

Application Number:	23/01334/HOUS
Location:	9 Midgley Drive Rochdale OL16 4QG
Proposal:	Part single storey, part two storey rear and side extension. First floor side extension, single storey front porch extension, alterations to fenestration on the west side elevation and insertion of 2no windows to eastern elevation
Applicant:	Mrs Shahana Begum
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 13.02.2024	EXT OF TIME 29.02.2024
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	YES

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

9 Midgley Drive is a two storey detached property within the Balderstone and Kirkholt ward of Rochdale. The property is substantially larger than the properties sited within the immediate and adjacent street scenes and sited approx. 18m from the adjacent highway with an unorthodox layout to which it benefits from generous amenity space, an attached garage and a single storey rear extension.

The principal elevation directly faces the highway to which the northern elevation faces the rear garden of no.7 Midgley Drive and the plot sits between no.11 Midgley Drive and no.10 Nall Gate. The rear curtilage borders no.24 Apple Tree.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part single / part two-storey side and rear extension, a first floor extension above the existing attached garage and a single storey front porch extension. Further permission is also sought for alteration to fenestration on the west side elevation with the existing Juliette balcony sought to change to a window as well as the insertion of 2no windows to the first floor eastern elevation.

Relevant History

91/D26211

Residential Development
Granted January 1991

<u>91/D27562</u>	Residential Development – 136 dwellings with associated garages Granted March 1992
<u>02/D40539</u>	First floor side extension to dwelling Granted September 2002
<u>04/D43269</u>	Single storey side extension to dwelling including demolition of existing conservatory Granted 2004

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The submitted plans show that the proposed extensions would have little impact on either internal or external parking provision, which is in line with Council standards.

The servicing arrangements for the extended dwelling would seem to remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways would raise no objection to this application, and we would request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. Three letters of objection were received

Objection Letters

- ☐ Reduced light to surrounding properties
- ☐ Poor design from viewpoints
- ☐ Extent of design would be out of keeping with its surroundings

Officer Response The above considerations are assessed in the 'design' section of the report

- ☐ Development would increase number of vehicles at property thereby impacting access to surrounding driveways

Officer Response The Council's Highways Department have been consulted on the development and raised no concern

- ☐ Disruption to neighbouring during development phase
- ☐ Damage and parking on surrounding drives

Officer Response The above are not planning material considerations therefore cannot be taken into account when carrying out the assessment

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

The agent was notified the scheme was largely unacceptable therefore amendments received saw much of the initially proposed development removed but the part single / part two storey side and rear extension redesigned which was also unacceptable.

Withdrawal was advised given the nature of the scheme now significantly contrasted that initially proposed however, a full write up of a refusal report on the initially proposed scheme was requested.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

The National Design Guide sets out how development should respond to existing local character and identity and how well-designed new development is influenced by an appreciation and understanding of vernacular, local or regional character, including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents as well as the height, scale, massing and relationships between buildings.

It is first noted the house itself is notably larger than those within the immediate surrounding estate (as originally built), as is the house to immediate east, no.10 Nail Gate however, both properties are sited within an estate which reflects local context. It is also noted the application property has already been previously extended in the early 2000's with the addition of a single storey rear extension and first floor extension which has notably increased the massing of the dwelling when viewed from the front elevation. In regards to the proposed additions as a collective, when viewed from the most prominent viewpoint from the highway, would demonstrate overdevelopment of the plot and would not have regard to the existing form or scale of the original dwelling. The development would appear unresolved and would present a massing which appears incongruous within its setting.

Minor design faults contribute to overall lack of attention to detail which would inevitably ensure the proposition of a high quality development which would respond positively to local characteristics. Notably, the front gable of the proposed porch would not align with the fronted gable within the roof above therefore does not present a design which has considered architectural elements of the existing dwelling. The siting of the front porch would seek to create an odd relationship through mismatched gable proportions and would collectively appear bulky and cluttered when viewed in addition to the existing protruding single storey front element.

The roof ridge of the first floor addition above the garage would be a continuation of the existing roof ridge of the previously approved first floor extension which is not considered to be unacceptable given both elements would be subservient to the main body of the dwellinghouse.

With reference to the part single / part two storey rear and side extension, this element appears to isolate the existing single storey extension and would create an odd arrangement at the rear, partially where it protrudes to the side at single storey level.

The materiality of the proposal is considered to visually respect the existing dwelling and surrounding setting by utilizing the existing material palette of the dwelling to remain in keeping with the character of the area. Fenestration contained within the proposal would also match those on the existing build in regards to both style, colour and scale.

The impact to the street scene is considered particularly harmful. The siting of the additions would visibly increase the massing of a dwelling which already sits irregular in scale and form to the rest of the dwellings in this vicinity. Regard has not been given to how the development would sit within the street and how this contrast would negatively undermine existing dwellings.

Bin storage would remain acceptable where it is stored to the sides of the dwelling and out of common viewpoints.

Irrespective of its negative impact to the street scene, the general design approach of extending the dwelling is not considered sympathetic to the original build and would not extend appropriate distances relative to the existing scale of the dwelling. The design of the proposal is therefore not acceptable and not considered to be constructed in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The SPD states extensions and alterations to existing properties should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties as well as satisfying section 4 Space Standards.

Paragraph 5.2 then goes on to state that “If the design of an extension significantly increases the massing of the extension to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers, it is possible that it may not be acceptable even if it meets the standards set out below”.

The SPD does not explicitly set out guidance for side extensions therefore the guidelines contained can be interpreted flexibly where appropriate. Paragraph 5.9 states “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(s)”. The part single / part two storey side and rear extension is not proposed to surpass the above guidelines and is not considered to negatively impact upon the amenity of surrounding neighbours therefore no concerns are raised in this regard.

The first floor addition above the existing garage would pose an unacceptable overbearing impact to the rear garden at the adjacent property, no. 7 Midgley Drive, given the distance from the common boundary would be marginal (1.4m).

Most habitable room windows contained within the development would accord with section 4 Space Standards. However, the separation distance between the existing first floor bathroom window to the eastern elevation which would change to a principal window hosting a habitable room would be 5.38m and would therefore fall short of the required 14m distance, as listed within Space Standards. Given this singular window is the only window that would serve this room, the impact is considered to be so impactful to the occupier it would contribute to a reason for refusal.

Elements of the proposal would appear to completely disregard the siting of surrounding properties and would inevitably pose an unacceptable standard of living therefore development would be at the detriment of both the host occupiers and occupiers of surrounding properties. The proposal would therefore impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and those at the application property and not be constructed in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Post development, the property would increase from a 4-bed to a 5-bed dwelling whilst remaining in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy where it is considered the plot can accommodate the require two spaces for a property of this size with additional off-street parking facilitated in the attached garage.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

- 1. By virtue of its scale, siting and design, the development as a collective would represent overdevelopment of the plot and be incoherent to its siting within the street scene therefore undermining the existing surrounding dwellings. The development would detrimentally increase the massing of the dwelling and fails to achieve a high standard of design. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework**
- 2. By virtue of its scale and siting, the proposed first floor addition above the existing garage would pose an unacceptable overbearing impact to the rear garden of no.7 Midgley Drive. Furthermore, the principal window hosting bedroom 4 would not accord with section 4 Space Standards of the SPD therefore posing a poor standard of living room the host occupiers by presenting a low degree of both light and outlook to a habitable room. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	12.02.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	29.02.2024	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo