

|                            |                                                                                                                      |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | 23/01047/HOUS                                                                                                        |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 28 Uplands, Middleton, M24 1FA                                                                                       |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Single storey rear, two storey side and single storey front extensions including demolition of existing conservatory |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr Paul Raw                                                                                                          |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Bob Melling                                                                                                          |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>     | <b>Refuse</b>                                                                                                        |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>Y</b> |

|                   |                                                                             |            |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>CONDITIONS</b> | <b>Pre-commencement conditions proposed?</b>                                | <b>N</b>   |
|                   | <b>Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?</b> | <b>N/A</b> |

### **Location**

The application refers to no. 28 Uplands, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in Alkrington. The dwelling faces the highway to the east, is adjoined by no. 26 Uplands to the north and is adjacent to Alkrington Tennis and Social Club to the south. It is faced to the front by nos. 39-41 Uplands and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear garden of no. 31 Crow Hill North. The host dwelling benefits from an existing rear conservatory and off-street parking to the front and side.

### **Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension, a single-storey front extension and a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory.

The two-storey side extension would project approx. 2.85m from the existing side elevation with an eaves and ridge height to match the main roof. It would project approx. 0.51m forward of the existing principal elevation at ground floor level and the existing canopy to the principal elevation would be extended above the proposed garage door.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would project approx. 3.2m from the existing rear elevation with a width of approx. 7.25m. It would have a lean-to roof with a height to eaves of approx. 2.5m and a maximum height of approx. 3.81m.

The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match the host dwelling.

### **Relevant History**

88/D21604      Conservatory To Rear Of Dwellinghouse  
Grant STC

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

#### Highways And Engineering

The submitted plans include the provision of a garage however for the size of the extended dwelling Council standards would require the provision of two off street parking spaces. If the application can provide these two spaces Highways would raise no objection to this application.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

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

#### Electricity North West

No comments received to date.

### **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. 1 neutral representation was received in response to the proposed development. The letter raised no objections to the proposed development.

### **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 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>P3</b>         | Improving Design of New Development |
| <b>DM1</b>        | General Development Requirements    |
| <b>T2</b>         | Improving Accessibility             |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | Schedule of Parking Standards       |

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

### Amendments

Following concerns raised by the Case Officer regarding the design of the proposed development, amended plans were submitted to alter the roof form from a gable roof to a hipped roof; in-keeping with the existing roof form.

A further amendment was requested by the Case Officer to set back the proposed front wall from the existing principal elevation, however this amendment was not made.

### Assessment

#### **Design: DM1 and P3**

- ❑ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring that development is “*sympathetic to local character.*” Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states, “*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.*”
- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*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 in general.*” In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”
- ❑ Notwithstanding the use of appropriate materials and window detailing, it is not considered that the proposed two-storey side extension would incorporate sufficient design features to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling. The proposed front wall would not be set back from the existing principal elevation and the proposed ridgeline would not be set down from the existing ridgeline. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would be unduly dominant and contrary to Section 5.1 of the SPD, which requires extensions to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling.

- ② While it is noted that other properties within the street scene have constructed two-storey side extensions built up to the main front wall and set level with the main ridgeline, notably nos. 35 and 43 Uplands, these extensions were approved in 1999 and 1998 respectively and significantly predate current local and national planning policies and guidance. Furthermore, nos. 35 and 43 Uplands are not directly comparable to the application property as they differ in building style. Therefore, it is not considered that the existence of other extensions would justify the harm identified and the application has been considered on its own merits against the most up to date local and national planning policies and guidance.
- ② Section 5.11 of the SPD sets out the guidance in relation to the terracing effect. While the proposed side extension would extend up to the main front wall and close the side boundary, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a harmful terracing effect given the staggered building line as a result of the curvature of the road.
- ② In addition, the proposed bin storage arrangements would be acceptable and in accordance with Section 3.12 of the SPD, which requires bins to be stored out of public view to avoid them dominating residential streets.
- ② For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with the design of the proposed single-storey rear extension, the scale and roof form of which would be acceptable.
- ② The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

#### **Amenity: DM1 and SPD**

- ② Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ② In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
  - o *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*
- ② Additionally, Section 5.5 states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 notes the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
  - o *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
- ② The proposed two-storey side extension would sit flush with the existing rear elevation and would measure some 40m to the rear boundary of the curtilage. It would stand adjacent to the Alkrington Tennis and Social Club to the south

and would measure at least 21m to the facing properties on the opposite side of Uplands. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed two-storey side extension would impede the levels of light, outlook and privacy currently experienced by any neighbouring properties.

- ☐ The adjoining property, no. 26 Uplands, benefits from a single-storey outrigger to the rear. The submitted site plan confirms that the proposed extension would not project beyond this. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the neighbouring property.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

#### **Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5**

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ☐ The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the provision of which would be retained in the existing front driveway.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

#### **Recommendation: Refuse**

1. By virtue of its design, the proposed two-storey side extension would fail to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling which would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to 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.

#### **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, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ☐ Location Plan
- ☐ Existing Plans. Drg no. 44
- ☐ Proposed Plans. Drg no. 44B. Revised 26/11/2023

|                         | Date       | Officer    |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 04/12/2023 | Signed: BM |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 07/12/2023 | Signed: RC |

Report Author Bob Melling