Application Number:	**19/00198/HOUS**
Location:	91 Crow Hill South Middleton M24 1LA
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing side and rear extension including construction of raised patio area.
Applicant:	Mrs Dianne White
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
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?**	**NA**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**NA**

Location

This application relates to a semi-detached, domestic property sited within a residential area of Middleton. It has a flat roofed, timber clad, side extension and a single storey rear extension which is built with a mono-pitched roof.

Description of Proposal

This application seeks permission for the following:

- The erection of a wrap-around, single storey, side and rear extension. The portion adjoining the side elevation would be built with a dual-pitched roof. The portion adjoining the rear elevation would be built with a mono-pitched roof. It would have a brick front elevation and rendered side and rear elevations.
- The creation of a raised patio area, to the rear of the host dwelling.

Relevant History

80/D10401- 91 Crow Hill South Middleton- Prefabricated Extension To Dwellinghouse. Permitted Development

Township/Member comments

None received.

Representations

None received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

Due to the curvature of Crow Hill South, the road on which the application property is sited, and the significant distance of separation between the application property and the neighbouring No.93, both the front and the side elevation of the proposed side extension would be highly visible in the street scene.

The application property is built in red brick. Red brick is also the dominant material within the property's immediate street scene. The proposed render section of the extension, indicated on the elevational drawings, to the side elevation of the proposed extension would be considerably sized, easily publically visible and appear out of character with the existing street scene.

The host dwelling is built with a hipped roof. The extension would have a dual pitched roof which has a very shallow pitch in relation to the pitch of the roof to the host dwelling. It is considered that by virtue of its roof design and the pitch of the roof, the proposed extension would appear as incongruous addition to the application property, to the detriment of the character of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Whilst it is noted that there is an existing timber clad extension to the side of the host dwelling (which would be demolished as part of this development), this is

considerably smaller than the host dwelling and is set back considerably further from the front elevation of the host dwelling than the proposed extension. As such, it is not as prominent as and has less of an adverse impact upon the character of the host dwelling and street scene than the proposed extension would.

Due to the siting, design and exterior materials of the proposed extension, it would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and wider street scene. As such it would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

The proposed raised patio would be of very similar appearance to the existing raised patio area. It is considered that by virtue of its similar design to the existing raised patio area, it would not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed extension would be built within close proximity to the side facing window ground floor window to No.93. This window is obscurely glazed and suffers from limited levels of natural light, due to its siting in relation to the application property. Given the window's already limited outlook and natural light, it is considered that the erection of the proposed extension is unlikely to result in an unacceptable loss of outlook, light to said window.

To ensure that a single storey extension does not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents, the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document provides standards which should be adhered to. Paragraph 5.6 of the guidance document states:

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

Paragraph 5.7 goes on to state:

'*The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any extension if one exists close to the common boundary. If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary. This is illustrated in figures 5 and 6'.*

The extension would be 3m in depth, measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining property, thus according with the above guidance. By virtue of the extension's size, the proposed extension would not result in a significant loss of light to or have an overbearing impact upon the occupants of No.93 and No.89 when viewed from these properties' rear facing windows.

The proposed, raised patio area would be 60cm above the height of the existing raised patio area and would extend 1m further beyond the rear of the host dwelling.

From the rear of the rear amenity space of the application property, there are views through to rear elevation of the neighbouring No.89 by virtue of the low curtilage boundary fencing. However, adjacent to the existing raised patio area, the boundary

treatment along the boundary shared with No.89 is high fencing which would largely obscure views across the neighbouring raised patio area. This provides a degree of privacy to the users of both patio areas. The increased height and position of the proposed raised patio area would mean that any user would be provided with view across the neighbouring property's patio area and through its ground floor rear facing windows, resulting in a significant loss of privacy to the occupants of this neighbouring property.

On the site plan submitted, it is unclear whether the proposed raised patio area would provide clear views across the rear amenity space and towards the ground floor, rear facing windows of the neighbouring No.93 as the position of this neighbouring property's garage detached garage which is positioned along the common boundary is not indicated.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons:

1. Due to the siting, design, scale, massing and exterior materials of the proposed extension, in particular the gable side elevation, would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and would harm the character and appearance of the property and the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to 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. The creation of the raised patio would result in loss of privacy to the private garden area of No.89 Crow Hill South to the detriment of the occupiers and future occupiers and insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in loss of privacy to the occupiers of No.93 Crow Hill South. No.93. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM1 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.

Informative

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

- Existing Elevations 661-P-04
- Proposed Elevations 661-P08B
- Existing Roof Plan 661-P-03
- Existing Site and Location Plan 661-P-01
- Existing Ground Floor Plan 661-P-02
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan 661-P-06D

- Proposed Roof Plan 661-P-07B
- Proposed Site and Location Plan 661-P-05B

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	15/04/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	17/04/2019	Signed: DR

Report Author Osian Perks