

Application Number:	23/00417/HOUS
Location:	2 Lobley Close, Rochdale, OL12 9SQ
Proposal:	Single storey front & first floor rear extensions
Applicant:	Rulcsana Bibi
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 2 Lobley close, a two-storey end of terrace house in Rochdale. Lobley Close and the surrounding streets comprise similar terrace houses, many of which have had front and/or rear dormer extensions. The area is predominantly residential, with access to local amenities, green space and shops. However, approx. 0.25km to the north-west of the property is a business park/ industrial estate.

The adjoining property to the north-west is 4 Lobley Close – the only neighbouring property. The front (south-west) elevation, and side (south-east) elevation both overlook Lobley Close highway, thus the property is in a visually prominent location. The rear, north-east elevation overlooks Stonie Heyes Avenue, and is again very visible from the street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey front extension and a first floor rear extension atop the existing rear ground-floor extension.

The proposed front extension is positioned in front of the existing front door, with a sloped roof. It would measure approx. 2.2m in height to eaves; 3.2m in maximum height; 2.9m in width and 1.9m in depth. The front extension would include a single window to the front elevation and a single door to the north-west facing side elevation. Red brick and slate roof tiles to match the host property are proposed.

The proposed rear extension is situated in top of the existing ground floor extension, but does not protrude as far back. A ridged roof form is suggested, as well as red brick and slate tiles to match the host property. The proposal includes a single window to the rear elevation. From ground level the maximum height would measure 5.8m, and the height to eaves would measure 4.7m. From the eaves of the existing ground floor extension, the maximum height of the proposed rear extension would measure 3.3m and the height to eaves 2.3m. The width of the rear extension measure approx. 3.4m and the depth from the host property, approx. 2.4; the depth is approx. 1.8m less than the ground floor extension.

Relevant History

10D53145 - Single-storey rear extension including loft extension with front and rear dormers– grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent 12/05/2023 to surrounding properties.

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

Policies P1, 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 on to 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.

Regarding the front extension, the design is problematic as it would create a visually overbearing structure which is incongruous relative to the host property and wider street scene. The scale of the extension would dominate the front elevation, and undermine the simple form of the original dwelling and surrounding dwellings. Additionally, it would comprise a significant breach of the strong building line of the terraced houses, appearing unduly conspicuous. The proposed single-storey window and the repositioning of the front door to a side facing arrangement would only serve to compound the irregularity of the design, which would fail to respond well to its context.

In terms of the rear extension, it is considered that the extension would relate poorly to the existing rear dormer with the gable of the extension adjoining the rear elevation of the dormer.

Taken cumulatively, the existing dormers, poor design of the front extension and the split form of the rear extension would combine to produce a wholly unresolved assemblage of forms and massing which would sit uncomfortably within the context of the street scene and wider area which is exclusively comprised of simple domestic typologies.

Furthermore, it is noted that the property and therefore the proposed extensions, would assume a highly prominent position at the junction of Lobley Cl and Stoney Heyes Ave. and as such would compound the visual harm already identified.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not 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.

No concerns are had in respect of overbearing impact or overshadowing as the proposed extensions would comply with the relevant projection guidance contained within the SPD.

Similarly the separation distance between the first floor rear extension and the facing neighbour would be reduced to 25m, and would comply with the 21m of separation contained within section 4.1 of the SPD.

The proposals would preserve the existing yard area which offers negligible amenity value, however is not an uncommon arrangement within the surrounding area and as such no unacceptable harm is identified in this regard.

In light of the

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The property currently offers no off street parking, therefore the effects of the proposal on parking provision are redundant.

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

Recommendation

Refuse:

By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed extensions would constitute an incongruous addition to the host dwelling that would represent an overdevelopment of the property. The proposed form would appear alien in the context of the adjoining terrace and surrounding terraces to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. Additionally, the design of the proposal would not constitute a high standard of design and would compound the visual harm to the dwelling and ultimately dilute the character that is present to an unacceptable extent. Taken as a whole, the development would fail to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance, and result in significant visual harm to the dwelling and street scene. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) 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 application relates to drawings:

Update elevations: sheet 2

Location plan: 223388

Existing site plan

Proposed site plan

Existing plans: sheet 1

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	03/07/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	03/07/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg