

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00647/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00647/HOUS
Location:	15 Bonscale Crescent, Middleton, M24 5LX
Proposal:	Proposed single storey front extension
Applicant:	Mrs Zakia Salman
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 02.09.2024	EXT OF TIME 20.09.2024
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 relates to no. 15 Bonscale Crescent, a two-storey end-terrace dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The dwelling faces the highway to the east, is adjoined to no. 17 Bonscale Crescent to the north and is adjacent to no. 13 Bonscale Crescent to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear gardens of nos. 26-28 Talkin Drive.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a front porch which would measure approximately 3.9 metres by 2 metres, with a ridge height of approximately 3.2 metres and a height to eaves of approximately 2.5 metres. It would be characterised by a lean-to roof and constructed from materials to match those used in the exterior of the existing dwelling. The proposals also include the removal of the existing door and the re-positioning of the existing window within the side elevation.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

Amendments were sought by the Case Officer to significantly reduce the scale of the initially proposed front extension. The Officer suggested that the downstairs toilet be accommodated within the existing hallway, with a small front porch possible under the limits of Class D of the GPDO. While the toilet has been accommodated within the hallway under the latest set of plans, a large front porch of approximately 7.8sqm has been proposed. The Officer advised that this would not be acceptable and the Planning Agent confirmed that they would like to application to be determined based on the latest set of amended plans.

The officer also suggested re-siting the extension (as a toilet extension) to either the side or rear elevations.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires new development to be “visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping” in addition to ensuring that development is “sympathetic to local character.” Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states, “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.”

PfE Policy JP-P1 requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identify that: “Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.”

CS Policies DM1 and P3 require development proposals to be “of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area” and to “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.” 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.”

The surrounding street scene is characterised by terraced dwellings of a simple front elevation design, with a number of dwellings comprising modestly-sized pitched roof canopies which appear to be original features. The adjoining building line has remained relatively unchanged and as such maintains a somewhat uniform appearance through its built forms. Front porches are not a characteristic of dwellings and this contributes to the sense of symmetry and the cohesive character of development in this location. In this respect, there is a balanced form and regular rhythm of development to the street.

The proposed front porch extension constitutes a substantial and disproportionate enlargement to the host dwelling and would stand wholly at odds with the character of the street scene, disrupting the regular rhythm of development.

It is noted that no. 44 Bonscale Crescent was granted planning permission for a two-storey rear extension and a front porch under application ref: 23/00195/HOUS. However, it would have been possible to construct the approved front porch without planning permission under Class D of the GPDO. As such, it was deemed that a refusal of the entire application would not have been justifiable.

Taken as a whole, the proposed development fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of design and constitutes adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

CS Policy DM1 states development proposals should ensure they “do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”

Section 5.5 of the SPD states “it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.” In particular, Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard 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).”

It is noted that although the above guidance generally relates to single-storey rear extensions, it can also be applied to projections to the front of the dwelling and is assessed as such below.

The front porch extension would comply with the above guidance and is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to “provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”

The front porch extension does not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property, therefore the parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with CS Policies T2 and DM1.

Other Matters: Personal Circumstances

Section 5.22 of the SPD states that, “Personal circumstances, such as a disability, may make it difficult to provide necessary facilities within the standards set out in this document. The Council may interpret these standards flexibly in such circumstances, but proposals that significantly exceed the standards set out in this document are unlikely to be appropriate. The more general planning considerations, such as the impact of a development on the character of an area and its impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, are still the principal considerations by which the planning application will be judged; the needs of a person may exist for only a few years whereas built development is likely to last for decades.”

The applicant has provided evidence to demonstrate that they require a frame and walking sticks to aid their mobility. While the Council does not dispute this and supports the applicant’s need for a downstairs toilet, it has not been demonstrated why such facilities could not be accommodated without extending to the front of the host dwelling. The Case Officer has made several suggestions, including utilising the large entrance hall and extending to the side or rear. While the proposals have been amended to include a downstairs shower room within the existing entrance hall, it is unclear why this would necessitate such a large front porch, particularly where this would result in substantial harm to the character of the street scene.

The Case Officer has suggested a smaller front porch of 3sqm and creating a larger opening, in order to minimise the impact on character and appearance while recouping some of the space lost as a result of the downstairs shower room. It has not been demonstrated why this is not a feasible alternative.

In summary, the proposed front porch would significantly exceed the standards set by the Council and it has not been demonstrated that this is the only viable option. To the contrary, it has been demonstrated that it would be possible to provide the necessary facilities within the existing building. The case officer has also suggested other solutions to providing ground floor shower facilities, including extending the property to the side or rear.

Overall, the personal circumstances identified in the supporting evidence are not considered to sufficiently outweigh the harm caused by the development in respect of its impact on character and appearance.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason -

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, the proposed front porch would constitute a disproportionate and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling. The front porch would dominate the original build and would have a prominence which would harmfully alter the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Sheet 1 – Location Plan
- Sheet 2 – Existing Plans
- Sheet 3 – Existing Elevations
- Sheet 4 – Proposed Plans. Submitted on 18/09/2024
- Sheet 5 – Proposed Elevations. Submitted on 18/09/2024
- Sheet 6 – Existing & Proposed Site Plan. Submitted on 18/09/2024

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/09/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	19/09/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling