

Application Number:	23/01183/HOUS
Location:	11 Alexander Drive, Milnrow ,Rochdale, OL16 3LY
Proposal:	Part-two, part-single storey side and rear extension and single-storey rear extension with balcony and balustrade, including alterations to fenestration on ground floor front elevation and first floor rear elevation, addition of 1 no. roof lights to rear, removal of existing chimney and conversion of existing garage to living accommodation (Part-retrospective)
Applicant:	Christopher Taylor
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 11 Alexander Drive, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a residential area in Milnrow. The street scene comprises a mix of bungalows of various built forms, materiality and design. The dwelling is distinct from the surrounding dwellings through its use of stone render and a prominent front-facing gable. It is adjacent to no. 12 Alexander Drive to the south-east, adjacent to no. 10 Alexander Drive to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto Protected Open Land and the River Beal to the north-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-two, part-single storey side and rear extension which projects 2.85m from the side elevation and 2.5m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It comprises a front and rear front gable with height to eaves of 2.68m and ridge heights of 5.04m and 4.29m respectively. The two-storey element is characterised by a matching dual-pitched roof form and is set down 0.27m from the ridge line.

The application also seeks to construct a single-storey rear extension which projects 3.5m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It comprises a balcony and glass balustrades on the first floor and has a ridge height of 2.97m.

Further, the following additional works are proposed:

- ☐ Alteration of the existing garage door to windows to facilitate garage conversion;
- ☐ Alteration of the first-floor rear fenestration to a set of French doors to accommodate proposed balcony;
- ☐ Addition of one roof light to the rear roof slope;
- ☐ Removal of the existing rear eaves; and
- ☐ Removal of the existing chimney.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed rear and side extensions would not have too much impact on the current external parking arrangements for the dwelling. The proposed floor plans identify a garage however this cannot be used for car parking as it does not meet the required dimensions. In terms of overall parking provision there is adequate residual parking space on the existing driveway to meet Council standards for the size of extended dwelling.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extension.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways would raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Five supporting letters and one objection letter was received with the following representations:

- ☐ The proposal would be in keeping with the host dwelling;
- ☐ The proposal would improve the local environment and positively contribute to neighbourhood;
- ☐ No windows would overlook any neighbouring property;
- ☐ The proposed side extension would result in loss of light of windows of adjacent dwelling.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating overshadowing impacts are addressed under the 'Amenity' section of the report.

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 they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 134 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 proposal seeks to enlarge the host dwelling through a number of extensions, most notably a part-two, part-single side extension. Whilst it is acknowledged the projection would be set below the ridge line and would appear somewhat subservient to the host dwelling, the introduction of a smaller, secondary front gable creates an awkward and irregular feature which would visually compete with the existing principle front gable and would not appear complementary. Similarly, the roof form of the gable-fronted single storey rear extension would also be an incongruous feature which relates poorly with the existing forms on the rear elevation.
- ❑ For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with the flat roof single-storey rear extension, the form and design of which would be acceptable in this context.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, the proposed side and rear extension fails to comprise a satisfactory of design and would appear incongruous to the character and visual appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ❑ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:

☐ *“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 rear extensions project 2.5m and 3.5m along the common boundary of nos. 10 and 12 respectively and is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts in this regard.
- ☐ It is noted adjacent no. 10 comprises several windows to its side elevation facing the proposed side extension. Whilst it has not been possible to ascertain the uses of such rooms, given the presence of large principle windows to the front and the rear elevation of no. 10, and the side elevation windows being obscurely-glazed, for the purposes of this assessment, the rooms are not considered as habitable rooms and are not subject to the amenity considerations under the SPD.
- ☐ The proposed seeks to construct a first-floor balcony directly adjacent to the common boundary of no. 12 which spans the width and projection of the proposed single-storey rear extension. Section 4.4 of the SPD states balconies *“should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”* By virtue of its siting 0.76m from the common boundary, the proposed balcony would overlook into the private rear amenity space of no. 12, thus resulting in detrimental loss of privacy to its occupiers.
- ☐ It is acknowledged that boundary treatments comprising approx. 3.5m-high hedging separates the no. 12 from the host dwelling. However, given the height of the balcony on the first floor, the possibility for occupants to view into the rear amenity space of no. 12 at standing height remains probable, therefore the overlooking harm would still stand.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ Notwithstanding, by virtue of the siting of the first-floor balcony, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of no. 12 and would not accord with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ☐ Notwithstanding the removal of the side access space, the proposal would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces for its occupants. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, massing, roof forms, and design, the front and rear gable of the proposed side and rear extension constitutes an incongruous and uncomplimentary feature which relates poorly with the existing forms of

the host dwelling. The proposed development would not be well-designed and would fail to 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.

2. By virtue of its height and siting, the proposed first-floor balcony would give rise to undue overlooking into the rear amenity space of no. 12 Alexander Drive and would result in detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD 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:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 27/10/2023
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3229.4 dated 08/2022
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Section Plan – Drawing No. 23.3229.1A dated 09/2023
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3229.5 dated 09/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 23.3229.SC1.1D dated 09/2023
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3229.SC1.2A dated 09/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	08/01/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	09/01/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen