Application Number:	**19/00022/HOUS**
Location:	38 Broomfield Crescent Middleton M24 4FW
Proposal:	Two storey and first floor side extension
Applicant:	Ms Janice Guerney
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
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**

Location

This application relates to a semi-detached domestic property sited within a residential area of Middleton. It is built with a bay window to front and a hipped roof. It is one of a group of similarly designed properties all of which front the North side of Broomfield Crescent.

A garage adjoins the property's side elevation and a conservatory extends beyond its rear elevation

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension. It is built in red brick. The ridge height of its roof is staggered and the roof is hipped.

The front elevation of the extension sits flush with that of the host dwelling.

Relevant History

n/a

Township/Member comments

n/a

Representations

None received.

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

Paragraph 5.1 of the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document indicates that extensions to residential properties should appear subservient to the host dwelling.

The proposed extension would be built with a hipped roof, reflecting the design of the host dwelling and the neighbouring properties. However, the extension would have a maximum ridge height equal to that of the host dwelling and would have a front elevation which sits flush with that of the host dwelling. It is considered that these features of the design of the extension will result in the extension not appearing as a subservient addition to the host dwelling.

To ensure that a 'terracing effect' does not arise as a result of two storey side extensions being built close to shared side boundaries the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document dictates that where a side extension is within 1 metre of the shared boundary, the front elevation of the side extension should be set back 2 metres from the front elevation of the main house at first floor level or the extension should be set back 1 metre from the front elevation of the main house at both first floor and ground floor level.

The proposed extension would be positioned 0.95m from the shared boundary and would not be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling at both ground and first floor level. As such, it would be contrary to the SPD guidance and it is considered that it would contribute to a terracing effect with the neighbouring No.36.

It is noted that there are several two storey side extensions within the existing street scene which have front elevations which sit flush with the front elevation of the dwelling to which they adjoin and as such are neither subservient to the dwelling to which they belong nor accord with SPD guidance regarding the terracing effect. These extensions were built before the adoption of the 2016 SPD policy.

Policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy seek to ensure that buildings contribute positively to an area and take opportunities to enhance its quality. The National Planning Policy Framework also requires that development adds to the overall quality of the area and is sympathetic to the built environment. The proposed development would not contribute positively to the area and in light of the above referenced local and national policy, it is considered that the presence of other development of equally poor design does not justify the further degradation of the character of the street scene.

Due to its size, siting and design, the proposed extension would appear as a non-subservient addition to the host dwelling and would contribute to a terracing effect with the neighbouring No.36. As such it would fail to accord with the visual amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development* SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed extension would be built within close proximity to the first floor landing window; first floor bathroom window and ground floor garage window within the side elevation of the neighbouring No.36. Given these are secondary windows only, it is considered that the loss of light to and outlook from these would not result in a significant loss of amenity to the occupier.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would accord with the residential amenity aims of Policies DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As a result of the proposed side extension, the total number of bedrooms within the application property would be increased from 3 to 4. The greater level of occupancy could result in an increase in the demand for car parking space. The property is currently served by 3 off street parking spaces (as defined by paragraph 3.15 of the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* SPD). It is considered that this would be adequate to serve the enlarged dwelling proposed.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

The proposed extension, due to its size, siting and design, would not form a subservient addition to the host dwelling and would contribute to a terracing effect with the neighbouring No.36, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the property and the street scene. The proposal is therefore 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.

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.

Informative:

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

- Drawing no. 733-18-01 revision A
- Drawing no. 733-18-02 revision A

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	12/03/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	13/03/2019	Signed: DR

Report Author Osian Perks