

Application Number: 19/00679/FUL

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension

Site: 17 Knowl Close, Denton, Tameside M34 2HW

Applicant: Miss Sargeant

Recommendation: APPROVE, subject to conditions

Reason for report: The applicant is an employee of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

1. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to No.17 Knowl Close. The extension would be constructed from matching brick material with a pitched tiled roof. To the rear wall it is proposed to insert 5-pane aluminium bi-fold doors, with a small window to the front elevation to serve the new W/C.

2. SITE & SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site relates to a semi-detached, brick built dwellinghouse under a hipped tiled roof. The property is located on Knowl Close – a pedestrianised avenue located just off Anson Road, which forms part of the wider Dane Bank residential estate.

2.2 The property benefits from a front and rear garden. The property has not been extended but the two adjacent semi-detached properties, Nos.16 and 18 Knowl Close, both have single storey conservatory extensions to the rear.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 No available planning history.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

4.1 Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

4.2 UDP Allocation – Unallocated within the Denton West Ward

4.3 Part 1 Policies

1.3 Creating a Cleaner and Greener Environment

1.5 Following the Principles of Sustainable Development

4.4 Part 2 Policies

H10 Detailed Design of Housing Developments

C1 Townscape and Urban Form

4.5 Other Policies

Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document

4.6 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.7 **Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

This is intended to complement the NPPF and to provide a single resource for planning guidance, whilst rationalising and streamlining the material. Almost all previous planning Circulars and advice notes have been cancelled. Specific reference will be made to the PPG or other national advice in the Analysis section of the report, where appropriate.

5. **PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT**

- 5.1 Neighbour notification letters were issued in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

6. **RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

- 6.1 TMBC Environmental Services (Contaminated Land): has raised no objection to the proposal - recommends an informative relating to ground gas.

7. **SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES RECEIVED**

- 7.1 No representations were received.

8. **ANALYSIS**

- 8.1 In accordance with the revised NPPF and the Tameside UDP, the main issues raised by the application relate to the following:

- Principle of the development;
- Impact of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- Impact on residential amenity; and,
- Impact on highway safety.

- 8.2 The above matters are considered in more detail below.

9. **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

- 9.1 The property is situated on unallocated land and is therefore acceptable in principle.

10. **CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA**

- 10.1 Amongst other matters, Policy H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan seeks high quality design in the layout, design and external appearance of housing developments that in turn complement the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Residential Design SPD provides more detailed guidance on this matter and states that extensions should be subordinate to the original building and should apply an architectural style that reflects the existing dwelling and use materials, external fixtures and fittings that align with the existing in terms of size, style, colour and texture.

- 10.2 The single storey extension would project approximately 1.5m beyond the side elevation of the original house and approximately 3.2m beyond the original rear wall. As a result, the maximum depth of the extension along the shared boundary with No.18 Knowl Close would be some 7m and the extension would have a maximum width of 6m.
- 10.3 Given the non-excessive scale and size of the proposal, Officers are of the view that the development would read as a clear subsidiary addition and so would not unacceptably alter the scale and massing of the main dwelling, compliant with Policy RED1 and RED5 of the SPD. The extension would be constructed with matching brick and so would also represent a complimentary addition to the main dwelling, compliant with Policy H10 of the UDP.
- 10.4 Policy RED5 requires the roof of a side extension to be in the same style as the original house. Though the extension would be constructed with a pitched roof rather than a dual-pitched roof to match the main dwelling, Officers do not consider this to be visually harmful particularly in relation to the street scene.
- 10.5 Policy RED5 also states that extensions should be setback from the side boundary by 1m to help prevent a 'terracing effect' and ensure front to rear access is retained. Exceptions to this may be considered where it can be illustrated that a terracing effect will not be created and an alternative means of rear access of bin store exists or can be created. In this case, the proposed side extension would extend up to the shared side boundary with No.18 but given its single storey height, a terracing effect would not be created. However, front to rear access would be lost. Despite this, the front wall of the side extension would be setback some 2.8m behind the main frontage and so bins could be discretely stored to the side of the property without harming the character and appearance of the wider street scene. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in respect of Policy RED5 and RED10 of the SPD.
- 10.5 In light of the above Officers are satisfied that the extension is of an acceptable scale and would not unduly detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling or wider street scene compliant with Policies 1.3, H10 and C1 of the UDP and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.

11. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

- 11.1 As part of its underlying drive to promote sustainable development, paragraph 127(f) of the revised National Planning Policy Framework says that a high standard of amenity should always be sought for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy H10 of the UDP also states that new development should have no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties through noise, loss of privacy, overshadowing or traffic.
- 11.2 In order to prevent overshadowing, loss of privacy and/or a reduced outlook for neighbours, the Council limits the size of single storey rear extensions using a 60 degree lune rule. If a neighbour has an existing extension and this is the nearest habitable room window, the rule should be applied from the extension.
- 11.3 When measured from both conservatory extensions to the rear of the adjacent neighbouring properties, No.16 and No.18 Knowl Close, the proposed single storey rear extension would not conflict with the 60 degree angle rule. In light of this, Officers are satisfied that the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers would not be unduly compromised by the proposed extension.
- 11.4 There are no windows at ground floor to the two storey side elevation of the neighbouring property No.18 Knowl Close. As a result, given the single storey height, the extension would also not appear overbearing or create an uncomfortable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of this property.

11.5 Between two directly facing habitable room windows a minimum distance of 18m should be retained (RED2). In this instance, a distance of approximately 25m (at an oblique angle) would be retained between the rear wall of the proposed extension and the rear wall of the nearest property to the rear of the site (No.12 Dunkirk Avenue). The proposal would therefore exceed the minimum interface distance requirements and as a result would not result in a loss of privacy for neighbours.

11.4 In light of the above, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers in respect of light, outlook or privacy compliant with Policy H10 of the UDP and the Residential Design SPD.

12. HIGHWAY SAFETY

12.1 There would be no impact on highway safety.

13. OTHER MATTERS

13.1 None.

14. CONCLUSION

14.1 To conclude, it is considered that the application is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, UDP policies 1.3, 1.5, 1.10, OL1, OL2, OL10 and H10 together with the Councils adopted Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design and is therefore recommended for approval.

15. RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved shall be as detailed on the approved drawing 1073-210 Rev A (Proposed Plans and Elevations).
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings:
 - a. Drawing number 1073-100 Rev A (Site Location Plan)
 - b. Drawing number 1073-200 (Proposed Site Plan)
 - c. Drawing number 1073-210 Rev A (Proposed Plans and Elevations)