

Application Number:	22/01378/HOUS
Location:	80 Mossway Middleton Rochdale M24 1NS
Proposal:	Two story side and rear extension and rear dormer following demolition of existing side extension
Applicant:	Mr Jamie Cloran
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?	Y

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

Location

The application refers to 80 Mossway, a two-storey semi-detached property located in a residential area in Middleton. The property has a hipped roof, faces north onto the highway, adjoins no.78 to the west and to the east is no.82 Mossway.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for:

- A two storey side extension that spans approximately 2.9m from the side elevation of the existing dwelling. The extension is set back 1m at both floors from the front elevation and will follow the demolition of an existing garage. The extension has a hipped roof which is set down 0.7m and has a roof light on the front elevation.
- A two storey rear extension that has a projection of 4.5m and a width of 5.85m. The extension has a hipped roof, Juliet balcony and a set of bi-folding doors.
- A hipped roof rear dormer extension which has a depth of 3m and a width of 1.6m.
- The addition of a roof light to the existing roof on the front elevation.

- The proposal includes the use of materials such as brick, tiles and uPVC that match those of the host dwelling.

Relevant History

21/00953/FUL	Single-storey rear extension to two properties (78 and 80). Decision: Grant subject to conditions.
21/01218/HOUS	Two storey side extension, part two storey/part single storey rear extension including Juliet balcony and rear dormers, addition of roof light to the front following demolition of existing garage and single storey rear extension. Decision: Refuse.

Reasons for refusal:

1. *By virtue of its siting, massing, scale and design, the proposed two storey side extension would be detrimental to the character of the street scene and would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling. In addition, it would contribute to a potential terracing effect between the host dwelling and no.82 Mossway that would result in the loss of a valuable break in the built form of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the visual amenity aims of 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 their siting, massing, scale and design, the proposed two storey rear extension and rear dormer would constitute incongruous additions to the host dwelling. The development would fail to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance, and result in significant visual harm to the character of the dwelling. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the visual amenity aims of 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.*
3. *By virtue of its siting, scale and design, the proposed extensions would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the ground and first floor rear windows of no.78 Mossway. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
4. *By virtue of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two storey rear extension would result in an undue loss of amenity for the occupiers of no.82 Mossway due to a loss of light and outlook to the ground and first floor rear windows and an overbearing impact on the rear outdoor amenity space. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

22/00269/HOUS Two storey side extension, two storey rear extension with Juliet balcony, single storey rear extension, rear dormer extension and addition of roof light following demolition of existing garage and single storey rear extension. Resub 21/01218/HOUS
Decision: Refuse. Appeal dismissed (Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3301992)

Reasons for refusal:

- 1. By virtue of the siting, massing, scale and flat-roof design, the proposed two storey rear extension constitutes an incongruous addition to the host dwelling. The development would fail to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance, and result in significant visual harm to the character of the dwelling. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the visual amenity aims of 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 siting, scale and design, the proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the ground floor rear windows of no.78 Mossway. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters were sent to neighbours and two representations were received in objection to the application. The objections raised the following concerns:

- Loss of light
- Overshadowing
- Overbearing expanse of brickwork
- Potential overlooking/loss of privacy

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. Section 5.17 of the SPD states the principles that should apply when determining applications that include dormers.

Paragraphs 5.11 - 5.13 of the SPD details 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.

A noticeable characteristic within the street scene of Mossway is the pairs of semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. The submitted plans indicate that this characteristic will be maintained through the hipped roof design of the side and rear enlargement, which is set down from the main ridgeline. This is considered to be in keeping with appearance and character of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached properties and street scene. Furthermore, the extension appears

subservient when viewed from the street scene due to the set back of 1m at both levels and set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling.

Given that the extension is within 1m of the shared boundary, the 1m setback of the side extension at both levels ensures compliance with sections 5.11-13 of the SPD and reduces any risk of a 'terracing effect' with no.82 Mossway.

Whilst the hipped roof dormer is not set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling, it is considered to be modest in size and does not occupy a large portion of the roof. Therefore the dormer is considered to be acceptable and would be in keeping with the design principles of the existing dwelling.

The previous application (ref: 22/00269/HOUS) included a flat roof design to the two storey rear extension, which was deemed "uncharacteristic" by the Inspector under appeal ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3301992. Whilst this element has been replaced by a hipped roof form, it is considered that the current application has not sufficiently addressed the concerns raised by both the Council and the Inspector with regards to the unacceptable mass of brickwork on the gable end which is created by the substantial scale and massing of the proposed side extension in combination with the two storey rear extension. This element of the scheme would be an incongruous addition to the property which would fail to respect the form and design of the residential built form of the area.

The proposal would retain the garage door on the front elevation which would allow space to store bins out of public viewpoint and to not unduly harm the appearance of the street scene.

In light of the above assessment, the proposal has not overcome the previous reason for refusal in regards to the design of the two storey side and rear enlargement. Therefore 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

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy states that all development proposals must not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Privacy

- ☐ To the rear of the applicant property is the M60 motorway and there are no windows on the side elevations of the proposed development.
- ☐ The proposed Juliet balcony is not considered to have any additional impact than a first floor rear window. Given the position of the balcony on the rear elevation, the line of sight from the proposed balcony would be at least approximately 10m from the shared boundaries.
- ☐ Furthermore, the bottom of the neighbouring gardens are not considered to be the most intensively used areas of outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposal would not cause an undue loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- ☐ Therefore the proposal adheres to the separation distances and the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for surrounding occupiers.

Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact

- ☐ The Council is aware that the development of joint single storey extensions to the rear of both the host property and no.78 Mossway has commenced, these having been granted planning permission under a previous application ref: 21/00953/FUL. Therefore the proposal has been assessed on this basis.
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD outlines that permission is not normally granted for two storey extensions that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from point 2.4m along the common boundary or 3m if the neighbour benefits from a single storey rear extension.
- ☐ The proposed two storey extension does not exceed a 30 degree line when taken from 2.4m along the shared boundary with no.78. Therefore the two storey rear extension is not considered to cause undue harm to the amenity of occupiers of no.78 Mossway.
- ☐ The two storey rear extension is close to the shared boundary with no.82 Mossway. The neighbour has a garage close to the common boundary with no principal windows to habitable rooms.
- ☐ Given the above and that the neighbour benefits from an existing single storey rear extension set approximately 2.75m from the shared boundary, the degree line has been measured from a point 3m along the shared boundary.
- ☐ The two storey rear extension would exceed this line by approximately 1.15m. Given that there would be a reasonable separation distance between the proposed two storey rear extension and the neighbour's rear habitable room windows, the exceedance is not considered to result in an undue loss of light or outlook to the occupiers of no.82 Mossway, who would continue to have an open aspect to the south.

Occupier Amenity

- ☐ The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden with a functional layout.

Summary

- ☐ In light of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and is contrary to policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of the siting, massing and scale, the proposed two storey rear extension when read in combination with the proposed side extension constitutes an incongruous addition to the host dwelling as it would result in a large and overbearing expanse of brickwork to the side elevation. The development would fail to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance, and result in significant visual harm to the character of the dwelling. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the visual amenity aims of 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 relates to the following plans:

- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 22MWpe Rev. 0
- Proposed Plans. Drg no. 22MWpp Rev. 1

- Proposed Site and Location Plan. Drg no. 22MWlp Rev. 0
- Existing Plans – Ground Floor. Drg no. 22MWep (1) Rev. 0
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 22MWee Rev. 0

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	02/12/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	04/01/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling