APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01119/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01119/HOUS
Location:	1 Dale View Littleborough OL15 0BP
Proposal:	First floor side extension, single storey rear, with replacement of existing front porch, render to front and side elevation of first floor extension.
Applicant:	Mr Simon Hill
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?	**N**

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

Location

The application relates to 1 Dale View, a two-storey detached dwelling located in Rochdale. The property occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Dale View and Knowl View. To the south of no. 1, the property shares its rear boundary with side boundary of no. 2 Knowl View. To the west of the of the property, is no. 3Dale View, no. 5 Dale and an electrical sub-station. The electrical sub-station sits in between no. 1 and no. 3 Dale View. To the north are detached properties at no. 6 to 10 Dale View and to the east is no. 1 and 3 Knowl View.

Description of Proposal

The applicant seeks planning permission for the following work:

- First-floor side extension above the existing two flat-roof garages. The proposed first floor extension would run the width of the two garages and therefore would be 5.8m wide. The proposed first floor extension would be set back from the front elevation and will be bridged by a small mono pitch roof. Additionally, the roof will be set below the ridge line.
- Single storey rear extension which would project out by 2.1m from the rear elevation of the host property and span a width of 6.2m. The proposed single storey extension would project out the same distance as the existing

outrigger. The proposed rear extension would have a mono pitched roof and bifolding doors to the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension.
- New mono-pitch roof above existing flat-roof rear outrigger.
- New flat roof front porch to replace existing porch.
- Render the front, side and rear elevations.

Planning permission was granted for a similar scheme was granted in 2019 (19/00716/HOUS) but has not been implemented. The prime difference between the two applications relates to the size of the first floor extension. Whereas the applicant proposes that the first floor side extension will extended the width of the two garages, the previous application proposed to extend it by the width of one garage.

Relevant History

19/00716/HOUS - Demolition of existing porch to front elevation and construction of flat-roof replacement; first floor extension to side elevation above existing garage; proposed single storey rear extension and formation of pitched roof above existing single-storey rear outrigger; and application of additional render to front elevation (re-submission 19/00305/HOUS) – Grant subject to conditions.

19/00305/HOUS - First floor side extension, single storey rear extension, new mono pitch roof above existing rear outrigger, new front porch to replace existing and application of external render to front, side and rear elevations – Refused. The application was refused for the following reason:

> *The proposed first-floor side extension would significantly alter the proportions of the dwelling, near doubling the two-storey width of the property, would fail to present a subordinate addition to the house, and would sit at odds with the street scene. The poor proportionality of the extension would be amplified by the proposed fenestration arrangement on the front elevation, the wide expanse of render and lack of brick pillar to correspond with the appearance of the existing house, and the alien gable roof feature. The extension would be of irregular form, would be out of proportion and would negatively affect the appearance of the host dwelling and result in an unacceptable degree of visual harm to the street scene, exacerbated by the prominent corner plot location of the dwelling. As such, the proposal fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

77/D04852 - Car Port Front Porch And Kitchen Extension – Approved.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

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
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

- The proposed first floor side extension would span a width of 5.8m across the two garages on the ground floor. The host property is 6.4m wide. This would significantly alter the proportions of the dwelling by almost doubling the two-storey width of the property. As percentile, that would equate to a 90.6 increase in the width of the first floor. The applicants have amended the previously refused plans (19/00305/HOUS) for a first floor side extension that spanned the width of the two garages by lowering the ridge height and by setting the first floor back slightly. Though the changes have slightly reduced the prominence of the extension, it is still not considered to be a subordinate addition, owing to the width of the proposed first floor side extension and the insufficient distance it has been set back from the host property.
- It is noted that a number of properties in the close vicinity have had first floor side extensions, however they differ from no.1 Dale View in that they have a single garage and sit on smaller plots. Additionally, the majority of those do not sit on prominent corner plots.
- As with the original application (19/00305/HOUS), the window to the front elevation of the proposed first floor side extension is a similar size and design to the window in the host property. The issue in regards to the poor proportions still exist and are still amplified by the proposed fenestration arrangement on the front elevation which would leave a wide expanse of render. The addition of a brick pillar corresponds well with the host property and helps tie the proposed first floor side extension with the host property.

- In regards to the proposed porch, it is noted that there are a mixture of properties with and without porches. The properties in the close vicinity of no.1 have mono pitch roof porches, and flat roof porches are not common feature within the area. However, the addition of the flat roof porch that has

been proposed is considered to represent a contemporary addition that would be appropriate addition to no.1 Dale View.

- The ground floor rear extension would project out the same distance as the outrigger to the rear of the property. A mono pitch roof will run along the proposed ground floor rear extension and the existing outrigger. The addition of the mono pitch roof will tie the two together well. The proposed ground floor extension and the roof of the existing outrigger will be screened from view and would not be visible from the street scene. It is considered the proposed ground floor extension and the mono pitched roof that will run along the proposed extension and the existing outrigger is an acceptable addition.
- The proposed render the front, side and rear elevations are considered acceptable additions.
- The property would retain the existing access to the side and rear, therefore it is considered that the proposal would not impact on the storage of bins. The bins will be able to be kept out view when not required and would therefore not have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the street scene.
- Due to the proportion of the proposed first floor side extension and the poor fenestration to the front elevation, the proposed first floor side extension would have a negative effect on the appearance of the host property and would result in an unacceptable degree of visual harm to the street scene. Additionally, due to the prominent location of no. 1 Dale View on a corner plot and close to the main entrance of the wider estate, the proposed additions would further exacerbate the visual harm identified. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- To the front of the proposed first floor extension, there will be a window that will service a bedroom. The distance between no.1 Dale View and no. 8 Dale View would be approximately 22.7m. Additionally, the proposed first floor side extension would be set back slightly from the front elevation of the host property, and therefore the distance between the properties would be slightly greater than when compared with the host property. It is therefore considered that the proposed first floor side extension would not unduly impact on the privacy of the occupants of no. 8 Dale View. Additionally, it considered that the proposed first floor side extension would not be overbearing to occupants of the neighbouring properties to the north.
- To the west, the proposed first floor side extension would be approximately 20m from the rear elevation of no. 3 Dale View. The proposal does not seek to add any windows to the side elevation of the property and therefore would meet the minimum requirement of 14m as set out in the SPD. Additionally, the electrical substation would separate the two properties. It is therefore considered that the proposed first floor side extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of no. 3 Dale View.
- In relation to no.2 Knowl View, the proposed first floor side extension would directly face the rear garden of no.2 Knowl View. The distance to shared boundary would be approximately 9.4m. The distance would fall short of the minimum requirement set in the SPD by approximately 1.1m. However, as noted in previous applications, the proposed first floor side extension would be constructed flush with the rear elevation of the host property and therefore it is considered that the minor shortfall would not result in a detrimental impact to the amenity of the occupiers of no. 2 Knowl View, with respect to their rear garden area, and not to the extent that would warrant a refusal on this basis.
- It is considered that the proposed front porch, the single storey rear extension and the mono pitch roof addition above existing rear outrigger and the render

to front, side and rear would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the neighbouring occupants.

- All habitable rooms within the application property will retain sufficient amount light and outlook.
- The property would retain garden space to the side and rear of the property meaning that it would retain suitable amounts of outdoor amenity space.
- The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- The property would retain the existing parking arrangement, which includes sufficient parking space for two vehicles.
- The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposed first floor side extension would significantly alter the proportions of the dwelling, nearly doubling the two-storey width of the property, and would therefore fail to present a subordinate addition to the host property, and would sit at odds with the street scene. The poor proportionality of the extension would be amplified by the proposed fenestration arrangement on the front elevation and the wide expanse of render. The proposed first floor side extension would have a negative effect on the appearance of the host property and result in an unacceptable degree of visual harm to the street scene, exacerbated by the prominent corner plot location of the dwelling. As such, the proposal fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.

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

Site location plan. Drawing no: 1001
Existing site plan. Drawing no: 1002
Proposed site plan. Drawing no: 1003
Existing plans and elevations. Drawing no: 0001
Proposed plans and elevations. Drawing no: 1005
Planning statement for 1 Dale View, Littleborough, OL15 0BP

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	06/11/2020	Signed: MM
Authorisation	06/11/2020	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir