

|                            |                                                                                                     |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | 22/01605/HOUS                                                                                       |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 78 Greenvale Rochdale OL11 5QJ                                                                      |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | First floor extension to form two storey dwelling including balconies on front and rear elevations. |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr Naeem Akhtar                                                                                     |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Chelsea Petrillo                                                                                    |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>     | <b>Refuse</b>                                                                                       |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>Y</b> |

|                   |                                                                             |            |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>CONDITIONS</b> | <b>Pre-commencement conditions proposed?</b>                                | <b>N</b>   |
|                   | <b>Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?</b> | <b>N/A</b> |

**Location**

The application relates to 78 Greenvale – a detached bungalow in the Bamford ward of Rochdale and in a defined urban area. The dwelling faces north onto Greenvale and sits adjacent to the side garden of 43 Norford Way to the front and 37 Norford Way to the rear. The dwelling is situated between 41 Norford Way to the east and 76 Greenvale to the west. The surrounding street scene features a mix of dwellings with a low degree of uniformity, comprised of bungalows, semi-detached, detached and terrace dwellings. The bungalow includes a single-storey element which protrudes significantly forward of the main part of the dwellinghouse, which is considered to be part of the original build.

**Description of Proposal**

The application is seeking planning permission to significantly redevelop the existing bungalow into a two-storey dwelling including the addition of two Juliette balconies to the front and rear elevations. The first floor would be constructed to form a symmetrical appearance to the front and rear and would feature a steep pitched roof. Materials would be sought to match those on the existing of brick and blockwork to external walls, UPVC window frames and concrete roof tiles. The extension is not proposed to extend onto the protruding single storey front element. The proposals would increase the dwelling from three bedrooms to six.

## **Relevant History**

**20/00651/HOUS** FRONT DORMER AND REAR DORMER WITH BALCONY AREA  
Granted with Conditions 05.08.2020

## **Township/Member comments**

None Applicable

## **Consultee responses**

A highways officer was consulted regarding parking arrangements and possible impacts to the highway post-development, the following response was received 09.01.2023:

*The application proposes to retain the existing driveway and garage so the extended property would meet this Council parking standards.*

*The servicing of the property would remain unchanged.*

*If approved the application is not likely to have an impact on road safety or highways capacity.*

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

## **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. One letter of objection was received 13.01.2023.

Raised height of dwelling would result in diminished natural light on ground floor level of neighbouring properties

*Officers Response: See amenity section of report*

## **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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, in addition to being sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and maintaining a strong sense of place. Core Strategy Policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape

It should be noted dwellings along Greenvale currently host a low degree of uniformity therefore it would be acceptable for design elements not found locally in the surrounding street scene to form additions to the dwelling. The original design of the application property and surrounding dwellings are of late 20<sup>th</sup> century architectural interest, to which the new proposal would not appear to visually respect. Although the roof pitch would remain the same, it is noted the current height of the dwelling would be doubled upwards in size to form the new first floor which although would appear out of keeping within the immediate surrounding cluster of bungalows, is not thought to act in absence of the form along the wider street scene where two-storey dwellings are common.

The proposed front gable would form as a central feature piece to the dwelling and be centrally located on the dwellinghouse and span a total width of 7m. It would be set down from the proposed ridge height by 0.8m therefore creating form of subservience. It would also propose a pitched roof to match that on the existing and would therefore be acceptable.

The material palette on the current dwelling is constructed in brick and block work, UPVC and concrete roof tiles to which the proposed extension would match the existing to ensure uniformity throughout the dwelling therefore acceptable. The plans indicate the replacement of the existing smaller window openings to larger, narrower bespoke glazed windows to the proposed front gable with two larger outer windows projecting across both the ground and first floor, which are considered to be too large and out-of-context to the character of the dwelling.

Proposed plans do not indicate that the first floor addition would protrude any further forward than the existing front, rear and side elevations therefore remaining on-balance with SPD Standards.

However, the projection upwards from the original build of 3.1m would form an unacceptable addition to the dwelling, given it is situated within a cluster of bungalows, only one of which has been subject to the addition of a first floor (formed with a steep centrally aligned pitch to retain the bungalow design and character). It should be noted the cluster of detached bungalows in the immediate surrounding vicinity feature a staggered siting, therefore a strong building building line would be absent. Although a building line is not present, given the

bungalow's central siting within the surrounding dwellings, a first floor addition would be an incongruous addition and be out-of-keeping with structure, form, scale, massing, height and design. A first floor with a scale of that on the proposed plans would constitute a disproportionate addition and project an overall height too large of that in the immediate vicinity.

In the instance this application was recommended for approval, it would have been deemed appropriate to seek amendments reconfiguring the positioning of the first floor window above the protruding single storey extension, given the proposed plans indicate an off-centre positioning leaving significant blank space between the front gable and the first floor window above the protruding single storey element. Additionally amendments would have been sought to reposition the width of the front gable so it forms complete symmetry as the plans indicate the right-hand side of the gable to extend further than the left. However, given the more significant design issues arising from the overall scale of the proposal, such amendments would not have made the proposal acceptable in design terms and seeking them was not deemed obligatory in this instance.

It is noted the dwelling sited to the west, 76 Greenvale, obtained planning permission in 2003 for the addition of a first floor to the original dwelling. The design of the adjoining dwelling would be more of an acceptable design for a dwelling of that size with a height of 6.9m at its height point and a significantly sized downwards slope to both sides of the dwelling to retain character of the original form of the bungalow and surrounding dwellings. The proposed plans indicate an overall height of 8.8m across the full width of the dwelling therefore significantly larger than the existing dwellings and surrounding bungalows.

Although not common amongst the Greenvale street scene and significantly large in width, the balconies to the front and rear elevations would form acceptable additions to the dwelling therefore on-balance with council standards.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF. The first floor addition would not visually respect the form of the original dwelling as well as forming a disproportionate addition and being out of character within the surrounding cluster of bungalows.

**Amenity: DM1 and SPD**

Paragraph 5.8 of the SPD sets out guidance for the addition of first floor extensions to the rear to which it states "first floor rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbouring occupiers than single storey extensions, particularly on their enjoyment of their garden area due to the potential oppressiveness of a two-storey wall close to a common boundary".

Guidance states planning permission will not normally be granted to first floor extensions 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 dwellings. Given the dwelling to the west, 76 Greenvale, is positioned further back than the rear elevation of the

application property, and the proposed extension is not protruding any part of the existing rear elevation, the proposal would therefore comply with paragraph 5.9 of the SPD.

It should be noted the dwelling to the east, 41 Norford Way, is a corner plot bungalow positioned at an angle to the application property. The first floor addition to the host dwelling would be noticeably oppressive to the rear garden of 41 Norford Way to which it would also lose a significant amount of light to the rear given the extension would be constructed close to the common boundary in order to match the width of the existing. Furthermore, the addition of two first floor windows to the east elevation would detrimentally overlook down into the adjoining rear garden posing an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupiers at 41 Norford Way. However, in the instance the application was recommended for approval, an obscured glazing condition would be appropriate to both side windows in order to reduce any overlooking impact. The extension has not been carefully designed with the protection of neighbour amenity as a consideration therefore would be unacceptable and pose an infringement of privacy and an unacceptable impact to the amenity of the rear garden at 41 Norford Way.

Existing garden space would not be reduced or increased post development therefore the proposal would ensure sufficient garden space is retained.

Paragraph 4.4 of the SPD states “Balconies and elevated terraces can result in adverse overlooking of neighbouring private garden areas or habitable room windows if they are located in close proximity to the boundary of the curtilage. They should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties”. Although acceptable in design terms, the balconies and windows to the first floor could pose an overlooking impact to the adjacent rear and side garden however would accord to Space Standards set out in Section 4 of the SPD which requires 21m between directly facing principal windows at upper floor level and 10m between a principal window at upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of curtilage. Given the width between the rear elevation of the application property and the rear elevation of the adjacent neighbour to the south, no.37 Norford Way is approx. 45m and the adjacent property is a bungalow, the application would comply with SPD Standards.

In view of the above assessment, the first floor addition to the dwelling would severely impact the residential amenity of the occupiers at 41 Norford Way posing a loss of light, overlooking and overbearing impact therefore not acting in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

**Highways and Parking:** DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As a result of development, the dwelling will increase from a 3-bed to a 7-bed dwelling. Appendix 5 parking standards requires a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed houses outside of the town center. Given the dwelling hosts a driveway to the front providing off-street parking, a car port and an attached garage to the front of the projected single storey element, the proposal would therefore comply with the Council's Appendix 5 scheduled parking standards and would

be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

**Recommendation: Refuse**

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed first floor extension would represent an incongruous form of development and not appear to respect the visual form and character of the host dwelling. The extension would appear discordant with the verdant character of the estate, resulting in visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. 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 siting, design and scale, the extension would be noticeably overbearing and pose a significant loss of light to the rear garden of the bungalow situated to the east (41 Norford Way) as a result of the scale of development taking place upwards of the existing dwelling. The development would also pose a loss of privacy regarding neighbouring amenity caused by the addition of two side windows to the eastern elevation which would overlook the rear garden of 41 Norford Way. 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 | 22.02.2023 | Signed: CP |
| Authorisation    | 02.03.2023 | Signed: TH |

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo