APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00340/HOUS

Application Number:	19/00340/HOUS
Location:	36 Naunton Road Middleton M24 1EY
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front and rear dormers and alterations to existing front elevation following removal of detached garage
Applicant:	Mr RAYMOND GIBSON
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
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**

Location

This application relates to a semi-detached domestic property situated on a residential street in the Middleton Township. It is built in red brick, with pantiles to roof and UPVC windows throughout. The property is built with a hipped roof and has a single storey, flat roofed rear extension. Within the rear amenity space of the property is a single storey, rendered garage.

The adjoining property has been significantly altered and extended. It has two dormer windows to front; the hipped roof has been replaced by a gable ended roof; a two storey extension has been erected to side; a dormer window to the rear and a single storey rear extension.

Several other single storey properties in the street scene have dormer windows to both the front and rear.

Description of Proposal

This application seeks permission for the following:

- The erection of twin gabled dormer windows to the front of the property and a flat roofed dormer window to the rear, including a “hip to gable” roof extension.
- A single storey rear extension. This would be built with a flat roof with a roof lantern. It would have an eaves height of 2.5 metres; a maximum height of 3.2 metres and a depth of 4 metres. It would cover the full width of the host dwelling and the proposed extension.
- A side extension. This extension would be built with a dual pitched roof, be built in brick and would be set back 1 metre from the front elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed rear dormer would continue over its rear roof slope and a dual pitched dormer would be sited within its front roof slope
- The rendering of the front and side elevations of the host dwelling in an off-white K-Render.
- The alteration of the front the property, creating a new bay window and a front elevation which sits entirely flush with that of the adjoining property.
- The creation of a brick paved hardstanding to the front of the host dwelling.

Relevant History

18/01059/HOUS- Single storey side and rear extension, front and rear dormers, alterations to existing front elevation and formation of hardstanding to front of dwelling - Resubmission of 18/00692/HOUS. Approved.

18/00692/HOUS- Two and single storey side and rear extensions, front and rear dormers, alterations to existing front elevation, alterations to roof and formation of hardstanding to front of dwelling. Refused for the following reasons:

- By reason of its size, scale and design the proposed two storey side extension would introduction of an awkward, irregular and conspicuous feature into the street scene that would not be in keeping with character and appearance of the dwelling house. As such the proposed development would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

No comments received.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

None received.

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

It is noted that the alterations to the roof, the erection of the side extension and erection of dormer windows to the front of the property would somewhat balance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties to which the host dwelling belongs. However, it is considered that the proposed side extension and alterations to the roof of the original dwelling would, due to their size and design with varying eaves heights, introduce an awkward, irregular and conspicuous feature into the street scene that would not be in keeping with character and appearance of the dwelling house. As such the proposal would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The re-rendering of the front of the host dwelling would not materially alter its appearance, given that it is currently rendered, provided that the colour/type of render is of an appropriate texture/colour.

Whilst the proposed rear facing dormer window would be of a considerable size and would be built with a flat roof, given that are several large flat roofed dormers in the immediate surrounding area, the erection of the proposed dormer would not harm the character of the property or surrounding area.

Whilst the proposed single storey rear extension would be built with a flat roof, given the presence of an existing flat roofed rear extension and the presence of flat roof extensions to the adjoining neighbouring property and nearby properties, it is not considered that the erection of the newly proposed flat roofed rear extension will significantly adversely impact upon the character of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.

It is considered that by virtue of its nature and small scale, the proposed new driveway would not substantially harm the character of the surrounding area.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD
To ensure that a single storey extension does not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents, the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document provides standards which should be adhered to. It states:

'The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions:

For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);

For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s). ‘

The proposed single storey rear extension would accord with the guidance in the SPD. It is therefore considered this element of the proposal will not result in the substantial loss of the light to or have an oppressive impact upon the residents of the neighbouring properties.

To ensure that developments do not cause a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of nearby dwellings, paragraph 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD also sets out space standards guidelines. It states that the following minimum space standards should be adhered to:

(i) 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 (Figure 2);

(ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 3);

(iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 4).

The proposed dormer windows and side extension would accord with the above guidance. It is therefore considered that their erection would not result in a significant loss of privacy to the occupiers of nearby properties.

The side extension would be within close proximity to the side facing bathroom and kitchen windows of the neighbouring property, resulting in a loss of light and outlook. However, given that the bathroom is a non-habitable room, and the kitchen has a larger rear facing window and French door, it is not considered that the impact would be so severe as to have an unacceptable impact upon the amenities of the occupants of this property.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

1. By reason of its size and design the proposed side extension would result in the introduction of an awkward, irregular and conspicuous feature into the street scene that would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling house. As such the proposed development would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	06/06/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	06/06/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Osian Perks