

Application Number:	23/01092/HOUS
Location:	21 Salthill Avenue, Heywood, OL10 2LB
Proposal:	Single storey front, side and rear extensions and increase in eaves and ridge height of roof to facilitate loft conversion to form additional living accommodation including new window opening on rear elevation
Applicant:	Sarah & Paul Gregson
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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 no. 21 Salthill Avenue, a detached two-storey dwelling in Heywood and located within the Defined Urban Area. The dwelling occupies a secluded plot adjacent to the turning area at the head of the cul-de-sac. Neighbouring dwellings are located immediately adjacent to the east, to the north across the street and beyond the application property's large garden to the west. To the south is an area of open land defined as Green Belt. The side and rear garden boundaries are formed by fencing of approximately two metres in height. The facing gable of the nearest property (no. 19 to the east) is blank and the two properties are set at an oblique angle to each other due to the road layout.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey front and side wraparound extension, a single-storey rear infill extension and an increase in the eaves and ridge height of the main roof. The proposals would be constructed from materials to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

15/01483/HOUS First floor rear extension
Grant subject to conditions

14/00633/HOUS First floor extension over existing garage, single storey rear extension and conversion of garage to living accommodation
Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring that development is “*sympathetic to local character.*” Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states, “*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.*”

Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*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, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”

The host dwelling lies within a relatively uniform estate, where dwellings share a strong building style and materiality. Dating to the 1990’s, dwellings are generally two-storey in height and of regular built forms with gable roofs, bay windows, canopy roofs and mock Tudor boards. The street scene is principally open plan, containing areas of soft landscaping while the properties each have open frontages. In this respect, there is a symmetry and cohesive character of development in this location.

This application would see the addition of several elements which cumulate to alter the appearance of the dwelling considerably.

The proposed single-storey ‘wraparound’ extension would have an irregular composition, with a staggered side wall and a section that would splay 45 degrees from the main front and side walls, following the curvature of the plot. This section would have a flat roof and would sit awkwardly between the two pitched roof forms. Given the slight decrease in topography in an east-west direction, the flat roof section would be visible from the public highway, and would appear incongruous within its context, which is mostly, if not entirely, devoid of flat roof extensions.

In addition to the flat roof, the single storey extension would include a range of other roof pitches, none of which would be consistent with the roof pitch proposed with the changes to the main roof. This inconsistency of roof pitches would create a confused and incoherent development that would respond poorly to the host property and the surrounding development.

Further to this, the proposed single-storey extension would extend the scale of development across a much greater width of the plot and it would also reduce the level of separation between the original build and the highway. This erosion of space would breach the building line while the significant additional width would appear both over dominant and represent an overdevelopment of the site.

Notwithstanding the presence of two detached bungalows, there is a general consistency in respect of building heights throughout the street scene. Dwellings

have relatively shallow pitched roofs and tend to be elongated across the width of the plot. The proposed increase in overall height and the noticeably steeper roof pitch would stand at odds with the character of the host dwelling and the surrounding street scene. The subsequent expanse of walling between the top of the windows and the soffit level would further compound this harm, resulting in an unresolved appearance. As such the character of the existing property would be subsumed within the proposed development.

Ultimately, the proposal would represent an incongruous and poor design solution that would result in an excessive scale of extensions and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the Council's Guidance and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not *"adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy."*

Due to the siting of the proposed development, and the nature of the application site in relation to its closest neighbouring properties, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would give rise to any loss of residential amenity to these neighbouring properties by reason of visual intrusion, an overbearing impact or overshadowing.

The submitted plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and the retention of a sufficient garden space of a functional layout. Therefore, the proposal would be considered acceptable in this regard.

For this reason, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of all neighbouring properties and would accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highway safety

The proposal would not interfere with the existing parking layout and it is considered that there would be no undue highway safety concerns with the proposal.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its size, scale and design, the proposed development would constitute poor design and would be an incongruous addition to the host property. The extensions and alterations would dominate the original build and would have a prominence which would harmfully alter the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed

development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, 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.

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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Details. Drg no. 21.2733.1B
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 21.2733.2B
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drg no. 21.2733.3
- Scheme 3 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 21.2733.SC3.1
- Scheme 3 – Prop. First and Second Floor Plans. Drg no. 21.2733.SC3.2B
- Scheme 3 – Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 21.2733.SC3.3B

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	28/11/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	07/12/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling