APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01505/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01505/HOUS
Location:	3 Langdale Avenue Rochdale OL16 4SA
Proposal:	Increase in ridge height, hip to gable roof conversion, first floor rear extension, dormers to front, part single part two storey extension to front, alteration to fenestration on rear and side elevations and render to front elevation
Applicant:	MR MARK JONES
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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?	**Y**

CONDITIONS	**Pre-commencement conditions proposed?**	**N**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**N/A**

Location

The application relates to no. 3 Langdale Avenue, a detached bungalow located in a residential area of Rochdale. No. 3 is located close towards the entrance of a cul-de-sac. No. 3 is located close to the junction between Oldham Road and Langdale Avenue, as well the junction between Ferndale Avenue, Marsden Close and Langdale Avenue.



Description of Proposal

The application proposes the following:

- increase in ridge height by 1.2m,
- hip to gable conversion,
- first floor rear extension,
- dormers to front
- part single part two storey extension to front,
- Alterations to fenestration including replacement of doors and windows on the ground floor rear elevation with two sets of bifolding doors, removal of windows on ground floor of eastern and western elevations, and insertion of ground floor door and two first floor windows on western elevation, and
- render to front elevation.

Relevant History

Not applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the neighbouring properties, and one objection was received. The objection is summarised below:

- Unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties
  Officer comments: Discussed in the amenity section
- Out of context within location. Too much render
  Officer comments: Discussed in the design section
- Detrimental to the street scene
  Officer comments: Discussed in the design section
- Overdevelopment of the site, providing poor levels of amenity
  Officer comments: Discussed in the amenity section
- Impact on solar panels. Will therefore have economic and environmental impact. Reducing the sustainability of neighbouring properties.
  Officer comments: Discussed in the amenity section
- Parking and impact on highway safety
  Officer comments: Discussed in the highways and parking section
- Lack of information provided to make judgement. Insufficient information on materials, parking and trees. Numerous documents should be requested including daylight/sunlight impact assessment, SUDs, parking plan, tree impact assessment and material schedule.
  Officer comments: It is considered sufficient information has been provided to make a judgement on the application and if required, pre-commencement conditions can be placed on the application.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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
G1	Tackling and adapting to climate change
T2	Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5	Schedule of Parking Standards

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

Amendments

The application has been amended to remove the single storey rear extension and the two storey extension to the front. A part single storey, part two storey extension with two dormers have been added to the front.

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 124 and 127 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 of the NPPF states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents'. Furthermore, paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.'

The proposal seeks to increase the ridge height by 1.2m and convert the existing hipped roof to a gable roof. It is noted that the property is a bungalow property sandwiched by two storey properties on either side. Furthermore, one property has a hipped roof, whereas the other has a gable roof design. It is noted that there is a mixture of single and two storey properties, as well as a mixture of properties with hipped and gable roofs within the local area. The proposed amendments to the roof would lead to a property with a considerably large roof elevation, which would dominate the front elevation of the property. Though the proposed conversion would

remove some of the openness that is created by the hipped roof design, overall, the increase in ridge height and hip to gable roof conversion is considered acceptable.

The proposal seeks to render the front in an off white colour. It is noted that there are a number of properties in close vicinity with white/cream rendered elevations. However, it is noted these are all single storey properties and the majority are not wholly rendered; brick elevations remain to break the render. It is considered that the addition of the render to the front would be in keeping with the render finish found in some of the neighbouring properties and therefore is considered acceptable.

The application proposes to include a front extension to create an entrance hallway with atrium, which would have a ridge and eaves height more akin to a two-storey extension. The proposed extension would follow some of the design principles found on the proposed dormers. However, due to the siting in the centre of the front elevation and the overall height, the proposed extension would be a prominent addition to the host property and the street scene. The proposed extension to the front would constitute poor design and an incongruous addition that would fail to accord with the character of the host property or local area, and would therefore have a detrimental impact upon the character of the host property and the wider street scene.

Looking at the proposed dormers to the front. Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that 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. Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD states the principles that will apply to dormer extension:

(i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the 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 ridges 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.

It is noted that there a number of properties in close vicinity along Ferndale Avenue, Marsden Close and Langdale Avenue that have front dormers. The principle of the front dormers at this location is considered acceptable. The proposed dormers would appear as appropriate additions to the host property, however, this would only be possible with the increase in the ridge height.

Moving to the first floor rear extension. The proposed extension would lead to the creation of what would appear like a two storey dwelling to the rear and a single storey dwelling to the front. However, due to the gap in between the properties, the rear element would be clearly visible from the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be clearly visible from the busy Oldham Road. The proposed first floor extension would not be in keeping with the host property or the local area.

Though the properties along Ferndale Avenue, Marsden Close and Langdale Avenue, differ in design, size and height, the properties have predominantly kept the character of the host property and the local area. The design of the proposed extension would substantially alter the appearance and character of the property.

It is therefore considered that the proposed two storey rear extension and the proposed two storey front extension would have a significant negative impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. They would constitute unduly prominent and incongruous additions to the application property As such the design of the proposal is contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposal would not see any further projection to the rear, however, it would have a first floor rear extension, and therefore alter the property from a single storey property to a two storey property. 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.*' . It is noted that the rear element of no 5 Langdale Avenue has a stepped design. The proposed first floor extension would be approximately 5m from the rear elevation of no. 5 that is closest to the shared boundary with no. 3. The elevation does have a window on the ground floor close to the shared boundary with no. 3. However, there appears to be a window to the front of the property for this room, and therefore the rear window is not considered to be a principal window. Additionally, the two windows on the first floor facing towards no. 3 are not principal windows. Considering the design, layout and siting of the two properties, it is considered that the proposal would not lead to any loss of light or overshadowing of any habitable rooms of no. 5 or the main garden area of no. 5.

In relation to no. 1 Langdale Avenue, the proposed first storey rear extension would accord with the requirements set out in paragraphs 5.8 – 5.10.

No. 925 Oldham Road is to the rear of no. 3, with the side boundary of the rear garden of no. 925 directly opposite no.3. The proposed first floor extension would be sited between 6.1m and 7m from the shared boundary with no. 925 Oldham Road. The SPD states that 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage and 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room. No. 925 Oldham Road has a single storey extension that runs along a large proportion of the shared boundary. The extension is set on slightly lower ground than that of no. 3. Though the extension would partly screen the rear garden area of no. 925, considering the distance between the two properties, low level nature of the extension of no. 925, the addition of the proposed first floor extension would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy to the rear garden area.

In regards to the amenity impact on the occupants of the applicant property, it is noted that the distance to the boundary would be the same as the existing, and the proposed extension would see two large bifolding glazed openings created. It is

therefore considered that the proposal would not lead to any greater loss of amenity for the occupants of the applicant property.

Solar Panels

It is noted that there are solar panels located on the neighbouring property of no. 925 Oldham Road. The location of the solar panels is on the roof of the single storey rear extension, which is located close to the shared boundary with no. 3. The solar panels face south and towards the rear of no. 3. It is also noted that no. 3 is set on slightly higher ground than no. 925.

A recent High Court judgement made in the case between R. (on the application of McLennon) v Medwat Council [2019] EWHC 1738 (Admin) , the High Court quashed a decision to grant permission for a household extension on the basis that interference with a neighbour's solar panels was not considered to be a material planning consideration. The Court decision believed that the NPPF considered the mitigation of climate change as a legitimate planning consideration. The Court decision noted that the NPPF recognises the positive contribution that can be made to climate change by even small-scale renewable energy schemes. The Court decision didn't discuss the weight that should or should not be given to the interference of the proposal on the solar panels, but rather, the Court decision quashed the decision as the original decision made by the planning authority rejected that the interference with solar panels as not having any material bearing.

There are no policies in the Core Strategy in relation to minimum distances relating to solar panels. No additional information has been provided in regards to the impacts of the proposal on the solar panels. It also noted that though the minimum space standards set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD do concern themselves with the impact on light, however these are related to light entering the property. The impact on solar panels would be different and potentially a smaller level of overshadowing can have greater impact.

A request for alterations to the design of the proposal were made. Though amendments have been made, the applicant has not amended the two storey rear element of the proposal. The removal of the first floor extension and replacement with traditional dormer design would have reduced the impact on both the rear garden and the solar panels.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable loss of light to the solar panels, loss of privacy to the rear garden space and an overbearing impact on the current and future residents of no. 925 Oldham Road. As such the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring property and therefore would not accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposal would see the garage converted, however, for a garage to be considered an off-street parking space it would need to have internal dimensions of at least 5.5 metres in length and 3.5 metres in width. The existing garage is approximately 5m by 2.7m wide. It is therefore not considered a parking space. The property would therefore retain the existing supply of one off-street parking space.

The proposal would not change the number of bedrooms at the property and therefore the property would retain the existing three bedrooms. It is therefore expected that it would not lead to any greater demand for off-street parking. Furthermore, it is noted that the parking standards are a maximum number and not a minimum number.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The design of the proposed first floor rear extension is considered to be of poor quality and would be out of keeping with character of the host dwelling. It would constitute an unduly prominent and incongruous addition to the host dwelling. It therefore would have an adverse impact upon the character of the host dwelling and the street scene and would fail to enhance the quality of the area. As such the proposal would fail to accord with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its size, siting and design, the proposed front extension would appear as an awkward, ungainly as an incongruous addition, which would be out of character with the host dwelling and the existing street scene. As such the proposal would fail to accord with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. By virtue of its size, siting and design, the proposed first floor rear extension and increase in the height of the roof would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the solar panels, loss of privacy to the rear garden space and overbearing impact on the current and future residents of no. 925 Oldham Road. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative
For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

Building Control Existing Plans. Drawing no: 03-LA-DC-EX
Building Control Proposed Plans. Drawing no: 03-LA-DC-PROP - REV -03
Site plans

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	17/05/21	Signed: MM

Authorisation	19/05/21	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir