APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01165/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01165/HOUS
Location:	22 Belmont Way Rochdale OL12 6HR
Proposal:	First floor rear extension with additional single storey rear extension, including alteration to fenestration to side elevation
Applicant:	Mr Aslam Pervatz
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?	**N**

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

Location

The application relates to 22 Belmont Way, a two-storey detached dwellinghouse located within a residential area to the south of Shawclough and Syke. The locality exhibits a predominance of two-storey detached dwellings.

The locality features a number of rear extensions which exhibit a range of styles and projections.

The dwelling currently exhibits a 3 metre ground floor extension

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a part-single, part-two storey extension to the rear and the alteration of fenestration along the east facing side elevation.

The proposed ground floor extension aspect would project 4 metres from the original rear elevation of the dwelling (and a further metre from the existing extension) at the full width of the existing dwelling (8.9 metres).

The ground floor extension aspect would feature a lean-to roof which would lean into the proposed first floor rear extension aspect reaching a total height of 3.2 metres and a height to eaves of 2.3 metres.

The proposed first floor extension aspect would project 3 metres from the rear elevation of the original dwelling. This would feature a hipped gable roof which would match the ridge of the original building.

Relevant History

00/D37803 – First Floor Rear Extension To Dwelling – Approved 21.07.2000

78/D06664 – Rear Extension – Approved (no date on record)

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice posted close to the site. No letters of representation have been received.

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

Amended plans were submitted to reduce the amenity impact of the proposed works on neighbouring properties.

Assessment

Design: DM1, P3, SPD

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 works would feature a roof above the first-floor extension that would match the ridge height of the existing dwelling whilst retaining subservience due to hipped gable feature.

The architectural merit of the existing building would be retained with the street scene unaffected by the proposed works.

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, SPD

Policy DM1 of the SPD 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.

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD relates to proposed single storey rear extensions and states that a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s) would be applicable to this type of dwelling with regard to single-storey extensions.

Paragraphs 5.9 and 5.10 of the SPD relate to proposed first floor or two storey rear extensions and state that permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s). However where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the 30 degree angle will be drawn from a point 3m along the common boundary from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling.

With regard to the proposed ground floor rear extension, the pattern of development within the area exhibits a staggered building line with rear elevations of the original buildings of both neighbours being set back from that of the application dwelling (no.24 being set back by 1.3 metres and no. 20 being set back 1.5 metres), and it is noted that both neighbours benefit from single storey rear extensions. With the eastern neighbour (no.20) exhibiting a ground floor rear extension that projects further than the extension proposed in this application by 0.6 metres it is recognised that no impact would be generated. With the western neighbour (No.24) exhibiting a 3.2 metre ground floor extension to the rear the proposed ground floor extension would project 2.6 metres from the associated point along the boundary and would therefore be acceptable in terms of impact on access to natural light as per paragraph 5.6 of the SPD. The proposed ground floor rear extension aspect of the application is therefore acceptable in amenity terms as per the SPD.

With regard to the proposed first floor rear extension and its relationship with no.24 to the west, whilst the proposed projection would project a distance of 4.5 metres from the first floor rear elevation of no.24, the ground floor extension at no.24 and the space generated between the two properties by the driveway of no,22 allows for the 30 degree angle from the 3 metre point along the shared boundary to be uninterrupted. Whilst the proposed rear first floor extension would be visible from the rear first floor windows of no.24, it is recognised to be acceptable as per paragraph 5.10 of the SPD.

However, with regard to the proposed first floor rear extension and its relationship with no.20 to the east it is noted that the proposed first floor rear extension would project 4.2 metres from the rearmost first floor elevation of no.20. With the shared boundary running along the side elevation of no.22, the proposed first floor projection would exceed the 3 metre mark point as set out in paragraph 5.10 of the SPD by 1.2 metres. It is therefore considered that the proposed first floor extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook from the first floor window of no.20.

The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring property no.20 Belmont Way and is not accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refusal due to the following reason

1. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of amenity for the occupiers of no.20 Belmont Way due to a loss of light and outlook to the nearest rear first floor window. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with 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.

Informatives

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Location Plan and Existing Elevations – Drawing No. Sheet 1 Rev 1 – Dated 16.12.2020
- Existing Site Plan
- Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. Sheet 2 Rev 1
- Amended Proposed Site Plan – Dated 27.11.2020
- Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. Sheet 4 Rev 1
- Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. Sheet 5 Rev 1

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	27.11.2020	Signed: RW
Authorisation	16.12.2020	Signed: AT

Report Author Richard Whittaker