

Application Number:	24/00035/HOUS
Location:	10 Lake Drive, Middleton, M24 1WB
Proposal:	Part first-floor, part two-storey rear extension, alteration to existing roof, formation of pitched roof over existing side extension, erection of rear dormer including Juliet balconies and alterations to fenestration on front and side elevations including roof lights following demolition of existing conservatory
Applicant:	Mr DANIEL GORE
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 10.04.2024	EXT OF TIME
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. 10 Lake Drive, a two-storey, semi-detached property located in Middleton. The subject property faces the highway to the northwest, is adjoined by no. 12 Lake Drive to the northeast and is adjacent to no. 8 Lake Drive to the southwest. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear gardens of nos. 22 and 24 Home Drive, which are set at a higher level than the application property owing to the change in topography. To the front of the application property is a large pond which forms a peripheral part of a designated Greenspace Corridor.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part first floor, part two-storey rear extension that would project 3m from the main rear elevation. The proposed rear extension would involve an alteration to the existing roof as the pitch would reduce from approx. 30 degrees to 22.75 degrees. Moreover, the existing roof would be converted from a hipped roof

to a gable roof with a dual-pitched, gable-style roof also formed over the existing flat roof side extension.

The proposal also includes a box-style rear dormer extension that would have a length of approx. 9.26m, height of approx. 2.29m and depth of approx. 5.04m with an overall volume of approx. 53.44 cubic metres. The dormer would include two Juliet balconies and be finished in composite cladding.

There would be several alterations to the existing fenestration, including the enlargement of the existing first floor window to the front elevation above the front porch.

The application proposes brickwork, roof tiles and uPVC frames to match existing.

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)

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

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area
G/8 Greenspace Corridors

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
G6	Enhancing Green Infrastructure
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.”* However, significant weight would be given to *“innovative designs which... help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”*
- ❑ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identify 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 surrounding building line along Lake Drive is characterised by semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. Whilst the application property and no. 18 Lake Drive have constructed flat roof side extensions, there is a notable sense of consistency to the roofscape.
- ❑ The proposed hip to gable roof conversion and the construction of a gable roof atop the existing side extension would be at odds with the character of the surrounding street scene and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, resulting in an unacceptable degree of visual harm.

- ② Whilst no concerns are had with the scale and massing of the proposed two-storey rear extension, it is noted that the proposed extension would result in an alteration to the existing roof, with the pitch reducing by approx. 7.25 degrees. This would result in significant harm to the character of the host property, particularly in its relationship with the adjoining property.
- ② The submitted plans have not sufficiently demonstrated the practicality of the proposed roof alterations which would meet awkwardly with the roof of the adjoining property and ultimately constitute a poorly thought-out alteration.
- ② To the rear, the proposal includes a rear dormer extension. 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 the following principles:

- (i) “They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
- (ii) They should be set back from the eaves line;*
- (iii) They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
- (iv) Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (v) Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
- (vi) Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
- (vii) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
- (viii) Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*

- ② The proposed dormer would be of a flat roof form which would occupy a substantial portion of the roof slope. By virtue of its design and materiality, the proposed dormer would fail to comply with points (i), (ii), (iv), (vi) and (vii) of Section 5.17. The dormer fenestration would be offset and the Juliet balconies would read as imposing features. The use of composite cladding would not match the existing roof tiles and the dormer would obscure most of the rear roof slope. Overall, it would constitute a poorly designed and disproportionate addition to the host property.
- ② The proposed plans indicate alterations of fenestration, particularly to the principal elevation. The existing first floor window above the front porch would be enlarged and the resulting arrangement would appear awkward and unresolved on a prominent elevation and would therefore inflict visual harm to the appearance of the dwelling.

- ❑ Taken as a whole, the cumulative impacts of the proposed development would result in an unsatisfactory standard of design which would inflict undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE 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.”*
- ❑ 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.”*
- ❑ Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals: *“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.”*
- ❑ In respect of two storey rear extensions, Section 5.9 of the SPD states that *“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 proposed two-storey rear extension would have a depth of 3m and would sit flush with the side boundaries of the curtilage. Moreover, numbers 8 and 12 Lake Drive do not benefit from single-storey rear extensions which are close to the common boundary.
- ❑ Therefore, the proposed rear extension would exceed the projection standards outlined above and is considered to result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook for the neighbouring properties. The extension would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring rear windows and private gardens and this harm would be compounded by the significant massing and scale of the proposed rear dormer.
- ❑ The proposed fenestration to the rear would measure approx. 14m to the rear boundary of the curtilage and at least 25m to the rear elevations of the properties along Home Drive. Therefore, no concerns are had with regards to a potential loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- ❑ 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.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Impact on Greenspace Corridor

- ☐ A section of the front garden of the application site falls within the Greenspace Corridor as defined on the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map. Policy G/8 states that the Greenspace Corridors shown on the proposals map will be protected, with developments only permitted where they will enhance the recreational, ecological or landscape and amenity value of the corridor.
- ☐ The proposed development would take place to the side and rear of the dwelling and would not fall within the Greenspace Corridor. It is not considered that the scale of development proposed would have a harmful impact on the visual, recreational or ecological value of the Greenspace Corridor.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale, design and materiality, the cumulative impacts of the proposed alterations and additions to the existing roof, including the rear dormer, and the alterations to the existing fenestration constitute unsympathetic and obtrusive forms of development which would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and immediate street scene. The development proposals would not be well-designed and represent an unsatisfactory standard of design and appearance, thereby failing 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 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two-storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable oppressive impact, loss of light and outlook to the rear windows and rear gardens of nos. 8 and 12 Lake Drive. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 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.

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:

- ☐ Plans Existing & Proposed. Drg no. MC-241-01. Rev C1

- ☐ Elevations Existing & Proposed. Drg no. MC-341-02. Rev C1
- ☐ Elevations Existing & Proposed. Drg no. MC-341-03. Rev C1

Report Author Bob Melling