

Application Number:	22/01276/HOUS
Location:	116 Bolton Road, Rochdale, OL11 4QX
Proposal:	Conversion of dormer bungalow into a two storey dwelling. Alterations to front elevation including conversion of garage to living accommodation with proposed bay window. Proposed first floor extension above existing garage. Juliet balconies on front and rear elevations at first floor. Alterations to fenestration on side elevations and erection of detached garage within rear garden with additional hardstanding, following the removal of existing conservatory and car port
Applicant:	Mr Irfan Mahmood
Case Officer:	Aimee Bovaird
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 proposed development is located at no.116 Bolton Road, a detached dormer bungalow. The dwelling consists of red brick and horizontal white cladding. The property is characterised by a front dormer, gable roof, an integral garage, a conservatory to the rear and a car port to the side.

The application dwelling, whilst detached, is grouped with a pair of semi-detached dormer bungalows of similar design to the immediate west (no.118 and no.120). The surrounding street scene comprises two storey terraced housing to the east and semi-detached dwellings opposite.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a first floor extension to facilitate the conversion of the existing dormer bungalow into a two storey dwelling. Alterations to the front elevation include conversion of the garage to a snug and toilet with two bay windows at ground floor. Juliet balconies will be located to the front and rear elevations at first floor.

Alterations will be undertaken to the fenestration on the side elevations.
Hardstanding will be laid in the rear garden leading to a detached garage, following the removal of existing conservatory and car port.

Relevant History

79/D09409 – Extension to existing dormer - granted

Township/Member comments

Not applicable

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the neighboring properties, no representations were made.

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

- ☐ Rochdale Core Strategy sets out in policy DM1 that developments should be of a high quality design and enhance the quality of the area. In addition to the above, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the Government attaches importance to the design of the built environment.
- ☐ The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.1 that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ The bungalows along the building line of the host dwelling (no.118 and no.120), while not of exceptional design quality, maintains uniformity and

cohesiveness in its building form and style. This is characterised by single-storey bungalows with large gabled roofslopes facing the highway and flat roof front dormers set back from the eaves. Thus, this establishes the character of the area to which the host dwelling should respect.

- ❑ As the application dwelling is grouped with the neighbouring dormer bungalows, it follows that the upwards extension of the bungalow would be inappropriate in this location. The proposal fundamentally alters the character and design of the host property, forming a two storey dwelling that would not appear subservient to the host dwelling but instead would be overbearing and appear prominent by virtue of its size and would look disjointed within the immediate street scene.
- ❑ The eaves are being raised by 2.3m to allow the first floor extension resulting in a shallow pitched roof, which would not be in keeping with the eaves line and roofslope of the immediate neighbours and instead would form an overbearing feature against the neighbouring dormer.
- ❑ It is considered that the inclusion of the bay windows to the front and the inclusion of Juliet balconies particularly to the front, would result in incongruous design features which would not be in keeping with the character of the main dwelling, nor with the immediate or wider street scene.
- ❑ The proposal is not within 1m of the shared boundary with no.118 and it is not considered that any terracing effect will occur.
- ❑ The proposed development will use appropriate materials in line with the host dwelling.
- ❑ Overall, it is considered that the proposed development due to its scale and incongruous design would not accord with the design of the host dwelling, nor the immediate street scene, and therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which sets out that proposals so not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.
- ❑ The neighbour at no.112-114 to the east is set forward of the host dwelling and accordingly the proposed development would not affect their amenity. All side facing windows included in the application do not comprise habitable room windows and therefore the privacy of no.112-114 and no.118 would be retained.
- ❑ The SPD sets out in paragraph 4.4 how balconies and elevated terraces can result in adverse overlooking of neighbouring private garden areas or habitable rooms room windows if they are located in close proximity to the boundary of the curtilage. They should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties. This proposal includes Juliet balconies on front and rear first floor elevations. These rear Juliet balcony would not be considered to negatively affect neighbours however the front Juliet balcony would not be in keeping with the wider street scene.

- ☐ The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.4, 'it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers.' There will be a sufficient garden left in relation to the size of the house to meet the needs of the existing and future occupiers.
- ☐ The proposed detached garage would not have a negative effect on occupier or neighbouring amenity.
- ☐ The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms.
- ☐ In light of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would provide a satisfactory standard of occupier amenity for all future occupiers in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ The provision of two off-street parking spaces would accord with the maximum parking standard contained within Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

- 1.) By virtue of its design, form and massing the proposed extension would be an unsympathetic and non-subservient addition to the host dwelling, and it would significantly erode the character and uniformity of the immediate streetscene. As such, the proposal would not accord with 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.

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following list of plans:

Existing Plans and Elevations – 2222/IM/01

Proposals – 2222/IM/02

New detached brick garage – 2222/IM/03

Site Layout / Location Plan – 2222/IM/04

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	15/11/22	Signed: AB
Authorisation	16/11/22	Signed: SS

Report Author Aimee Bovaird