

Application Number:	23/01104/HOUS
Location:	2 Lowhouse Close, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3EP
Proposal:	Single-storey side and rear extension, extension to front dormer, alteration to fenestration to side elevation, rear dormer extension and erection of single-storey detached ancillary outbuilding to form gym
Applicant:	Mr Saul Critchley
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 08.01.2024	EXT OF TIME 24.05.2024
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. 2 Lowhouse Close, a two-storey semi-detached bungalow located in Milnrow. The surrounding locality is of a residential context cohesive in its built forms, where dormer bungalow is the predominant built form and dormer extensions are established features. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 1 Lowhouse Close to the south-west, adjacent to no. 3 Lowhouse Close to the north-east, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage boundaries of nos. 110 and 112 Kiln Lane to the north.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey side and rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation and 1.41m from the side elevation of the dwelling. The rear projection is characterised by a lean-to roof form whilst the side extension

comprises a pitched roof form. The extension has a ridge height 3.81m and a height to eaves of 2.78m.

In addition, a front and rear flat roof dormer extension is proposed. The front dormer extension is set to project 3.12m from the side elevation of the existing front dormer. The proposed rear dormer measures 6.7m in length, 1.49m in height and 3.83m in depth.

The proposal also seeks to construct a single-storey gym outbuilding to the rearmost part of the rear garden. It is characterised by a flat roof form and measures 9m in length, 8m in depth, and 2.55m in height.

Finally, the submitted plans indicate the alterations of fenestration on the north-east side elevation.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed rear and side extensions would not have too much impact on the current external parking arrangements and there is adequate residual parking space on the existing driveway to meet Council standards for the size of extended dwelling.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

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

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

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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:

Policy 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

N/A

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 they are “*sympathetic to local character.*”

- Paragraph 139 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.”*
- Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 proposal seeks to construct a single-storey flat roof outbuilding in the rear curtilage space to facilitate a gym. The proposed outbuilding spans the width of the rear garden and occupies a substantial footprint of 72.51m², which exceeds the original floor space of the host dwelling and would constitute a wholly disproportionate and non-subservient addition. The use of render to the side and rear walls would also appear unsympathetic against the established use of brickwork in the area. Notwithstanding its siting to the rear of the dwelling, owing to the open aspect nature of rear amenity space, the outbuilding would remain readily visible from the rear windows and gardens of the surrounding properties and would appear as an obtrusive and incongruous structure which would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- The application has not detailed the layouts and proposed operational use of the gym outbuilding and it is accepted the use of a gym is capable of being considered as incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, as defined in Section 55 (2)(d) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. However, when considering the substantial scale of the proposed outbuilding against the modestly-sized host dwelling, the proposed structure would not be subordinate to the dwelling and as a matter of fact and degree, goes beyond what could be reasonably considered for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling.
- The proposal also seeks to construct a front and rear flat roof dormer extension to the host dwelling roof slope. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes *“dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.”* Section 5.17 expands on this with a number of design principles. Regards have been had to the surrounding

context, where large front and rear dormers of mixed materiality are evident in neighbouring dwellings. On this basis, the proposed dormer extensions would not significantly detract from the established appearance of the surrounding street scene. Notwithstanding, in the event of an approved application, the applicant would be expected to set the dormers away from the side wall of the dwelling and apply a more sympathetic material palette to the external walls.

- For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with the proposed side and rear extension, the single-storey and lean-to roof form of which would be acceptable design.
- Notwithstanding, the design of the proposed outbuilding is unacceptable and fails to 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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”*
- No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the proposed single-storey rear extension which would comply with the maximum space standards of Section 5.6 of the SPD.
- Section 5.17 of the SPD states *“dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- Taking into account of Section 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed front and rear dormer extension would not result in significant amenity impacts to the directly facing neighbouring habitable room windows.
- Notwithstanding the substantial scale of the proposed outbuilding, by virtue of its siting adjoining the rear curtilages of the neighbouring properties and its 2.71m height, which would not be unreasonably higher than the existing boundary treatments, the outbuilding is not considered to give rise to adverse amenity harm 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. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- 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

- Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the provision of which would be retained in the existing hardstanding.
- The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, excessive footprint, massing, materiality and design, the proposed outbuilding constitutes an obtrusive and incongruous form of development which appears out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed outbuilding would not be well-designed and therefore fails to 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', the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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:

- Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 01 Rev. 03 received 07/11/2023
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Outbuilding Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 02 Rev. 07 received 03/11/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	24/05/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	24/05/2024	Signed: RK