

Application Number:	22/01303/HOUS
Location:	59 Mountain Ash Rochdale OL12 7JD
Proposal:	Part two/part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear conservatory together with front and rear dormers
Applicant:	MR MICK HERNON
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to No.59 Mountain Ash, a two storey terrace dwelling located on a residential street in Rochdale. The property has one adjoining dwelling to the East (No.57 Mountain Ash) and sits west of (No.61 Mountain Ash). The boundary of the dwelling's curtilage borders an alleyway to the edge of the rear garden and sits adjacent to No.23 Mountain Ash to the rear. There is also a side entrance from the front to the rear garden of the property. The overall street design features predominately rows of terrace houses as well as semi-detached dwellings.

Description of Proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for a front and rear dormer and part two/part single storey rear extensions. The existing single-storey conservatory to the rear will be demolished to make way for the proposed works.

The front dormer projects an additional total height of 1.8m to the roof elevation and is set back 1.3m from the principal elevation of the host dwelling. It has a total width of 2.6m and matches the height of the existing ridge of the roof. The rear dormer projects a total height of 2.4m to the roof elevation and is not set back from the principal rear wall. It has a total length of 3.6m. The rear dormer also matches the ridge height of the existing roof. The front and rear dormer combined has an overall total length of 7m and the existing dwelling has an overall total length of 8m. It can be seen from the plans the dormers will host an additional bathroom, bedroom and landing space.

The ground floor of the rear extension will extend 3m from the rear wall of the host dwelling and will have a height to eaves of 2.7m and features a lean-to roof. The first floor of the two-storey extension will extend 2.4m from the rear wall of the host dwelling and will have a height to eaves of 2.3m. The pitched roof of the extension is proposed to connect onto the rear dormer at a height of 1m. The overall height of the two-storey extension is 6.2m and the overall width would match the existing dwelling width of 5.2m. It can be seen from the plans the extension will host a family area on the ground floor and an additional bedroom on the first floor.

The proposed materials for additional exterior walls and surrounding fenestration outlined in the application is sought to match the existing materials and finishes. Although the materials of the fenestration is matched throughout the property, the front hosts a different finish to the side and rear windows and doors.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

7 surrounding neighbours were consulted regarding this application. 2 letters of representation were received.

1 comment received in objection to the planning application.

- Loss of direct sunlight.
Officer Response: See amenity section of report
- Loss of privacy
Officer Response: See amenity section of report
- Devalue our house
Officer Response: This is not a material planning consideration

1 comment received in support of the application.

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

N/A

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”.
- ❑ The Council’s SPD Paragraph 5.16 states that “dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted”. Rear dormers “should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling”. The proposed front dormer would have a flat roof and would form a dominant feature of the principal elevation of the terrace. It would extend to match the ridge height of the host dwelling therefore not subservient in respect to the existing dwelling design. When assessing the proposal from a public viewpoint, the width of the dormer would be detrimental to the character of the existing terrace and wider street scene. The front dormer would pose an overbearing impact due to the scale matching close to the measurements of those on the existing property and would allow the terrace to be viewed as a possible three-storey dwelling. It is therefore noted that the front dormer would be overly visible from public viewpoints.
- ❑ Paragraph 5.16 states rear dormers “should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof”. The proposed plans indicate a larger rear dormer than the one proposed to the front. It would dominate a significant proportion of the existing roof also matching the ridge height, a feature unacceptable against SPD standards.
- ❑ With reference to the surrounding properties in the area, there are currently no front or rear dormers in the adjoining row of terraces. Further down the street, 10 properties host a front dormer however, they are set a large proportion down from the ridge line and feature a significantly smaller scale than the one proposed.
- ❑ The proposed two-storey rear extension would also be prominent in relation to the surrounding rear street layout, but is not considered unacceptable. However, the roof of the two-storey extension attaches onto the proposed rear dormer, a design not normally considered acceptable. Once removed or scaled down, the rear two-storey extension would be deemed an acceptable addition to the existing dwelling.
- ❑ It is considered that the dormers (front and rear) would be not in keeping to the original design and character of the host dwelling and overall street design due to its excessive size, occupying a large width of the roof. Although rear dormers can be acceptable in the SPD, the various merits of this application would be detrimental to the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding site. The main concern for this application gives weight to predominantly the front dormer however, the scale of both the front and rear fall short of SPD standards. Should this application be resubmitted to comply with SPD guidelines, the front and rear dormers would need to be significantly reduced in scale to better respect the existing elements of the dwelling and surrounding properties and not dominant a large part of the roof. Both dormers would be reduced down from the ridge height of the roof in order to not appear disproportionate and should better respect the character

of the area. Additionally, further detail on the fenestration should also be sought due to the inconsistency of the windows and doors from the front elevation of brown fenestration to the side and rear elevations containing white fenestration. It should be clearly outlined in the application the further details to avoid any further imbalance on the dwelling.

Summary

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Section 4 “Space Standards” in the SPD states that “it is expected that most new development will have some impact on neighbours” and “all new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings”.
- ❑ With regards to space standards, the proposed two storey and single-storey extensions comply with the SPD at 2.4m and 3m in length respectively, and will not cause any significant loss of light or outlook for the neighbouring dwellings to either side.
- ❑ Although the proposed extension poses no loss of privacy to the adjoining properties, it is thought to have a harmful impact on the property adjacent to the rear garden (No.23 Mountain Ash). The SPD requires there to be a minimum of 21m of space between principal facing windows therefore as the proposal would only leave a 17m gap between the proposed rear bedroom window of the extension and that of the adjacent property, the development would not accord to SPD Space Standards. Additionally, the SPD requires a 10.5m gap between the rear extension and boundary of the curtilage. The development proposes a 5m gap therefore also not complying with the SPD Space Standards.
- ❑ It is noted the dwelling hosts an existing 2.8m x 4m outbuilding sited in the rear garden therefore a 3m rear extension would leave inadequate outdoor amenity space remaining for the host occupiers.

Summary

As listed above, the impact of the proposed works regarding occupier amenity on No.23 Mountain Ash would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would not act in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ The proposed development would not impact the existing provision of off road parking available at the property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of siting, scale and design, the proposed front and rear dormer would constitute an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling, to the detriment of its character and amenity of surrounding neighbours. The proposed development therefore constitutes poor design, contrary to 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.

2. By virtue of siting, scale and design, the proposed two-storey rear extension would compromise the amenity of No.23 Mountain Ash and would not comply with SPD space standards. This would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy on the adjacent neighbouring windows to the rear and will result in inadequate private rear garden space for the occupier of the host dwelling, due to the presence of the existing outbuilding. The application therefore fails to adhere to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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
- 22.2914.5 SITE PLANS
- 22.2914.3 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
- 22.2914.2A EXISTING ELEVATIONS REVISED
- 22.2914.2A PROPOSED EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	08.12.22	Signed: C.Petrillo
Authorisation	19.12.22	Signed:L.Ashworth

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo