

Application Number:	22/01161/HOUS
Location:	13 Moss Hall Road Heywood BL9 7JJ
Proposal:	Two-storey side, front porch extension, canopy to front elevation, render to all elevations including alteration to fenestration and additional parking at rear
Applicant:	M/s Louise Jackson
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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

This application refers to no.13 Moss Hall Road, a two-storey semi-detached property located on a corner plot between the junction of Moss Hall Road and Heap Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension which would sit flush with the existing front and rear elevations and project 4m from the existing side elevation. The proposed side elevation would sit 0.84m from the side curtilage at the rear wall and 2.34m from the side curtilage at the front wall. It would feature a gable roof and align with both the existing ridgeline and existing eaves height. The plans also indicate a front porch extension that would project 1.2m from the front elevation and have a width of 2.6m. There would also be a canopy to the front elevation, an additional parking space for one car provided within the rear curtilage, alterations to the existing fenestration and application of 'K' render to all elevations to match the colour of those properties in close proximity that have been rendered.

Relevant History

22/00029/CPL

Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed rear dormer extension.
Decision: **Grant**.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The proposed development includes additional parking for the extended dwelling with the provision of two spaces which meets the Councils parking standards. Access to these spaces is via an unadopted access road, however it would appear that private vehicular access rights have been long established so we have no concerns regarding parking provision.

The proposed extension will have no impact on the existing visibility for vehicles at the junction of Heap Street and Moss Hall Road.

The development would have no undue impact on road safety or highway capacity.

Servicing for the dwelling would remain unchanged

We would ask that the additional parking space is SUDs compliant.

Highways raise no objection to this application.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

Suggested Drainage Conditions:

Prior to the commencement of development, details of the site's proposed drainage connection(s) to public shall be provided. In addition, details of permeable paving, including a cross-section of the paving sub-base if this forms part of the sustainable drainage system, shall be provided.

Reason: To prevent an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development and to ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved Policy EM/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Drainage infrastructure will need to be implemented prior to commencement of above ground works and a scheme therefore needs to be agreed in advance of the same.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the neighbouring properties, no representations were received relating 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 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

- ☐ Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.
- ☐ Additionally, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states: *"Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents."*
- ☐ Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD advises that house extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ Paragraphs 5.11 - 5.13 of the SPD detail the requirements of side extensions in order to prevent the terracing effect, requiring two storey side extensions that fall within 1m of the side boundary to be set back from the front elevation by 2m at a first floor level or 1m at both a ground floor and first floor level.
- ☐ The proposed side extension is sited within 1m of the boundary to the rear and is not set down from the existing ridgeline, nor is it set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling. This would constitute a significant massing to the host dwelling. This would present a vast, uninterrupted roof slope that would be easily viewed from the public realm. Although the application property is sited on a corner plot, given that the adjoining property has a two storey side extension that sits flush with the front elevation (application no.89/D24399), the proposed side extension would appear to create a terracing effect with the adjoining property.
- ☐ Paragraphs 5.14 – 5.15 of the SPD outline the guidance for side extensions to dwellings on a corner plot. Given that the extension is of a significant projection from the existing side elevation and would be sited close to the

side boundary, particularly at the rear, it is considered that the development would not maintain sufficient space between the boundary. Whilst the absence of a strong building line offers some mitigation, the erosion of space would cause imbalance with no.15 Moss Hall Road and therefore harm the overall character and openness of the street.

- ❑ The proposal also seeks to apply render to all elevations. Although some properties on both Heap Street and Parth Street incorporate render, it is noted that the majority of neighbouring dwellings are constructed in brick. In this instance, it is considered that the use of render would only increase the prominence of the development from surrounding public vantage points, further highlighting the unsympathetic design of the proposal and exacerbating the visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
- ❑ The proposed construction of a porch and canopy to the front elevation would enhance the visual appearance of the dwelling and create symmetry with the adjoining property. This aspect would constitute good design.
- ❑ In light of the above assessment, the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 outlines that development should not *“adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ❑ The side elevation is sited approximately 17.17m away from the side elevation of no.15 Moss Hall Road and therefore complies with the space standards outlined in Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD. Given that the front and rear elevations of the enlargement would sit flush with the existing dwelling, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any additional harm to the neighbouring amenity and would be acceptable.
- ❑ Paragraph 5.4 of the SPD outlines the importance of retaining sufficient garden space: *“An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers. An extension that does not leave sufficient **private** [officer’s emphasis] garden space is unlikely to be acceptable.”* Although the front garden of the property will remain unaffected by the proposals, the perimeter of this space is marked by a low level boundary wall and is open aspect. The existing private patio area to the side of the property will be removed, while the additional parking space to the rear will mean that the development will not leave sufficient private garden space to meet the needs of the existing and future occupiers.
- ❑ In view of the above assessment, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the existing and future occupants of application property and would not comply with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- 2 The proposed parking arrangements would increase the parking available at the property to two car parking spaces and would therefore adhere to appendix 5 of Policy T2 of the CS.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its size, scale, design and proposed materials, the proposed development would constitute poor design and would be an incongruous addition to the host property. The extension would dominate the original build and would have a prominence which would harmfully alter the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to 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.
2. By virtue of its size, scale and design, the proposed development and rear parking space would harm the amenity of the existing and future occupiers. The extension and parking space would erode the private garden space to the side and rear of the property. The proposed development therefore fails to leave sufficient private garden space, contrary to 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.

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following drawings:-

- Proposed Elevations and Ground and Second Floor Plans drg.
B/HJ/JJ/13Moss4
- Existing Ground Floor and First Floor and Proposed First Floor Plan drg.
B/HJ/13Moss3
- Existing Elevations, Second Floor Plan, Site and Location Plan drg.
B/HJ/JJ/14Moss11
- Location Plan

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	18/10/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	08/11/2022	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling

