

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00478/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00478/HOUS
Location:	5 Moor Hill, Rochdale, OL11 5YB
Proposal:	Two storey side, single storey rear extensions following demolition of existing detached garage. Erection of new 1.8m high timber gate and fence together with alterations to fenestration on the front and rear first floor elevations
Applicant:	Ross And Samantha Jones
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 25.07.2024	EXT OF TIME 02.08.2024
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 no. 5 Moor Hill, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the residential suburb of Norden. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 3 Moor Hill to the south, adjacent to no. 7 Moor Hill to the north-east, and faces the highway and no. 34 Bagslate Moor Road to the east. The rear curtilage boundary borders the rear curtilage of no. 2 Shelfield Lane to the west. The property is characterised by a front projecting gable and benefits from a detached single garage and a front driveway.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects, as amended, 3.6m from the side elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of

the existing detached garage. It is characterised by a hipped roof with matching ridge and eaves height. The existing front porch canopy is also extended along the front elevation of the side extension. It would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The proposal also seeks to construct a single-storey rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 2.77m. The extension would be constructed in off-white render, with brickwork on the south-facing elevation.

The submitted plans also indicate the erection of 1.8m-high timber fencing and gate to the front elevation as well as alterations to the front and rear fenestration.

Relevant History

82/D14566 - Single Storey Rear Extension To Dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

No comments received at the time of writing.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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:

Policy 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:

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

Following concerns regarding the design of the proposal, amended plans were submitted indicating a 0.4m reduction in the width of the proposed side extension. These revised plans are assessed in this report.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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 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 proposal relates to a two-storey side extension of a 3.6m projection, which constitutes over half of the width of the original dwelling. By virtue of its excessive width, the side extension fails to respect the proportions of the host dwelling, resulting in a non-subservient addition which dominates the dwelling.

- ☐ It is acknowledged amendments have been made to reduce the width of the side projection by 0.4m. However, this reduction is negligible and is not considered to be sufficient in addressing the identified harm to the dwelling.
- ☐ Regards have been had to the adjacent dwellings which forms the immediate street scene, in particular, the extant two-storey flat roof front projection to adjoining no. 3, a poorly-designed extension which has already eroded the symmetry and appearance of the pair of dwellings. Notwithstanding, the presence of this harmful feature does not justify another addition which would only seek to further distort the built form and proportions of the dwellings and is therefore afforded limited weight.
- ☐ On this basis, the proposed side extension fails to constitute a satisfactory standard of design, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ☐ For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with the built form and design of the proposed single-storey rear extension which would be acceptable.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE, and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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 two-storey side extension does not directly face any habitable room windows and maintains a 10.58m distance from the directly facing curtilage boundary of no.2. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in significant overlooking impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.6 of the SPD, no concerns are had with regard to the amenity impacts of the proposed single-storey rear extension which would be acceptable.
- ☐ As a result of the revised plans, the two proposed bedrooms would fall short of the minimum floor area for double bedrooms as stated in *“Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard.”* However, details were not provided as to the actual number of bedspaces/persons to each proposed bedroom and as such, a refusal on residential amenity grounds cannot be reasonably substantiated in this instance.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*

- ☐ The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, provisions of which would be retained in the front driveway.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive width, built form and design, the proposed two-storey side extension constitutes a dominant and non-subservient addition to the dwelling, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding street scene. The proposal would not be well-designed and therefore fails to 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', Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	01/08/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	01/08/2024	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

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

- ☐ Location Plan – received 21/05/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 24.3336.3A received 30/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 24.3336.1 received 21/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 24.3336.2 received 21/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 24.3336.SC7.1B received 04/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 24.3336.SC7.2B received 04/07/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Street Drawings – Drawing No. 24.3336.SC7.3 received 04/07/2024

Report Author Sam Yuen

