APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00432/HOUS

Application Number:	19/00432/HOUS
Location:	76 Hardfield Road Middleton M24 1JB
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extensions to dwelling including the demolition of existing detached garage
Applicant:	Mr M DOSWELL
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?**	**n**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**n**

Location

This application relates to a two storey, semi-detached residential property sited within a residential area of Middleton. It is built in a red brick with concrete tiles to roof and faux wood UPVC windows throughout. It is built with a hipped roof. A single storey extension projects from the rear and a detached garage is sited within the rear amenity space and runs parallel with 78 Hardfield Road.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The side extension would have a front elevation which sits flush with that of the the host dwelling and a ridge and eaves height equal to it. It would have a single storey rear extension which has a depth of 3 metres.

Relevant History

81/D12363- Two Storey Extension To Rear Of Dwellinghouse. Approved.

Township/Member comments

n/a

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

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

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that extensions to residential properties should appear subservient to the host dwelling.

The extension would have a ridge height equal to that of the host dwelling and would have a front elevation which sits flush with that of the host dwelling. It is considered that these features of the design of the extension will result in the extension not appearing as a subservient addition to the host dwelling and thus, it would not accord with paragraph 5.1 of the SPD or policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

To ensure that a 'terracing effect' does not arise as a result of two storey or first floor side extensions being built close to shared side boundaries, the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document dictates that where a side extension is within 1 metre of the shared boundary, the front elevation of the side extension should be set back 2 metres from the front elevation

of the main house at first floor level or the extension should be set back 1 metre from the front elevation of the main house at both first floor and ground floor level.

The proposed extension would be positioned within close proximity to the shared boundary and would not be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling at both ground and first floor level thus not according with the guidance described above and having an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene, due to its contribution to a terracing appearance.

Further to this, the pair of semi-detached properties to which the application property belongs has a symmetrical appearance. Due to its size and lack of subservience, the proposed extension would significantly unbalance the appearance of this pair of properties.

In light of the above, the proposed two storey side extension would fail to accord with the visual amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development SPD.

The proposed rear extension would be built in materials matching the host dwelling with a dual pitched roof. It would have a height and eaves height which are significantly lower than those of the host dwelling and it is considered it would be visually acceptable. Refuse bins could be kept in the proposed storage room to the front of the extension, which would prevent any loss of visual amenity due to bins in the street scene.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed side extension would not be built within close proximity to any windows within the side elevation of the neighbouring No.78 Hardfield Road. By virtue of its size, siting and design, it is considered that the proposed side extension would not have a significant adverse impact upon the occupants of this property.

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 proposed rear extension would accord with the above guidance in relation to both neighbouring properties. By virtue of its size, siting and design, it is considered that it would not overshadow or have an overbearing impact upon the occupants of the neighbouring properties.

Recommendation: **Refuse for the following reason:**

1. As a result of its scale, siting and design, the proposed extension would not be subservient to the application property, would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and would result in a terracing effect between the application property and the neighbouring dwelling at no.78 Hardfield Road. As such, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the host property and the surrounding street scene and would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

INFORMATIVE:
For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:
Location plan 1:1250
SLW/MD/01
SLW/MD/O2

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	04/06/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	06/06/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Osian Perks