

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01042/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01042/HOUS
Location:	18 Moorgate Avenue, Rochdale, OL11 5JY
Proposal:	Increase in ridge height for first floor extension with addition of rear dormer extension, front porch extension, 3no. rooflights to front elevation and alteration to fenestration
Applicant:	Miss Nicola Staley
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

This application relates to no. 18 Moorgate Avenue, a detached bungalow located within the Moorgate Avenue Conservation Area, which derives its significance from being a high quality example of interwar housing. The application property faces southwest towards the highway, is adjacent to no. 16 Moorgate Avenue to the southwest and no. 20 Moorgate Avenue to the northwest. The rear boundary of the curtilage is shared with no. 19 Norwich Avenue with no. 11 Moorgate Avenue located across the highway to the southwest. Moorgate Avenue rises gradually in a northwesterly direction with the result that the application property is sited on higher ground than the adjacent no. 16 Moorgate Avenue. The application property has retained its original features including the slate roof, canted bay to the front elevation and chimney stack.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for an increase in ridge height, a hip-to-gable roof conversion, a rear dormer, a front porch and alterations to the existing fenestration including three roof lights to the front roof slope. The proposals also include the removal of the

existing chimney. The extensions would be constructed in brickwork and slate to match the existing materials.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Representations

A press notice was published on 04.12.2024, a site notice was posted on 16.12.2024 and neighbour letters were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2024
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
JP-P2	Heritage

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:

P2	Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design and Heritage: DM1, P2 and P3

CS Policies P3 and DM1 require development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraph 131 of NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF explains that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Within Conservation Areas, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 applies. Section 72 of this Act requires local planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 215 states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.' Similarly, PfE Policy JP-P2 seeks to positively conserve, sustain and enhance our historic environment and heritage assets and their settings. CS Policy P2 promotes the protection and enhancement of key heritage assets and their visual amenity.

The application property is a modest, interwar bungalow within the Moorgate Avenue Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA derives from it being a high quality example of interwar housing. This is further enhanced by the inclusion of the grade II listed no. 15 Broadhalgh Avenue by eminent 20th century architects Parker Unwin.

The application is supported by a Heritage Statement (dated 27.11.2024) which states that the application property 'has no heritage or conservation value.' While the application property is the only property of its type along the street scene, it is still considered to make a positive contribution to the setting of the CA by virtue of its simplicity and form. Moreover, the property retains many of its original features including a hipped roof finished in natural blue slate, canted bay to the front elevation and chimney stack.

While some properties along Moorgate Avenue feature front gable projections, the majority are characterized by hipped roofs. The low profile, hipped roof form of the application property means that it assimilates comfortably amid the adjacent dwellings. The shape of the existing roof is considered to be an important element of its positive contribution to the setting of the CA.

The proposals would constitute a substantial volumetric increase in roof space, transforming the modest bungalow into a much larger, and more dominant, building that would have a substantial, box-like structure to the rear. The resultant dwelling would have an unusual built form and the extensions would sit awkwardly against the original building. Moreover, the proposals would result in the loss of original features, such as the chimney stack.

The design of the rear dormer would bear little relation to the proportions and simple design of the existing property. The dormer would have a substantial scale, extending above the existing outrigger, and it would have an uncharacteristic flat roof. The dormer would detract from the simplicity of the host property and would dominate the side and rear elevations. Although the use of natural blue slate would help to soften the appearance of the dormer, this would not overcome the principle concerns. As a result, it would be a harmful and intrusive feature that would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and consequently, the setting of the CA.

While the proposed dormer is positioned to the rear of the host dwelling, it would still be prominent in public views along Moorgate Avenue, particularly given the 7m gap between the application property and no. 20 Moorgate Avenue. Further, it would also be clearly visible to pedestrians traversing the public footpath betwixt the application property and no. 20 Moorgate Avenue.

When read in combination, the increase in height, the hip-to-gable roof conversion, the rear dormer and the addition of roof lights would lead to a harmful reduction in the character and quality of the existing bungalow, which would in turn have a detrimental impact on the setting of the CA.

While the proposed front porch would be a relatively modest addition to the front elevation, it would still read as a low-quality addition to an otherwise attractive façade.

Overall, the design of the proposal is considered to be unacceptable through its incongruous design relative to the host dwelling. As such, the proposed development would adversely affect the heritage value of the CA, through visual competition and conflicting style. This would result in less than substantial harm, which has not been

reasonably justified in terms of its public benefit. Therefore, the proposal fails to accord with CS Policies DM1, P2 and P3, PfE Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, 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. This is reflected in both the NPPF and PfE, which establish the importance of achieving high standards of residential amenity.

Section 4.1 of the SPD for residential development sets out the following space standards for all new development:

- i. 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;
- ii. 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
- iii. 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

The proposed rear dormer would measure approximately 8.5m to the directly facing rear boundary of the curtilage and approximately 20m to the nearest principal window to the rear of no. 19 Norwich Avenue. The dormer would also include a window within the northwest facing side elevation that would measure approximately 6.7m to the side boundary of no. 20 Moorgate Avenue. Additionally, it should be noted that the application property is located on a slightly higher ground level than no. 19 Norwich Avenue to the rear.

Therefore, the proposed dormer extension would fail to comply with the minimum space standards outlined in the SPD.

It is considered that the proposed first floor windows would result in a harmful loss of privacy for the occupants of no. 20 Moorgate Avenue and no. 19 Norwich Avenue. In particular, the windows are considered to harmfully overlook the private garden areas of both properties.

While it is noted that there is currently a laurel hedge circa 3-4m in height along the rear boundary which provides a greater degree of screening than a typical 2m timber fence, it would not be possible for the local authority to control the height of the hedge, which could be pruned to a lower height. Therefore, the current level of screening provided by the hedge can be afforded limited weight in the consideration of residential amenity.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is not considered that the proposals would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for neighbouring properties. Additionally, all habitable rooms within the application property would be supplied with sufficient natural light and outlook.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in conflict with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed scheme would have no impact on the existing off-street parking arrangements and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2.

Recommendation:

Refuse for the following reason:

1. By virtue of their size, scale, form and design, the proposed extensions to the host dwelling would constitute incongruous and poorly designed additions that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, the proposed extensions would adversely affect the heritage value of the Moorgate Avenue Conservation Area through visual competition and conflicting style. This would result in less than substantial harm, which has not been reasonably justified in terms of its public benefit. The proposal does not therefore accord with policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of the failure to comply with the minimum separation distances outlined in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed first floor windows serving the master bedroom would result in a harmful loss of privacy for the occupants of no. 20 Moorgate Avenue and no. 19 Norwich Avenue. In particular, the windows are considered to harmfully overlook the private garden areas of both properties. The proposal does not therefore accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

Notes for the applicant

This decision relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan dated 18.10.2024
- Location Plan, Site Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Existing Elevations. Dwg no. 18 MA/A
- Proposed Elevations and Sections. Dwg no. 18 MA
- Proposed Block Plan dated November 2024

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	21/01/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	22/01/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling