

Application Number:	22/01408/HOUS
Location:	6 Manesty Close Middleton M24 4SA
Proposal:	Single-storey side and rear extension - Retrospective
Applicant:	Georgina Johnson
Case Officer:	Aimee Bovaird
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N

Site Description and Location

The application relates to 6 Manesty Close, a two storey semi-detached dwelling which consists of red brick elevations, in a residential area within the defined urban area. The property faces west onto the highway. The surrounding street scene is made up of similar dwellings of brick construction. This is not in a conservation area and the site does not contain protected trees.

Description of Proposal

The application comprises a single-storey side and rear extension with a flat roof including a roof lantern. The extension is constructed and therefore this application is retrospective. The proposed development will create a utility room and additional living space. The extension has all elevations finished in white render.

The extension projects 3m to the rear of the host dwelling and 2.42m to the side. It has a height of 2.7m including the roof and a width of 7.85m including the roof at its widest point. It contains a window in the front-facing elevation and bi-folding doors in the rear elevation. It is set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, by 4.83m.

The application has been submitted as a result of investigations from the Council's Planning Enforcement Team.

Relevant History

No relevant history.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

No consultations were required

Representations

Letters of representation have been sent out. One objection letter has been received, this raised concerns over the extension setting a precedent for future extensions in terms of its design and appearance, and these devaluing properties in the area – the latter point is not a material planning consideration.

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

- ☐ Rochdale Core Strategy sets out in policy DM1 that developments should be of a high quality design and enhance the quality of the area. In addition to the above, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the Government attaches importance to the design of the built environment.
- ☐ The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.1 that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ The proposed development is considered subservient in scale to the host dwelling due to its size and that it is single storey.

- ❑ The SPD sets out that new development should be in keeping with the host property and be in keeping with the surrounding character of the area. All elevations are rendered white. This is not in keeping with the host dwelling which is constructed entirely from brick to its elevations. There is no visible render on neighbouring properties and in this case the extension can be seen from within the street scene and from neighbouring properties. The extensive use of render fails to compliment the overall design of the property and serves to harm the character of the dwelling itself and the street scene.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore not acceptable and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals so not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.
- ❑ The SPD sets out the standards for single storey rear extensions in paragraph 5.6, '*The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions: • For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*' The development complies with the SDP and will not result in any loss of amenity (in terms of overbearing impact) for the neighbouring dwelling.
- ❑ The proposed development will not result in the loss of amenity (in terms of privacy) for neighbouring dwellings as it is single storey and there are no windows on the side elevations. The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.4, '*it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play.*' The proposed development will leave a sufficient amount of garden space for current and future occupiers.
- ❑ For the reasons above, 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

- ❑ The existing parking arrangements are unaffected by the proposed development, and the proposed extension does not include bedrooms. Therefore the development is acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1

Summary

In conclusion, due to the use of render on all the elevations this has resulted in an unacceptable design and appearance that is harmful to the appearance of the dwelling itself and the character and appearance of the area. It is not possible to overcome this decision with planning conditions and therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Refuse

- 1.) By virtue of its appearance, most particularly through the use of render, the extension is an unsympathetic and harmful addition to the host dwelling. It significantly erodes the character and uniformity of the immediate streetscene. As such, the proposal would not 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.

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

Location and Site Plan – HAD3448-01

Pre Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – HAD3448-02

Revised Proposed Site Plan received 13/12/22 – HAD3448-05

Existing (Proposed) Floor Plans and Roof Plans – HAD3448-03

Proposed Elevations – HAD3448-04

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	09/01/23	Signed: ABovaird
Authorisation	09/01/23	Signed: L.Ashworth

Report Author Aimee Bovaird