

Application Number:	23/00112/HOUS
Location:	80 Mitchell Street Rochdale OL12 6SH
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Rana Nafeez Ur Rahman
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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

The application relates to 80 Mitchell Street, a two storey end terrace property located in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale. The property sits within a row of three terraces all hosting a 3.4m two storey outrigger and 3m single storey rear extension extending up to the site boundary at the rear and considered to be part of the original build. The dwellings sits adjacent to a detached dwelling to the south, 78 Mitchell Street, and borders a small alleyway shared with the rear gardens of 43-49 Littledale Street and 86 Mitchell Street.

The dwelling hosts limited garden space to the front and rear, a similar occurrence of the terrace dwellings in the immediate surrounding vicinity.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension projecting 4m from the rear elevation leaving approx. 2m x 2m of rear outdoor space remaining. The extension would be constructed with a lean-to roof, host two roof lights and match the material palette of the existing dwelling.

Relevant History

None Applicable.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable.

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No letters of representation were received.

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

Policy DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy requires all new development proposals to be of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.

NPPF paragraph 134 notes that "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..."

The single storey rear extension has been constructed to respect the visual appearance of the existing dwelling utilizing existing materials of brick and blockwork to external walls, grey roof tiles to the roof and UPVC to the fenestration to be in keeping with the external appearance.

The proposal is not thought to unduly impact the street scene along Mitchell Street given the extension is proposed to the rear. The extension would be largely out of view from the public highway however would be visible by surrounding properties at the rear. The impact of a single storey extension visible at the rear is not considered to be unacceptably harmful given many of the surrounding terrace dwellings host two-storey and single storey rear extensions however, thought to be widely part of the existing build.

Policy P3 notes that all developments should have regard to the principles outlined in supplementary planning guidance which set out the Council's design expectations for new development.

Paragraph 5.4 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states “It is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. 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 garden space is unlikely to be acceptable”.

The existing rear yard has measurements of 5.8m in length x 2.1m in width. The existing size of the yard is thought to meet the needs of the occupiers and provide enough space to be practical. The new 4m extension would eradicate over 50% of the existing space, leaving internal measurements of 2m x 2m. Taking the internal proposed use of the extension into account, the remaining private garden space remaining post-development is not thought to be acceptable for a dwelling of this size and would represent overdevelopment to the plot which would not be in accordance with the SPD.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF. The projection of the single storey extension would be too large for a dwelling with already limited garden space. The extension would be over 50% of the existing garden space and not retain sufficient space for the enjoyment of the occupiers, both present and future.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD outlines maximum standards for single storey rear extensions which requires “a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling for attached properties.

Aforementioned above, the two storey outrigger and single storey protruding element on all three terraces are considered to be part of the original build. The extension would be eligible for a 3m extension forward of the neighbouring single storey protruding element, essentially to the edge of the curtilage boundary. Proposed plans do not indicate the extension to match the projection of the single storey protruding element therefore in accordance with the SPD.

Paragraph 5.7 of the SPD states the distance mentioned above in paragraph 5.6 will be measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property. If the extension is set away from the boundary, the point 3m can be increased providing it does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary. Given the rear most elevation of no.78 Mitchell Street is set a significant distance away from the boundary, when measured 3m from the common boundary, the plans do not indicate the extension to project beyond the point 3m therefore in accordance with the SPD.

It is acknowledged 78 Mitchell Street currently hosts two rear elevations along a staggered siting with a ground floor bedroom close to the side elevation of the application property with a principal window facing the rear set approx. 3m back of the rear elevation of the application property. With the extension constructed close to the boundary of the application property, the 3m wall would be extended

to an overall length of 7m however, given the dwelling sits south of the application property and hosts significant garden space to the rear, a 7m wall close to the boundary is not thought to be so overbearing or harmful it would be unacceptable in terms of residential amenity to the dwelling to the south.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed single storey rear extension would represent overdevelopment of the plot at the rear. The remaining outdoor space would not be sufficient for a dwelling of this size taking into account present and future occupiers. 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

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.

Notes for Applicant:

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

- LOCATION PLAN
- 1985/2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN, FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	28.03.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	03.04.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo