proposed Side Elevation (2018 10 01-10 Rev A)
- Existing & Proposed Side Elevation (2018 10 01-11)
- Existing: Ground Floor Plan (2018 10 01-02)
- Existing: Rear & Side Elevation (2018 10 01-05)
- Proposed: Rear Elevation (2018 10 01-09)
- Existing: First Floor Plan (2018 10 01-03)
- Existing: Front Elevation (2018 10 01-04)
- Proposed: First Floor Plan (2018 10 01-08)
- Proposed First Floor Plan (2018 10 01-07 Rev B)
- Proposed: Ground Floor Plan (2018 10 01-05)

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	27/02/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	01/03/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Osian Perks