APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00275/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00275/HOUS
Location:	26 Camberley Drive Rochdale OL11 4AZ
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Sohail Sabir
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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 26 Camberley Drive, a detached bungalow located in a residential area in Rochdale.

Description of Proposal

The applications seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension.

Relevant History

20/01351/HOUS Proposed single storey rear extension
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

12/55656/HOUS Single storey rear extension to dwelling.
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

04/D44725 Erection Of One Detached Dwelling And Partial Demolition Of No.26 Camberley Drive.
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties and one objection has been received. The objection has been summarised below.

- Size and Scale of Proposed Total Development – When added to the two previous applications that have been approved (one built (12/55656/HOUS) and one not built (20/01351/HOUS)), it would lead to a disproportionate addition and inappropriate overdevelopment of the plot. Would result in an increase in floorspace that would be 35% of the original dwelling.
  Officer comments: Discussed in the design section of the report.

  Loss of privacy – Would result in a considerable loss of privacy to neighbouring garden and lead to overlooking.
  Officer comments: Discussed in the amenity section of the report.

  Loss of outlook and overbearing - size of the overall extensions would have an overbearing impact, cause visual intrusion, overshadowing and loss of outlook. It would be contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, SPD and UDP policy H/11.
  Officer comments: Discussed in amenity section of the report. Policy H/11 of the UDP has been deleted and replaced by policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

  The proposal by reason of its siting, scale and massing would result in a dominant form of development to the detriment of surrounding properties and could set a precedent for the locality and is contrary to the UDP H/11 Residential Extensions
  Officer comments: Discussed in the design section of the report. Policy H/11 of the UDP has been deleted and replaced by policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

  Overdevelopment of the plot has already led to a distinctly oddly shaped property with the original integral garage being removed, and the first rear extension is visible from the street and has changed the street scene.
  Officer comments: Discussed in the design section of the report. The existing extension is not a consideration in regards to its impact on the street scene. The report can only consider the proposed extension.

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

- It is noted that there is considerable variation in design, siting and massing of properties along Camberley Drive. The properties on the opposite side of the road of no. 26 are two storey properties. The properties on the same side as no. 26 are bungalows. However, there is a variation in design, siting and massing of these bungalows. There are a number of properties that have seen considerable extensions take place, which has led to the variations. There is a variation in design methods used, height, roof pitch, facing materials used on elevations (brick, stone and render), orientation and fenestration. Some of the properties are set further back and enjoy larger front gardens, whereas others are set closer to the highway. It is therefore considered there is no set design character of the area.
- The proposed extension would have a flat roof with an overhanding roof. This would differ in design from the existing property and therefore would not be in keeping with the host property. However, due to the orientation of no. 26, the host property and the neighbouring properties, the proposed extension would be sufficiently screened from the street scene to unduly impact on visual amenity of the street scene.
- The objection believes that the proposed extension with the addition of the previous application would lead to an overdevelopment of the plot. It was noted in the objection letter than the proposed extension would lead to a floor space increase of 35% over the original property. The SPD provides guidance of 35% for developments located in the green belt. It is noted that the property is not located in the green belt. However, when the proposed extensions plus the existing extension are added together, it would see an increase in footprint of only approximately 43% over the original property. Additionally, the characteristics of a property and proposal will vary and each proposal should be judged separately. There will be occasions when such an increase would be considered disproportionate and other occasions when a greater increase may be considered proportionate. It is noted that the property enjoys a large garden to the front, and in particular, to the rear. It is considered that the addition of the proposed extension would not lead to an overdevelopment of the plot.
- The objection considered that the siting, scale and massing would result in a dominant form of development to the detriment of surrounding properties. It is

noted that there are a number of properties on Camberley Drive that have a similar or larger footprints than no. 26 would have with the addition of the proposed extensions. The proposed extension would be to the rear, as is the existing extension. The proposed extension would be sufficiently screened from the street scene by the host property and the neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not lead to a dominant development that would be detrimental to the neighbouring properties or the street scene.

- The proposed extension would be a modest addition that would be subservient to the host property.
- The fenestration is considered acceptable.
- On balance, 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

- Due to no. 26 and no. 28 siting on corner plots, the rear of the properties angle away from each other, with the side elevation of no. 26 being almost parallel to the rear elevation of no. 28. The standard SPD guidance would not be applicable for such a proposal. There are windows on the side elevation of no. 28 that face towards no. 26. The proposed extension would at its shortest point be approximately 11.3m from the shared boundary with the neighbouring property of no. 28. At its shortest point, the proposed extension would be approximately 21.8m from the side elevation of no. 28. Furthermore, it is noted that primary habitable windows on the rear would not face the proposed extension. Considering the orientation of the properties and the distance between the two properties, it is considered that the addition of the proposed extension would not lead to undue overshadowing, loss of outlook or a loss of light to the occupants of no. 28.
- The proposed extension would have glazed bifolding doors to the southeast and southwest elevations. The bifolding doors on the southeast elevation would face towards to the neighbouring property of no. 28. Due to the angle of no. 26, the bifolding doors would face to the rear part of the rear garden of no. 28. It is noted that there are a number of trees towards to the rear of no.28 and the part of the garden that southeast elevation would face would be sufficiently screened by the landscaping and the detached garage located in the rear garden of no. 26. Additionally, it is noted that the proposal is for a single storey extension which would not result in overlooking from an elevated position. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposed lounge would have bifolding glazed doors to the rear, therefore if required, it could be conditioned to be obscure glazing. However, due to the orientation of the proposed extension, the single storey nature of the proposed extension, the landscaping and the detached garage, it is considered that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the privacy of the occupants of no. 28.
- It is considered that proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the other neighbouring properties.
- The proposed extension would leave the room labelled as ‘bedroom’ without direct access to an external window. A bedroom room is considered to be a habitable room and therefore requires sufficient light and outlook. The lack of provision of a suitable window in the bedroom would result in an

unacceptable standard of residential amenity through neglecting to provide an adequate level of light and outlook. It is noted that at present, the room receives limited light and outlook owing to the siting of the existing window, however, the addition of the proposed extension would see this removed.

- It is therefore considered that the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the applicant property and therefore would not be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- The property would retain amble off-street parking space with sufficient space for at least 2 vehicles. Therefore the provision of off-street parking spaces would accord with the maximum parking standard contained within Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy.
- The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed single storey rear extension would result in inadequate light and outlook for the room labeled as 'bedroom' to the detriment of the amenity of its occupiers. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Standards and Guidelines for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

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

- Location plan
- Existing Ground Floor Plan and elevations – Drawing No. 1656A/1
- Proposed ground floor plan and proposed site plan. Drawing no: 1656A/2
- Proposed elevations and existing site plan. Drawing no: 1656A/3

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	07/05/2021	Signed: MM
Authorisation	11/05/2021	Signed: EH