

Application Number:	23/00004/HOUS
Location:	72 Elm Park Grove Rochdale OL12 7JT
Proposal:	Two storey and part single storey rear extensions including Juliette balcony and alterations to rear and side fenestration and dormer extension to the front elevation
Applicant:	Mr Awais Khalid
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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 72 Elm Park Grove, a two storey detached property located in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale and within a cul-de-sac. The site benefits from a detached garage and generous front, rear and side gardens. The house includes with a part-width, single story hipped-roof rear outrigger. The rear boundary curtilage of the site sits adjacent to Brotherod Wood – a recreational management area designated as green belt land and of ecological and geomorphological importance. The surrounding street scene features predominantly detached bungalow dwellings with a low degree of uniformity.

Description of Proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for a two storey, first floor and part single storey rear extensions with the addition of a Juliette balcony to the rear at first floor level. The house currently has two rear elevations as a result of a staggered layout, both of which are thought to part of the original build and both of which have been altered. The rear extension towards the south elevation would feature a projection of 6.3m and extend 4.7m the width of the house, replacing the existing rear dormer. The first floor extension towards the north elevation would extend 2.5m from the rear elevation and feature a Juliette balcony. The proposed single storey rear extension would project 1m from the existing rear elevation close to the north elevation.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

A consultation was received from the highways officer on 23.01.23 regarding parking arrangements post development, the following response read:

The proposed extension does not appear to have any impact on the existing driveway arrangements and the residual parking provision would meet current Council standards for the size of the extended dwelling.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

We do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

Highways raise no objection to this application or ask for any specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbouring properties. No letters of representation were received.

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

Amendments were sought from the agent regarding clarification on internal rooms and functions surrounding the internal layout.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that developments must demonstrate that they "are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area" and "do not adversely

affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing and loss of privacy". Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states new developments must "enhance the boroughs 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".

It should be noted the extension would seek to significantly redevelop the scale, massing, height and layout to the rear of the existing house. It should also be noted the neighbour sited to the north, 74 Elm Park Grove, has also been subject to development at the rear to which it now hosts a rear first floor terrace close to the common boundary.

The dwelling currently hosts a front dormer to which the application proposes an additional front dormer which would sit above the existing catslide roof and be constructed in line with the one currently in place matching its overall appearance in terms of design, scale, height and positioning. The dormer would comply with section 5.17 of the SPD which outlines dormer design principles, the following of which are relevant:

- (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*
- (v) *design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (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*

Although dormers to the front elevation are not normally permitted, it is acknowledged front dormers are common on dwellings along Elm Park Grove and this element of the proposal would therefore be acceptable.

The 6.3m rear extension would be set down 0.09m from the existing roof ridge and would have eaves height significantly higher than that of the existing bungalow. This is not thought to act in subservience to the host dwelling. It would feature a pitched roof to match the existing however would be constructed significantly shallower than the one on the existing.

Overall the two storey rear extension would be too large for a dwelling of this size therefore appearing out of character to the host dwelling and not visually respecting the built form of the existing design.

The first floor extension has been designed to not extend beyond the existing rear wall. It would be set down 0.2m from the existing ridge and feature a Juliette balcony close to the common boundary of the adjoining property sited to the north. The first floor extension would also feature a pitched roof shallower than the one on the existing.

The single-storey rear extension would extend 1m from the rear elevation. It would be a continuation of the rear elevation by 1m and feature a chamfered edge towards the north elevation which although, would constitute poor design would be sited to the rear and out of view from public vantage points. It is thought the single storey rear extension would form a suitable addition to the dwelling given it would match the height, layout and materials of the existing build.

The impact of the development on the overall street scene would be minimal given development is proposed to the rear therefore out of view from any public vantage points. The front dormer is not thought to negatively impact the street scene given dormers are collective.

The material palette on the host dwelling currently features brick and blockwork to the external walls, UPVC fenestration and concrete interlocking roof tiles to which all elements of the proposed extension is sought to match to form a continuation of the visual appearance of the host dwelling.

Window proportions are thought to match fenestration on the existing and not feature a scale which would detrimentally impact the design of the existing dwelling, and would therefore be acceptable.

In light of the above assessment, the proposed works would significantly undermine the design and built form of the existing bungalow dwelling and feature a scale too large for a dwelling of this size. The extension would not visually respect the built form of the existing dwelling and would constitute a disproportionately large and incongruous addition to an otherwise standard dwelling.

The design is therefore 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

Paragraph 5.8 of the SPD sets out guidance for the addition of two-storey and first floor extensions to the rear to which it states “first floor rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbouring occupiers than single storey extensions, particularly on their enjoyment of their garden area due to the potential oppressiveness of a two-storey wall close to a common boundary”.

It should be noted the dwelling sited to the south, 70 Elm Park Grove, features a siting angled away from the application property therefore Section 4 Standards for the insertion of a window to the south elevation are not thought to apply given they would not directly face any windows. However, given 70 Elm Park Grove currently hosts a first floor side window to the north elevation, proposed plans do not indicate the projection of the two-storey extension to extend beyond such a length that it would not comply with Space Standards which requires “14m between a principal window and any directly facing two-storey elevation which does not contain a window to a habitable room”.

With the proposed first floor extension constructed close to the common boundary shared between the application property and 74 Elm Park Grove including a Juliette balcony, it is considered that the

proposal would overlook the rear garden and first-floor rear terrace at the adjacent property. In other circumstances it is considered that this level of overlooking would be unacceptably harmful. However, in this case, the overlooking and loss of privacy resulting from the proposed Juliette balcony would be no worse than that which results from the terrace towards the application site. This element of the proposal would mean that both properties would experience a similar level of overlooking from each other. With this in mind, it is not considered that a refusal on the grounds of loss of privacy of no 74 could be justified.

The front dormer is thought to be acceptable in amenity terms given it does not directly face a surrounding dwelling.

The SPD allows for a projection of “a point 4 meters along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”. Paragraph 5.7 requires single storey rear extensions to not project beyond a 45 degree line measured 4m from the common boundary. Plans indicate the single storey extension would have a projection of 4.8m measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining property however, the extension is proposed to host a chamfered edge in order to comply with SPD guidance therefore not projecting beyond the 45 degree line. The single storey extension is therefore acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity.

The two-storey element of the extension would project slightly beyond a 30 degree line measured from a point on the shared boundary measured 2.4m from the rear elevation of the neighbouring house at no 74. No 74 has ground floor windows close to the shared boundary, however these are already significantly compromised in terms of outlook and daylight by the existing single-storey rear extension placed immediately adjacent to the boundary. No 74 also has a first-floor rear-facing window near to the boundary, from which the rear extension would be visible. However, owing to the lower height of the bungalow compared to no 74, the impact in terms of visual intrusion to this window would be limited. It is not considered that the height and projection would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact on the outdoor space at no 74, as the property has an extensive rear and side garden set away from the boundary.

Plans indicate all rooms within the extension and those in the host dwelling would receive sufficient outlook and light. Additionally, sufficient garden space would be retained post development given the application property hosts generous rear, side and front gardens, which the development is not thought to compromise.

In view of the above assessment, in particularly in light of the existing first-floor height terrace at no 74, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of impacts upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, and therefore to comply with the relevant aspects of policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As a result of development, the dwelling will increase from a 3-bed to a 4-bed dwelling. Appendix 5 parking standards requires a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed houses outside of the town center. Given the dwelling hosts a driveway to the front and side of the

dwelling providing off-street parking, the proposal would therefore comply with the Council's Appendix 5 scheduled parking standards and would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, scale and siting, the proposed extension(s) would represent an incongruous form of development and not appear to respect the visual form and character of the host dwelling. The extension would be too large for a dwelling of this size and not be subservient to the scale of the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would not 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' 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.

Notes for Applicant:

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

LOCATION PLAN

1971/2 AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND SITE PLAN

1971/3 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	27.02.23	Signed: CP
Authorisation	08.03.23	Signed:TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo