

Application Number:	22/01530/HOUS
Location:	105 Heights Avenue Rochdale OL12 6JH
Proposal:	First floor extension, alteration to roof pitch to front elevation, alteration to existing garage door into a window including alteration to front canopy roof and render to front and side elevations following removal of existing front dormer
Applicant:	Mr Abdul Quyyom
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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

The application relates to 105 Heights Avenue – a two storey property located in a residential area at the head of a cul-de-sac. The dwelling faces east, overlooking Heights Avenue and 129 Heights Avenue opposite. The north side elevation faces the side elevation of 107 Heights avenue, and the south side elevation faces the rear curtilage of 103 Heights avenue. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders Heights Close, a public residential road.

The neighbouring group of dwellings were constructed with integrated dormer features that are continuations of the main rear elevations. The front elevations are characterised by elongated roof slopes which wrap around the side of the narrower first floor level and project forward to cover the garages.

A first floor extension the rear of the property has been erected without approval. A certificate of lawfulness has been submitted retrospectively, but a decision is yet to be made.

Description of Proposal

- ☐ The proposal seeks a first floor extension, including an alteration to the roof pitch and front elevation. The existing dormer would be replaced by an extension which spans the full width of the front elevation with a shallow roof pitch. The extension would sit atop the existing garage and integrate with the existing elevation of the existing dormer.
- ☐ The height to eaves of the front elevation would measure 5.4m, and the maximum height to apex would measure 7.4m. The width of the front elevation would measure 8.3m.
- ☐ The proposal also seeks an alteration to the existing garage at the front including modification to the canopy and the replacement of the garage door with a window. The height to eaves of the canopy would measure 2.5m, and the maximum height would measure 3.6m. The maximum width of the canopy roof would measure 4.7m, whilst the width of the front elevation of the canopy would measure 3m, leaving a 1.7m open canopy in front of the front door.
- ☐ Render would be applied to the front and side elevations.

Relevant History

16/01024/HOUS: First floor extensions to front and rear with new pitched roofs refuse (25/10/2016).

Reasons:

1. The proposals, by virtue of their scale, massing, siting, design and materials would result in a form of development that would be incompatible with its surroundings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. The application is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed rear and side extensions would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupants of No. 103 Heights Avenue through visual intrusion, overbearing impact and overshadowing. As such the proposals are contrary to Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document '*Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development*', and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties, no responses were received.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 outlines that all new development must “*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.*” Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 requires “*development to be of a high quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.*”
- ❑ Further to the above are the considerations of the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that all new developments “should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”
- ❑ The proposal to extend and render the front elevation is considered to be a visually intrusive form of development. There is a uniformity to the neighboring properties which is not adhered to in the design proposal. The scale and design of the extension would make the property more imposing than the surrounding houses, thus making it incongruous.

- ❑ The proposal to change the flat roof form above the existing front dormer, and to raise the sloped roof pitch above the garage would again result in an incongruous form of development that would completely alter the appearance of the dwelling.
- ❑ Taking into account the above, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires that development proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Acceptable limits for residential extensions in respect of the above are quantified in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development'.
- ❑ The proposal would not have a significant impact on the neighbors. Whilst the alteration to the roof pitch would reduce 107 Height Avenue's exposure to sunlight, the consequences would be minimal, as the windows affected are obscured and predominantly covered by shade from the property's current form.
- ❑ 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.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ The property would maintain the maximum standard of 2 parking spaces at the front.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposals, by virtue of their scale, massing, siting, design and materials would result in a form of development that would be incompatible with its surroundings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. The application is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Notes for applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- ❑ Existing floor plans: CL 11225791/10
- ❑ Propose site plans: CL 11225791/14
- ❑ Proposed elevations: CL 11225791/12

- ❑ Site plans: CL 11225791/13
- ❑ Proposed floor plans: CL 11225791/11

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	26/01/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	30/01/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg