Application Number:	21/00247/HOUS
Location:	15 Mount Road Middleton M24 1DY
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr James Kirk & Ms Catherine Fraser
Case Officer:	Emily Sykes
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 refers to no.15 Mount Road, a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the corner plot of the junction between Mount Road and Lever Walk in East Middleton. The dwelling faces south on to the highway, adjoining to no.13 to the west. No.17 Mount Road is positioned on the adjacent corner plot to the east of the dwelling. The rear boundary of curtilage borders the side boundary of curtilage at no.6 Lever Walk and the rear of the applicant property is highly visible from the highway on Lever Walk. The property benefits from off-road parking to the front of the dwelling, a sufficiently sized rear garden and a single storey rear extension.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The proposed development will be constructed in matching materials to the host dwelling.

The proposed two storey side extension is set back approximately 1.75m from the front principal wall of the host dwelling, sitting flush with the rear of the property. It will be constructed with an appropriately placed hipped roof, with a bay window located on the ground floor front elevation. The first floor front elevation will feature a large window and the ground floor side elevation will feature a window leading to a dining area.

The proposed single storey rear extension projects 3m from the rear of the host dwelling and proposed two storey side extension. It will be constructed with a pitched roof, with two roof lights on the roof slope. There will be a small window leading to a

utility room on the side elevation and a set of patio doors and a window which leads to a WC on the rear elevation.

Relevant History

04/D44203 – Two storey extension to side and rear of dwelling, including 2m timber fence along side boundary - Granted Subject to Conditions.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding neighbours and no representations were 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 and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host dwelling and should

generally be subservient to it. The proposed development will be constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling and is therefore considered to be in keeping with the design language of the property.

The proposed fenestration is considered to be appropriate within its siting, design and scale, as it is also in keeping with the design of that on the host dwelling.

The proposed roof design is considered to be appropriately placed. The proposed hipped roof on the two storey side extension is set down from the roof ridge on the host dwelling and the proposed development is set well back from the front principal wall of the host dwelling. As a result it is considered that the proposed development does not overwhelm the character of the host dwelling and appears subservient to the applicant property.

The terracing effect is also avoided as per paragraph 5.13 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, which states that when a dwelling is on a corner plot, there is little chance of a terracing effect occurring.

Whilst the design in isolation is subservient, there are concerns relating to the proposed development being located on a prominent corner plot. Paragraph 5.14 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that "Extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension."

When looking at the dwelling from Lever Walk, there is the presence of a strong building line. The applicant dwelling and adjacent dwelling also located on the corner plot of the junction of Mount Road and Lever Walk both maintain the same important space, set back from the highway of Lever Walk. The side elevations of these dwellings is in line with the building line of the properties on Lever Walk.

The proposed development will jut out to the junction, significantly eroding the space between the property and the highway contrary to paragraph 5.14 of the SPD as illustrated by figures 10 and 11 of the SPD. It is considered that this space is valuable to the overall character of the street scene as there is a need to protect the strong building line when looking out of Lever Walk. As a result, it is considered that the proposed development will appear an incongruous feature on the corner plot which is unsympathetic to local character.

Access between the front and rear of the dwelling is retained, meaning that it is possible for bins to be stored at the rear of the dwelling and out of public viewpoint.

Overall, as a result of the proximity to the side boundary on a prominent corner plot, it is considered that the design of the proposal is not in accordance with 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. This is supported through Paragraph 5.5 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development

SPD which advises that it is important that extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupants.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD outlines the minimum space standards which new developments must be in accordance with to ensure that the impact is not so significant that it results in unacceptable harm. The proposed development is in accordance with the minimum space standards and therefore is not considered to cause significant significant loss of privacy or light for neighbouring occupiers.

Due to the proposed two storey side extension's positioning on the east side of the applicant property next to the junction, it is considered that it will not have an unduly overbearing or harmful impact on any of the neighbouring occupiers' amenity.

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD states that single storey rear extensions to attached properties should not project past a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling. The proposed development projects approximately 3m from the rear of the adjoining property and is therefore considered to not cause any undue harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed development retains a sufficiently sized rear garden with a functional layout. Adequate access to light and outlook to all habitable rooms would be possible as a result of the design of the proposal.

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.

Recommendation: Refuse

By virtue of the siting of the proposed development on a prominent corner plot and its proximity to the side boundary, the proposed two storey side extension will project significantly beyond the existing strong building line of Lever Walk and result in a significant loss of spaciousness to the side, unduly harming the character of the area and the street scene. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document 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 is based on the following plans:

- Cover Sheet and Block Plan (0.01)
- Existing and Proposed Site Plans (1.01)
- Existing Floor Plans (1.02)
- Existing Floor Plans (1.03)

- Existing Elevations (1.04)
- Proposed Floor Plans (2.01)
- Proposed Floor Plans (2.02)
- Proposed Elevations (2.03)

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	12/04/2021	Signed: ES
Authorisation	26/04/2021	Signed: DR

Report Author Emily Sykes