

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00981/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00981/HOUS
Location:	14 Glamis Avenue Heywood Rochdale OL10 2LX
Proposal:	Single storey rear and first floor side extension including garage conversion, alteration to fenestration and roof lights
Applicant:	Mr Munro
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
DETERMINATION DATE 01.01.2025	EXT OF TIME
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?	NA
	Neighbour comments received?	N

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

Location

The application relates to 14 Glamis Avenue, a semi-detached dwellinghouse in the Hopwood area of Heywood, just off Middleton Road, approximately 500m north of the M62. The area is residential in character and is predominately surrounded by other residential properties and estates of varying ages.

While Glamis Avenue, particularly to the south, has a range of house types and designs which respond to the topography, the immediate surroundings of the application property appear similar in age. Majority of properties are semi-detached with a hipped roof design.

The application property is the only property on the street with an original catslip roof design. The catslip roof is also present on No 16 also with no alterations to this as visible from the front elevation. The adjacent non-adjointed neighbour at No 18 Glamis Avenue, is the only detached property on the street.

The northern elevation of 14 Glamis Avenue is the principle elevation adjacent to the highway. The southern elevation is the rear elevation to the property. The variation in land levels between the property at 14 Glamis avenue, and the properties to the rear are evident from the rear garden area, as the ground floor of No 62, a bungalow property, is at an elevated position; at approximately the same level as the first floor of the application site.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor side extension including hip to gable roof extension, insertion of rooflights to the main roofslope, and a single storey flat roof rear extension. Proposed materials include new facing brick, grey concrete roof tiles, black UPVC windows, black aluminium doors, black soffits and fascia and rainwater goods, and a white render to the rear extension.

The first floor extension would measure 4.9m (eaves height) 7.6m (maximum height), 2.3m width at the eaves, and 4.5m width at the ridge.

The single storey rear extension would project 2.95m from the rear elevation of the property, measure 3m in height and 8m in width.

Additional alterations include the addition of a door on the side elevation of the property and the bricking up of a window.

Relevant History

None applicable

Township/Member comments

None received.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

None received

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone, and the SPD seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping.

The proposed first-floor extension would seek to remove the catslip roof design and infill this with a hip to gable roof extension, and first floor extension. The dwelling, which is read as a pair, is the only property on the avenue of a catslip design, and as a result, the proposed extension would appear starkly unbalanced, and appear incongruous within the streetscene. The proposed first floor extension would not be set back from the front elevation of the existing dwellinghouse, resulting in an unsightly brick join.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with NPPF, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, Policies DM1 and P3 of Rochdale Council's Core Strategy, and the SPD.

Fallback Position

Following the officer's site visit and review of the proposals, the agent was emailed to inform them the application was to be refused. As a response the agent stated the fallback position in relation to the erection of the single storey rear extension and the erection of a side and rear dormer in place of the first floor extension, through the use of permitted development rights.

This position has been considered by the case officer, and it is noted the proposed extension is substantially different to the works described by the agent to be

constructed through the use of permitted development rights, so much to the degree it is not a similar, nor comparable case. No plans have been submitted to demonstrate the use of such rights, nor has a certificate of proposed lawfulness been submitted.

It is noted the materials on the rear extension would be white render which would not be compliant with permitted development.

The proposed works of a first floor side extension considered under this planning application would result in an unbalanced appearance when reading the building as a pair and would appear incongruous when viewed from the streetscene. While the works described as being a fallback position may not be desirable, it is not considered the impact of the first floor extension would incur any less harm to the main dwellinghouse.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*

The proposal would not result in any additional windows which would have any unacceptable overlooking impact. The proposals would not result in an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact on any adjacent neighbouring property. The single storey rear extension would be sited 340mm away from the shared boundary, and would not project further forward than the existing conservatory directly adjacent.

While the over and above that of 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 proposal would remove an existing internal garage on the site. Nonetheless, the proposed parking arrangements are still acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its scale, massing and design, the proposed first floor side extension including hip to gable extension would constitute an unbalanced and incongruous appearance within the streetscene, which is wholly out of keeping with the host dwelling and the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would result in undue visual harm in this regard. The proposal would not be well-designed and would fail to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	18/12/2024	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	23/12/2024	Signed:LA

Report Author Rosalind Gralton