

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0287
Location: 10 Mayfield Terrace, Rochdale, OL16 2NQ
Proposal: Part single part two storey rear extension
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Majid Mir

SITE

The application relates to no. 10 Mayfield Terrace; a two-storey terraced property on the outskirts of Rochdale town. Mayfield Terrace is in a residential setting, comprising a variety of housing types and an urban character.

No. 10 faces west, overlooking a front yard and a shared pedestrian access. It adjoins no. 12 to the north and no. 8 to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces east, bordering a small side road off Cook Street.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission to construct a part two storey, part single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

P3 Improving design of new development

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements

SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

25/00548/HH42 - Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 5m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 2.9m and height to eaves to 2.9m). Decision: Refuse. Reason for refusal:

The single storey rear extension would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the rear facing window and rear yard of no.8 Mayfield Terrace. The development proposals therefore fail to comply with the requirements of Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

16/00901/HOUS - Two storey and single storey rear extension including demolition of existing single storey rear extension. Decision: Refuse. Reason for refusal:

1. The proposal, by virtue of the design, scale and massing of the extension, would result in visually intrusive, incongruous and poorly designed addition to the host dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H/11, G/BE/1 and BE/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, Policies DM1 and P3 of the Emerging Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed ground floor rear projection, by virtue of its size and position along the common boundary with the adjoining neighbour, would have a significantly overbearing impact on the occupants of No. 8 Mayfield Terrace and would result in a significant loss of light. As such, the proposal would result in overshadowing, loss of light, loss of outlook and would be overbearing in relation to this dwelling and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy H/11 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy DM1 of the Emerging Rochdale Core Strategy, 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

08/D50891 - Single And Two Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling. Decision: Approve with conditions.

05/D46544 - Front And Rear Dormer Extensions To Dwelling. Decision: Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representation have been sent out to surrounding properties. One objection has been received. The representation has been summarised below:

- Reduce the light to neighbouring properties.

Officer comment: Discussed in the amenity section of the report.

- Height of garden raised and causing damp issues.

Officer comment: A raised garden does not form part of this application.

AMENDMENTS

N/A

Design

The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies 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 Framework states that ‘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 front of no. 10 is access via a pedestrian path with the rear being access being a single lane vehicle path. Both are cul-de-sacs. The front is relatively enclosed with limited movement via the footpath. The rear of the properties is more open with views of the application property visible from Arkwright Avenue. Additionally, when viewed from Roch Street, the properties on Mayfield Terrace are located on higher ground. Although some views of the application property are obscured by no.29 and no. 31 Cook Street, the application property is visible on either end of the properties

when viewed from Roch Street. Views are also visible from Cook Street, although these are more fleeting.

The application property already has flat roof dormers on either side of the roof plane that cover the majority of the roof. The application proposes to construct a mono pitched single storey extension that projects out by 3m and runs along the width of the application property. The first-floor element would project out by 2.4m and would be 2.9m wide. The application proposes a dual pitched hipped roof for the first-floor element of the proposal. The eaves of the first-floor element would be set slightly below that of the host property. The ridge would be set substantially lower than the ridge of the host property. The ridge would be set just below the bottom of the existing flat roof dormer. The roof form would become cluttered with eaves set below that of the host property, the roof intersecting the original pitched roof of the host property and set just below the flat roof dormer.

The proposed first floor element would be set directly adjacent to the rear facing bedroom window and the ridge of the mono pitched roof adjoining the host property just below the window cill. With the addition of the varied depths of the single storey and first floor elements of the proposed extension, the proposed extension would create a cramped and cluttered design with no coherence. The poor design of the proposed extensions is further exacerbated with the failure of the window on the ground floor element of the proposed extensions to line up with the window on the first floor first floor element of the proposed extensions.

It is therefore concluded that the design of the proposal is unacceptable and fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

The SPD sets out guidance for two storey rear extensions, 'Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project 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' In regard to single storey extensions, the SPD states that a single storey extension shall not project more than 3 metres measured along the common boundary and from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling. 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. The proposed single storey extension would project out by 3m and the first-floor element of the extension would project out by 2.4m. Both elements of the extension would therefore adhere to the SPD standards.

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD provides minimum spaces standards that will be applied to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties. However, paragraph 4.3 adds that where the character and density of the surrounding area would be best preserved by reduced distances and this would not detract from the general levels of privacy and amenity typical in the area, then exceptions may be made. The guidance is relevant to assess the impact on no. 29 Cook Street. It is noted that no. 29 is set on lower ground. No. 29 is also set at a right angle to no. 10 and therefore the side elevation faces towards the rear of no.

10. No. 29 is sited close the highway and there are no windows on the side elevation of no. 29 facing towards no. 19. All the properties on Mayfield Terrace have single storey rear extensions of varying depths. The single storey element of the proposed extension would be sited approximately 8.5m from side elevation of no. 29. The first-floor element would be sited approximately 9m from the side elevation of no. 29. The first-floor element would primarily face the side elevation of the no. 29, with a proportion of the single storey element facing the rear garden area of no. 29. The window on the first floor would be for a bathroom with the ground floor being used for a kitchen / combined kitchen and living room. Taking into consideration the above, subject to the addition of a condition requiring the bathroom window on the first floor being obscured with restricted opening, it is considered that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of no. 29.

Along with protecting the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties, a proposal must not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the application property. The proposed single storey extension would create a combined enlarged kitchen and living area. Light and outlook to the room would be from the window on the rear elevation and the rooflight. It is considered that, on balance, adequate amount of light and outlook can be achieved through the proposed windows and would not be dissimilar to the level of light and outlook experienced presently by the occupiers of no. 10.

Paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that 'it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable.' It is noted that the application property has five bedrooms. Presently, the rear garden is approximately 24.2 sqm. The addition of the proposed extensions would reduce that to approximately 17.9 sqm. It is noted that the properties on Mayfield Terrace have no vehicle access from the front and is a cul-de-sac. Therefore, it is a relatively quiet to the front and enclosed. When combined with the front garden, the property would have a total of 43.9 sqm of outdoor amenity space. Taking into consideration the number of bedrooms, the amount of outdoor amenity space would be limited but a functional space where there be sufficient space for sitting out, drying cloths or children to play.

It is therefore concluded that, on balance, the proposals would not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties or the occupiers of the host property and therefore accords with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the policy JP-P1 of the PfE, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (1)

- 1 By virtue of its size, scale, massing, built form and design, the proposed part two storey part single storey rear extension would constitute a cluttered, unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the host dwelling which would represent poor design and appears out of keeping to the

appearance of the host dwelling. The poor design of the proposed part two storey part single storey rear extension is further exacerbated by failure of the windows to line up. The proposed development represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and constitutes undue visual harm to the character and visual appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 1 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.

- 2 For the avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans:

Location Plan

Existing Site Plan and Proposed Site Plan

Sheet 1 – Existing Plans & Elevations

Sheet 2 – Proposed Plans & Elevations