

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01027/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01027/HOUS
Location:	61 Argyle Street, Heywood, OL10 3DQ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Ms Michelle Smyth
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 24.12.2024	EXT OF TIME N/A
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 no. 61 Argyle Street, a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling located in a residential area in the defined urban area of Heywood. The dwelling faces the highway to the north and is adjoined by no. 59 Argyle Street to the east. Immediately to the west is an unadopted road which is used for parking and access to both Unity Crescent and the rear alleyway. The gated alleyway provides space for both off-street parking and bin storage. No. 63 Argyle Street is located across the unadopted road to the west with further residential development along Unity Crescent to the south.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension that would project approximately 3.4 metres from the existing side elevation to the front and 2.6 metres to the rear, stepping in approximately 0.8m at the midpoint. The extension would be flush with the existing front and rear elevations, forming a continuation of the original building. Where the extension juts out to the front it would effectively have a mono-pitched roof, with an unbroken expanse of brickwork extending the full height of the dwelling visible to the rear. The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match those use in the exterior of the existing building.

Relevant History

92/D28495 Private Detached Garage.
Grant subject to conditions (September 1992)

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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:

P1 Improving image
P3 Improving Design of New Development
DM1 General Development Requirements
T2 Improving Accessibility

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

Amendments

Amendments were sought to reduce the width of the extension to the front in order to remove the staggered side wall and create an appropriate buffer to the side boundary. Additionally, it was advised that a setback from the front elevation would be required to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling. No amended plans were submitted.

Assessment

Design: DM1, P1 and P3

PfE Policy JP-P1 requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identify that: "Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used."

CS Policies DM1, P1 and P3 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."

Paragraph 135 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 139 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."

The immediate street scene is characterised by three groups of red brick terraced dwellings with simple built forms and modest proportions. The application property and no. 63 Argyle Street are located on corner plots at the entrance to the unadopted road and both dwellings benefit from a comfortable gap between the gable end and the side boundary, resulting in a soft edge to the highway.

Section 5.14 of the SPD provides guidance on side extensions to dwellings on a corner plot: "Extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension."

The proposed extension would result in a significant erosion of space between the gable end and the side boundary, presenting a hard edge to the public highway. At present the application property and no. 63 Argyle Street have low-level boundary treatments and soft landscaping to the side, which results in a gentle buffer between the gable ends and the public highway. The proposed extension would unbalance the existing pattern of development, causing undue harm to the character of the street scene.

When viewed from the front, the width of the extension would be substantial, well over half the width of the existing dwelling, which, when coupled with the lack of a set back from the front elevation, would result in a prominent addition to the host dwelling that would not demonstrate subservience to the original build, contrary to Section 5.1 of the SPD.

Furthermore, the extension would introduce an unusual built form that would sit awkwardly against the simple design of the host dwelling. When viewed on the southern approach from Unity Crescent, passers-by would be confronted with an unbroken expanse of brickwork stretching from the ground level to the ridgeline. This is considered to constitute poor design that would detract from the overall quality of the area and would not complement the character of the host dwelling.

Taken as a whole, the proposed development fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of design and constitutes adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1, P1 and P3. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

CS Policy DM1 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.”

The proposed extension would comply with the minimum separation distances outlined in Section 4.1 of the SPD and therefore it is not considered to result in an undue loss of light, outlook or privacy for any neighbouring properties.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient private garden space of a functional layout would be retained.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason -

1. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed extension would constitute a disproportionate and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling that would harmfully alter the appearance and character of the street scene through the significant erosion of space on a corner plot. The proposed extension would fail to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling and the use of different widths would result in an unacceptably poor standard of design in a prominent location. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the host dwelling and the area, contrary to policies DM1, P1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Sheet no. 001. Location Plan and Proposed Site Plan.
- Sheet no. 002. Existing Plans and Elevations.
- Sheet no. 003. Proposed Plans and Elevations.
- Sheet no. 301. Existing and Proposed Block Plans

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/12/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	19/12/2024	Signed: LA

Report Author Bob Melling