

Application Number:	23/00629/HOUS
Location:	72 Elm Park Grove Rochdale OL12 7JT
Proposal:	First floor rear extension, single storey rear extension, dormer to front elevation and alterations to fenestration on side elevation
Applicant:	Awais Khalid
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	No

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to 72 Elm Park Grove, a two storey detached residence in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale and within a cul-de-sac. The site benefits from a detached garage and generous front, rear and side amenity space and the rear boundary curtilage sits adjacent to Brotherod Wood. The surrounding street scene features predominantly detached bungalow and two-storey dwellings.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a hipped roof first floor rear extension spanning the full width of the rear elevation to create a two-storey dwelling at the rear and a single storey rear hipped roof extension matching the proportions, projection and design of the existing single storey projecting element. Permission is also sought for a flat roof dormer extension to the front roof slope matching the scale and design of that on the existing as well as alteration to fenestration to the side and rear fenestration.

It is noted the current application is the third application which has sought to dramatically transform the rear elevation at no.72 to which the first application was deemed unacceptable by virtue of its design and scale. Similarly to the first application, the resubmission was withdrawn due to the application presenting the same issues as previous concerns had not been overcome.

Relevant History

23/00004/HOUS

Two storey and part single storey rear extensions including Juliette balcony and alterations to rear and side fenestration and dormer extension to the front elevation

Refuse March 2023

1. By virtue of its design, scale and siting, the proposed extension(s) would represent an incongruous form of development and not appear to respect the visual form and character of the host dwelling. The extension would be too large for a dwelling of this size and not be subservient to the scale of the host dwelling. 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

23/00311/HOUS Two storey rear and single storey rear extensions. Alterations to side fenestration and dormer extension to the front first floor elevation. Resubmission of 23/0004/HOUS
Withdrawn

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No letters of representation were received.

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

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that developments must demonstrate that they "are of high quality design and take the opportunity to

enhance the quality of the area". Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states new developments must "enhance the boroughs 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".

As per the first application, the dormer to the front elevation would remain acceptable given it abides with SPD Paragraph 5.17 which outlines design principles for dormers and would be in keeping with that on the existing and those on the surrounding streetscene. The material palette of the development would also remain acceptable.

The dwelling itself is sited within a cul-de sac where detached dormer bungalows and two-storey dwellings are present therefore the principle of extending the dwelling at the rear is acceptable in this location. It is noted the first application proposed a two-storey rear extension of an unacceptable scale therefore was refused. Whilst this concern has been reduced to propose a first floor extension, when assessed in conjunction with the proposed single storey rear extension, the rear of the dwelling is significantly transformed and is not considered to respect the existing original form of the bungalow by virtue of the development expanding across the full width of the rear elevation therefore considered an overhaul. The first floor extension is not set down from the existing ridge line of the bungalow therefore cannot be classed as subservient to the original dwelling and would incorporate a hipped roof form. Although the single storey projecting element currently hosts a hipped roof, the original roof style of the bungalow is pitched therefore the hipped roof of both the first floor and single storey extension are considered incongruous and of poor quality design in reference to compromising the existing visual amenity.

In line with the previous applications, the proportion sizes of the fenestration are considered acceptable given they match those on the existing however, the placement of these windows is considered poor on both the first floor rear extension and single storey rear extension given they do not appropriately align. In the event of an approval, amendments would be sought to fix the positioning of these windows to produce better placement to display a higher quality of design.

In light of the above assessment, the proposed works would remain unacceptable by virtue of both the single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension not being considered to respect the visual amenity and form of the existing bungalow. The design 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

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD states "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)". It is noted the adjacent dwelling, 74 Elm Park Grove, is a two-storey dwelling which features its rear most elevation approx. 3.7m away from the common boundary to which the rear most elevation at no.72 is sited approx. 0.5m forward of that at the adjacent property. The development is not considered to surpass the rear most elevation of the host property therefore would remain acceptable by the SPD.

The two first floor windows along the south elevation hosting an ensuite are considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity. Although it is noted these would directly face the side amenity space at 70 Elm Park Grove, there is not considered to be any strong overriding need to reduce any overlooking to this space given the existing low boundary wall between the two properties. Furthermore, these windows do not host a habitable room therefore it is not considered necessary, in terms of an approved application, that these windows are conditioned to be obscurely glazed.

In line with the previous application, both the front dormer and single storey rear extension do not give rise to any residential amenity concerns and would remain acceptable in this regard.

All habitable rooms, new and existing, are to receive adequate light and outlook with regards to occupier amenity and the plot would retain suitably sized front, side and rear amenity space.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The number of bedrooms at the dwelling would remain unchanged post development and the works are not considered to impact upon the accessibility of the front and side driveway and access to the rear detached garage. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its scale, siting and design, the proposed extensions to the rear are not considered acceptable and would represent an incongruous form of development which fails to visually respect the existing form of the bungalow. The first floor extension is not considered subservient to the original dwelling and would overhaul the form at the rear. 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.

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	30.08.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	01.09.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, the above decision relates to the following plans;

- Location Plan
- Rev A 1971/2 Proposed Floor Plans and Site Plan
- Rev A 1971/3 Proposed Elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo