APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00369/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00369/HOUS
Location:	32 Alpine Drive, Milnrow, OL16 3HW
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension following removal of existing rear dormer, addition of pitched roof over existing front dormer and installation of windows in side elevation
Applicant:	Mr Aaron Whittaker
Case Officer:	James Bridgman
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/A**

Location

The application relates to 32 Alpine Drive, a semi-detached bungalow with front and rear dormers in a residential area in Milnrow, Rochdale.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a two storey extension following the removal of the existing rear dormer, the addition of pitched roof over the existing front dormer and the installation of windows on the side elevation of the existing dwelling. The proposed two storey extension would project 3.1m outwards from the rear elevation.

Relevant History

89/D23601 – Front and Rear Dormer Extensions to Dwellinghouse. Decision: Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties. No letters of representation have been 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

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states "The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities." This proposal is considered poor design and is contrary to the NPPF.

Furthermore, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states "Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunity available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents".

Throughout the proposal, the use of materials to match the host property would allow for the proposed two storey rear extension to be in keeping with the host property.

The proposal includes the installation of a windows on the side elevation of the existing dwelling which is considered acceptable as the use of uPVC window matches those on the existing dwelling. The pitched roof over the front dormer is also considered acceptable.

The addition of the proposed two storey rear extension would follow the demolition of an existing rear dormer. The proposed two storey rear extension would have a significantly shallow dual pitched roof. Additionally, the proposal includes an additional pitched roof over the front dormer. The proposed roof additions would form part of the existing roof and would both have the same ridge height as the host dwelling. However, the height of the eaves of the existing dwelling is significantly lower due to being a bungalow. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development is unacceptable as it would not be coherent with the design values of the host dwelling and is detrimental to the character of 32 Alpine Drive.

The host dwelling is situated on a corner plot on Alpine Drive and it is considered that in principle a two storey rear extension would be unacceptable. The wider area consists of bungalows, with the majority having front and rear dormers. Therefore, the addition of a two storey extension and the resulting side elevation of the dwelling would appear incongruous on the street scene and detrimental to the character of the hosting dwelling and the wider area.

Therefore, the design of the proposal is unacceptable and is contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

In paragraph 5.9 of the SPD, it states that 'planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).' .

The proposed two storey extension would project out by 3.1m and would be adjacent to the shared boundary with no.30 Alpine Drive. The neighbouring property no.30 has a single storey rear extension. In paragraph 5.10 of the SPD, it outlines that when there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the measurement of the angle is taken from point 3m along the common boundary. Therefore, the two storey extension would be acceptable and in accordance with the SPD.

The two storey extension would project east from the rear elevation of no.32. Whilst it is considered that there may be a loss of light to the upper floor window of 30 Alpine Drive it would not warrant refusal. The loss of light is considered minimal and does not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

The proposal includes the addition of a window on the ground floor and first floor side elevation of the host dwelling. The semi-detached bungalow is situated on a corner plot of Alpine Drive. The side elevation directly faces the front elevation of Hollin Hall on Kiln Lane.

Section 4.1 of the SPD states that “(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 curtilage”. This is to ensure that all new developments do not cause a significant loss of privacy and/or light to neighbouring occupiers.

The distance between the side elevation of no.32 Alpine Drive and the front elevation of Hollin Hall is approximately 23.5 metres. Additionally, the distance between the side elevation of no.32 and the boundary of the curtilage of Hollin Hall is approximately 18 metres. Therefore, the introduction of a bathroom window on the first floor side elevation would present no issues. However, if planning were to be granted, a condition to ensure obscure glazing would be recommended.

The proposed ground floor window on the existing side elevation is for a utility room and would be the principal window. However, there are principal windows to habitable rooms on the two storey front elevation of Hollin Hall directly facing. The SPD states that there should be a 14m distance between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room. Therefore, the proposed ground floor window would appear to be acceptable and does not permit any loss of privacy to Hollin Hall.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and SPD

The extension is at the rear and in accordance with policies DM1 and SPD.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale and design, the proposed two storey rear extension would appear as an incongruous feature and be detrimental to the character of the host dwelling and the wider area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the visual amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

INFORMATIVE:
For the avoidance of doubt, this decision related to the following plans:
Existing Elevations – Dwg: 01
Existing Floor and Roof Plans – Dwg: 02
Proposed Elevations - Dwg: 03
Proposed Floor Plan and Roof Plans - Dwg: 04
Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Dwg: 05
Location Plan

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	19/05/21	Signed: JB
Authorisation	19/05/2021	Signed: AT

Report Author James Bridgman