

Application Number:	22/01289/HOUS
Location:	9 Tenterhill Lane Rochdale OL11 5TY
Proposal:	Two-storey front extension and installation of ground floor high level window to side elevation
Applicant:	MR CARL BRIERLEY
Case Officer:	Aimee Bovaird
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

Location

The proposal relates to no.9 Tenterhill Lane, a two storey detached dwelling. The dwelling consists of red brick and is characterised by an attached garage to the side of the property. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a front garden and a long driveway. The house is set back slightly from the adjacent dwelling.

The application dwelling is detached and the surrounding street scene is characterised by similar dwellings.

It is located within the defined urban area. It is not listed, nor within a conservation area and there are no protected trees within the site.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a two-storey front extension which projects 6 metres from the original front elevation and has a width of 6 metres.

At the ground floor two windows are proposed on the front elevation and one to the side elevation. At first floor on the front elevation two front dormers are proposed. Both have pitched roofs and a rooflight separates them.

On the ground floor the extension forms a lounge and on the first floor one bedroom and an en suite plus dressing room is proposed.

Relevant History

No relevant history.

Township/Member comments

No comments

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the neighboring properties, no representations were made.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Rochdale Core Strategy sets out in policy DM1 that developments should be of a high quality design and enhance the quality of the area. New developments must not adversely affect the amenity of the area, including by reason on visual intrusion. Policy P3 requires new development 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; and Ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape, and are well proportioned.”

- ❑ In addition to the above, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the Government attaches importance to the design of the built environment.
- ❑ The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.1 that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ❑ This proposed development is not considered subservient to the host dwelling as it extends to the front of the host dwelling by some 6 metres and will result in an overall change in appearance and character of the property that is detrimental to the dwelling itself and as it will become the most prominent feature of the dwelling.
- ❑ The proposed development will project to the front of the house and in front of the building line and become an overbearing feature in the street.
- ❑ Dormers to the front are not normally permitted under the SPD. The street scene is largely unchanged by additions to the front, indeed there are no other similar front facing dormers within the immediate locality. The proposed development would be an incongruous feature on the host dwelling and negatively affect the design and character of the area.
- ❑ The proposal is considered to fundamentally alter the character and design of the host property, resulting in the property to be overbearing and appear prominent by virtue of its size and would look disjointed within the immediate street scene.
- ❑ Overall, it is considered that the proposed development due to its positioning on the front, incorporation of dormers, its scale and incongruous design would not accord with the design of the host dwelling, nor the immediate street scene, and therefore 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 Council's adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals so not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.
- ❑ The proposed window on the North facing elevation will not look onto any neighbouring dwellings and will not affect amenity. The proposed window on the South facing window will also not look over the neighbouring property and is not considered to result in a loss of privacy.
- ❑ The proposed windows on the front elevations do not negatively affect the amenity of the opposite dwelling as there is sufficient space between the dwellings.
- ❑ The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.4, 'it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers.' As this proposed development is at the front of the house it will not affect the rear garden.
- ❑ 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

- ❑ The provision of two off-street parking spaces would accord with the maximum parking standard contained within Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy.

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

Recommendation: Refuse

- 1.) By virtue of its design, form and massing the proposed extension plus dormers would be an unsympathetic and non-subservient addition to the host dwelling, and it would significantly erode the character and uniformity of the immediate streetscene. 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.

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

Location Plan

Site Plan – 22.2949.3

Existing Elevations – 22.2949.2

Existing Floor Plans – 22.2949.1

Proposed Elevations – 22.2949.SC1.2A

Proposed Floor Plans – 22.2949.SC1.1A

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	5/12/22	Signed: ABovaird
Authorisation	12/12/22	Signed:L.Ashworth

Report Author Aimee Bovaird