

Application Number:	23/00292/HOUS
Location:	91 Warwick Road, Middleton, M24 1HU
Proposal:	Single-storey front extension, canopy to front, application of render to front and side elevations and erection of boundary wall following demolition of existing front porch
Applicant:	Gill Elsworth
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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 refers to no. 91 Warwick Road, a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The subject property faces west on to the highway, adjoining no. 89 Warwick Avenue to the north and adjacent to no. 93 to the south. The property is constructed in red brick with brown uPVC fenestration and grey roof tiles. It benefits from ample off-street parking to the front and side and a small, lean-to front porch.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey front extension and the application of render to the existing front and side elevations following the partial demolition of the existing front porch. The proposed extension would have a maximum projection of 2.96m from the existing front elevation with a width across of 4.11m and a ground area (measured externally) of 8.75m². It would also feature a 2.79m canopy roof section above. The proposed extension would include a porch and shower room. Fenestration for the development is proposed as an obscurely glazed top-opener window to the shower room with a single door and top-opener window to the porch.

The proposed development would be constructed in roof tiles and uPVC to match existing. The submitted plans also indicate the application of cream render to the proposed extension and the existing front and side elevations.

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)
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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and

are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Paragraph 130 c) states that planning decisions should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. The application property and the surrounding built environment has simple architectural design values; dual-pitch gable style roofs, a single ground floor window and front door, two first floor windows and quoins. The consistency amongst properties promotes a strong coherence between the visual appearance of dwellings on the street. Notwithstanding the regular rhythm of built form, it is acknowledged that properties along the street have been variously modified since their completion.

Views along Warwick Road from the application property include front porch extensions, canopy roofs, side extensions, dormer extensions and the use of varying materials. Despite such modifications, it is important that proposed developments are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment as a result of good architecture and appropriate scale.

However, the proposed extension is considered to have an inappropriate scale and complex design that would sit awkwardly against the simple design values of the host dwelling. It would appear unduly prominent within the street scene and this would be compounded by the proposed use of cream render, which is a departure from the overriding materiality of the host dwelling and street scene.

Whilst there are example of render in the immediate locality, notably nos. 80 and 93 Warwick Road, the Council does not have any record of planning permission being sought for the use of render to these properties. Further to this, these properties have applied render to the front elevation only and no. 80 has retained brick quoins to the front façade. Neither of these properties have single storey front extensions.

In addition, it is acknowledged that nos. 66, 68 and 72 Warwick Road have all implemented single storey front extensions of a similar scale to that proposed under this application. However, these were granted planning permission prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy and the SPD and do not provide sufficient rationale for the acceptance of design that does not align with the standards outlined in the current national and local policies and guidance.

In light of the above, the proposed development is considered to fail to comply with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and P3 which seek, amongst other things, to promote a high standard of design and visual appearance. Conflict also arises with Paragraph 130 of the NPPF which requires planning decisions to ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to the local built environment.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Minimum distance requirements set out in section 4.1 of the SPD are satisfied by virtue of having an approximate 19m of separation between direct front facing neighbours.

A suitably sized rear garden is retained for the purpose of sitting out and drying clothes, and access is retained between the front and rear curtilage.

In light of the above, the proposal would not unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and therefore accord with policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. As a result of the siting, size and design, the proposed extension and application of render would form an unduly dominating development that would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider street scene. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) 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.

INFORMATIVE:

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following drawings:-

Site Location Plan and Proposed Block Site Plan. Drg no. 91WR/200/BR. Rev C1
Existing Layouts. Drg no. 91WR/201/BR
Proposed Layouts. Drg no. 91WR/202/BR. Rev C1

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	17/05/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	29/05/2023	Signed: LA

Report Author Bob Melling