

Application Number:	23/00702/HOUS
Location:	2 Tern Close Rochdale OL11 5QU
Proposal:	Part first floor, part two storey / part one and a half storey side extensions with alterations to front, side and rear elevations, alteration to existing boundary fence, extension to existing hardstanding and addition of raised platform to the rear. Resubmission of 22/00531/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Annam Arshid
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	NO

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	NO

Location

The application relates to no.2 Tern Close, a two storey detached property located in Bamford. The dwelling is sited on a corner plot at the junction where Petrel Close, Snipe Avenue, Tern Close and Bittern Close intersect. The property faces west onto the highway, adjacent to no.4 Tern Close to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the side elevation and driveway of no.1 Petrel Close.

Tern Close sits in a residential estate comprising detached houses of a similar design and material palette. Whilst there is an abundance of greenery and mature trees, the estate retains a sense of openness due to the generous space between properties.

The property recently underwent development which included the removal of several mature trees from the front of the property. Consequently, no.2 Tern Close is particularly exposed and visible from several directions.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for an extension on the existing attached garage. The proposed development includes a first floor addition, and an extension in width and depth. The development will raise the existing ridge height of the garage to form an extended sloped roof.

As a result of the development, the side extension would measure approx. 7.3m in width, and 10.6m in depth. The height to eaves would measure approx. 2.3m, while the maximum height measures 5.8m.

The proposal includes 3 sky lights at the front, and 1 sky light and a pitched-roof dormer at the rear. Further alterations to the fenestration include: 3 windows on the front elevation; a single door on the side elevation; windows at ground and first floor level of the side elevation; and bi-folding doors on the rear elevation.

Red brick, slate roof tiles, and black aluminum window frames are included to match the existing external materials of the host dwelling.

The proposed development also includes an alteration to the existing boundary fence to accommodate the added width of the extension. Furthermore, an extension and addition to the hard standing raised platform is proposed to the rear.

Relevant History

15/01409/HOUS: Erection of timber boundary fence 1.9m high (retrospective) – Approved

22/00531/HOUS: Conversion of existing garage to living accommodation including alterations to front elevation, two storey rear extension, first floor front extension, single storey side extension, construction of terrace and installation of canopy to rear, formation of vehicular access including hardstanding and alterations to existing rear fenestration and boundary treatment – REFUSAL

Reason:

By virtue of its design, scale and size, the proposed development would significantly alter the proportions and form of the original dwelling and would amount to an overdevelopment of the plot. The proposed extensions would dominate the host property and would have a prominence which would harmfully impact the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

12/07/2023:

For the size of the extended dwelling we would require two viable off street parking spaces to be provided and from some of the submitted plans it would seem to be achievable. The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

We do not expect that there would be any detrimental impact on highway capacity or road safety as a result of the proposed development. Highways raise no objection to this application subject to the provision of two viable off street parking spaces, and we request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 12/07/2023.

One objection was raised based on the following reasons:

- Blockage of light and visual outlook.
- Reduction of privacy.
- Harming the character of the area.
- Safety concerns regarding vehicles on the driveway obscuring the view on a 4-way junction.
- Concern that the extension would be within 30 feet of the neighbour's foundations.

Officer's notes:

- The matters are assessed within the 'Design' and 'Amenity' sections of the report.
- Concerns over the proximity of built form to foundations form a civil legal matter and therefore no regard shall be had.

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

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P3 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes onto state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The application proposes a one-and-a-half storey side extension, which would provide accommodation within the roof space at first floor level with the inclusion of a dormer window to the rear facing roof slope. The overall width of the side extension would be comparable to that of the entire host dwelling, and as such, the extension appears entirely discordant with the two storey form of the host dwelling and would be highly conspicuous within the street scene due to the corner plot siting and absence of substantial planting.

The design and placement of fenestration to the front elevation of the extension would assist in breaking up the expanse of masonry and roof slope, however would only further alienate the extension from the more ordinary appearance of the host dwelling and therefore result in a more visually harmful form of development.

It is noted that section 5.14 of the SPD requires development on a corner plot to "maintain sufficient space between the boundary and the nearest part of the extension". Given the setting down of the ridge relative to the host dwelling and remaining separation to the highway, it is not considered that this development would necessarily present a 'hard edge' to the public realm, however this matter would weigh neutrally in the overall planning balance.

Concerning dormers, the section 5.16 of the SPD states that they should be "carefully designed and sited" as they can be "visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway". As the applicant property is on a corner plot, the rear is visible from Petrel Close. The proposed rear dormer should therefore adhere to the following requirements laid out in section 5.16 and 5.17 of the SPD:

- Modest in size and not occupy a disproportionate portion of the roof;
- Should not exceed the height of the ridge, and where possible should be set lower;
- Set back from the eaves line;

- Set in from the party walls of the house;
- Where possible, avoid using a flat roof;
- Where possible, vertically align with existing ground floor windows;
- Use materials to match the host dwelling.

The proposed dormer complies with all of the above policy except that it is not set lower than the ridge line. However, the position of the proposed dormer allows it to line up with the first floor windows of the host property. When viewed from the rear, this balance would prove more important than setting the dormer further down, which would in fact create imbalance. Due to its pitched roof and uniform design, the dormer is considered to be acceptable on balance and would not comprise an unduly harmful feature.

The proposed use of red bricks, grey slate roof tiles, and black aluminum window frames to match the host property's external materials is considered appropriate were the development to be acceptable.

Other than in material palette, the proposed development largely fails to integrate with the host property and instead results in a disproportionate and incongruous form at a highly prominent location which would ultimately fail to reach an adequate standard of design and would therefore be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and the development therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Section 4.1 of the SPD requires new development to adhere to the following minimum space standards (which are relevant in the determination of this application):

- 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

Rear facing upper floor windows to habitable rooms are only present in the rear facing dormer, which would not have a direct facing window to a neighbour, and would retain 10.6m of separation to the rear facing boundary and therefore would comply with the requirements of the SPD.

The proposal would retain an appropriate garden area for a dwelling of this size and would provide adequate light and outlook to all habitable rooms. As such, the proposals would comply with the requirements of Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As the development would retain the existing parking and servicing arrangements, which include 2 off-street parking spaces, the development would comply with Policy DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core strategy and NPPF.

Recommendation: REFUSE for the following reason:

1. By reason of its form, design and exposed siting, the extension would form an incongruous and alien feature which would fail to sit sympathetically with, and would respond poorly to, the established character of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development proposals ultimately fail to amount to a satisfactory standard of design and the application is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/10/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	04/12/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Procedure 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.

Informative

This decision relates to the following list of plans:

P01A – Location & Existing Site Plan
P04B – Site Plan as Proposed
P05D – Plans as Proposed
P06D – Elevations as proposed

Report Author Hamish Rigg