

Application Number:	23/00129/HOUS
Location:	3 Newbold Moss Rochdale OL16 2YS
Proposal:	Single storey front extension and two storey side and rear extension including alterations to fenestration on the side elevation. Re-submission of 22/00504/HOUS
Applicant:	Mrs. Ayesha Inayat Waqas
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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/A

Location

The application relates to no. 3 Newbold Moss, a two-storey detached dwelling located a residential estate in Newbold. The dwelling is sited on a corner plot and is adjoined by no. 1 Newbold Moss to the south-east, adjacent to no. 2 Newbold Moss to the north, adjacent to nos. 16 and 18 Newbold Moss to the north-west, and faces the highway to the north-east. The north-west and north-east curtilage boundary forms part of the service strip which extends 2m from the edge of the carriageway, whilst the rear boundary borders the front curtilage of no. 5 Newbold Moss to the south-west. The property benefits from a driveway sited to the north-west of the dwelling and a modestly-sized rear garden.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey extension which projects 1.35m from the front elevation of the host dwelling. This is accompanied by an additional front porch extension projecting a further 0.75m from the front elevation. The front extension is characterised by a lean-to roof and has a maximum ridge height of

approx. 3.62m and an eaves height of approx. 2.61m. The front porch is characterised by a dual-pitched roof and has a ridge height of approx. 3.39m and an eaves height of approx. 2.62m.

The application also proposes a part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension which projects 2.6m from the north-west side elevation and 3.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. The side projection is characterised by a hipped roof form and has a ridge height of approx. 6.11m and an eaves to height matching the host dwelling. The rear projection continues the pitched roof form of the host dwelling with matching ridge and eaves height.

Additionally, the application proposes the addition of windows to the utility room, wet room, and first-floor bedroom of the south-east side elevation.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The application is a resubmission of a previous application 22/00504/HOUS with amendments made to reduce the first-floor rear projection at the south-west corner by 3.5m and alterations to the windows of the first-floor rear-facing bedroom.

Relevant History

20/01252/HOUS - Two storey side extension, two storey rear extension and single storey front extension with detached garage – Withdrawn

21/01331/HOUS - Single-storey front extension and two-storey side and rear extension with the alterations to fenestration on existing side elevation- Resubmission of 20/01252/HOUS – Refuse

Officer's Comment

1. By virtue of its design, scale and massing, the proposed development would constitute poor design and would be an incongruous addition that would dominate the host property and would be an overdevelopment of the plot. It would incorporate a convoluted roof design and would have a lack of subservience to the host dwelling which would significantly impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. The application therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed two storey side and rear extension would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring amenity of no.5, no.16 and no.18 Newbold Moss and would not comply with the SPD spatial standards. The application therefore fails to adhere to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. By virtue of its scale and projection, the proposed development would substantially reduce the occupant's outdoor amenity space. It would result in insufficient garden space of a functional layout for a development of the size proposed, and would have an unacceptable impact on the standard of amenity for existing and future occupants. Therefore, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

22/00504/HOUS - Single-storey front extension and two-storey side and rear extension with alterations to fenestration on existing side elevation – Refuse

Officer's Comment

1. By virtue of its design, scale and massing, the proposed development would constitute poor design and would be an incongruous addition that would dominate the host property and would be an overdevelopment of the plot. It would have a lack of subservience to the host dwelling which would significantly impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. The application therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed two storey side and rear extension would have an overbearing impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no.16 and no.18 Newbold Moss. The application therefore fails to adhere to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. By virtue of its scale and projection, the proposed development would substantially reduce the occupant's outdoor amenity space. It would result in insufficient garden space of a functional layout for a development of the size proposed, and would have an unacceptable impact on the standard of amenity for existing and future occupants. Therefore, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main Highways concern regarding this application is parking provision.

The side extension over the driveway will sever the existing driveway and reduce off street parking provision for the extended dwelling to one space. Council standards require that for the size of the extended dwelling that two off-street parking spaces should be provided and taking into account the layout of Newbold Moss and the dwelling's proximity to an existing junction Highways would require that two viable parking spaces be provided.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

Highways do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

If the requested parking spaces could be provided Highways would raise no objection to this application or ask for any specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Two objection letter were received with the following concerns raised:

- Concerns over impact of the proposals on the character of the neighbourhood;
- Concerns over the proposals resulting in neighbouring gardens becoming further waterlogged;
- The proposals would further reduce visibility and vehicular access in and out of Newbold Moss; and
- The application has already been previously refused by virtue of concerns over the size of the proposals and its effect on the surrounding area.

Officer's Comment

- Concerns over the impact of the proposals on the character of the area are addressed under the 'Design' heading of the report;
- Concerns over the user visibility and vehicular access are addressed under the 'Highways and Parking' heading of the report.

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.”* 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.”*
- ❑ The host dwelling is sited on a prominent corner plot close to the entrance of Newbold Moss and is readily visible from the surrounding public vantage points on the highway, particularly along its north-west side elevation.
- ❑ The immediate locality is characterised by a mixed street scene of modestly-sized detached and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst dwellings vary in design and materiality, it is predominantly characterised by regular built forms with simple pitched roof forms.
- ❑ The proposal seeks to drastically overhaul the appearance of the host dwelling through substantial enlargements of the front, side and rear elevations. The resultant development constitutes a floor space increase of approx. 145% over and above the original dwelling and would constitute an overdevelopment to the original plot. Notwithstanding the proposed side extension roof being set down from the ridge line, the excessive scale of the extensions would not appear subservient and would wholly dominate the host dwelling. This harm is further exacerbated by its prominent siting within the sight lines of the highway and surrounding properties, creating an obtrusive and overbearing structure in the street scene.
- ❑ Given the simple roof forms of the host dwelling and of dwellings in the estate, the introduction of numerous roof forms would appear unsympathetic

and would further detract from the established character and appearance of the surrounding area.

- ☐ It is considered the amendments made to reduce the first-floor rear projection by 3.5m have not sufficiently addressed the concerns raised in the previous submissions, particularly with regard to the excessive scale and non-subservient form.
- ☐ The proposed porch would be of a scale and form which would be dominant and disproportionate in the context of the site. The addition of large elements of glazing would further detract from the overall appearance of the dwellinghouse and exacerbate the visual harm already identified.
- ☐ Notwithstanding the irregular layout of properties in the estate, and the existing dwelling sited approx. 2m forward of the front elevation of rear-facing no. 5, the proposed two-storey side extension would further erode the space between the host dwelling and the side curtilage boundary, creating a hard edge to the highway and obscuring the view of the properties to the rear of the host dwelling.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development comprises a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design and would result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.
- ☐ 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.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.”*
- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;*
 - (ii) *14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room”*
- ☐ For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with regard to the amenity impacts of the proposal to the occupiers of adjacent nos. 2 and 5, given the extensions do not directly face the principal windows and two-storey elevation walls of both properties.
- ☐ Moreover, there is an 18.4m separation distance between the proposed north-west side elevation and the principal windows of nos. 16 and 18, as such, the amenity impacts are acceptable in this regard.
- ☐ However, the proposed first-floor south-east facing side bedroom window would be sited approx. 1.4m from the common boundary of adjacent no. 1. It

would also be sited approx. 4m from the side elevation of no. 1, directly facing the existing conservatory of no. 1. Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed window would not face any dwellings, it would nonetheless directly overlook onto the rear curtilage of no. 1, resulting in significant loss of privacy for the neighbouring occupiers.

- Additionally, Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

□ *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

- It is noted that although the above guidance generally relates to single-storey rear extensions, it can also be applied to projections to the front of the dwelling and is assessed as such below.
- Section 5.9 states two storey extensions projecting *“beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- The proposed front extension and porch extension projects a maximum 2.1m along the common boundary from the front elevation of adjacent no. 1.
- The proposed single-storey rear extension would be obscured by the proposed two-storey rear extension, and would not result in amenity harm in this regard.
- The proposed two-storey rear extension does not project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the existing rear conservatory of adjacent no. 1.
- On this basis, it is considered the proposed front and rear extension would not result in significant overshadowing and overbearing harm to the occupiers of no. 1.
- Whilst the submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms, given the proposal seeks to accommodate five bedrooms, the proposed rear extension would substantially reduce the outdoor functional amenity space and would not ensure sufficient levels of residential amenity for its occupants.
- By virtue of the unacceptable overlooking impacts and lack of outdoor amenity space, the proposal would result in undue amenity harm to both the occupiers of the host dwelling and adjacent no. 1, and would not accord 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 five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ❑ Notwithstanding the assessment from the Highways Officer, the proposed side extension would sever the existing driveway and would not provide sufficient space for its remaining single off-street parking space, and would result in an encroachment of the service strip and carriageway. The application has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate how two off-street parking spaces can be accommodated.
- ❑ Whilst it is acknowledged that on-street parking is prevalent in the estate, given the prominent position of the host property close to the junction with Croxton Avenue and as a turning point towards properties in Newbold Moss, it is considered the displacement of vehicles onto the highway would further restrict the width of the carriageway and pose a threat to highway safety, to the detriment of highway users and pedestrians.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore unacceptable and would not accord with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, massing, siting and design, the proposed extension constitutes an incongruous and non-subservient addition that would dominate the host property and would be an overdevelopment of the plot. It would not be well-designed and would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of the siting of the proposed first-floor window on the south-east side elevation, the proposed development would result in undue loss of amenity to the neighbouring occupiers by means of undue overlooking onto the rear curtilage space of adjacent no. 1 Newbold Moss. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. By virtue of its scale and projection, the proposed development would substantially reduce the occupant's outdoor amenity space. It would result in insufficient garden space of a functional layout for a development of the size proposed, and would have an unacceptable impact on the standard of amenity for existing and future occupants. Therefore, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed extension would result in the loss of off-street parking space for the proposed five-bedroom property, and would result in the displacement of vehicles onto the section of the carriageway close to the junction between Newbold Moss and Croxton Avenue. The proposed parking arrangements

would be detrimental to the safety of highway users and pedestrians and is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.

INFORMATIVES

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

- ☐ Location Plan, Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. NA-P01 dated 04/2014
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan and Floor Plans – Drawing No. NA-P02 dated 04/2014
- ☐ Existing Site Plan and Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. NA-P03 dated 10/2020

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	09/08/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	09/08/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen