APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00226/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00226/HOUS
Location:	23 Rhodes Crescent Rochdale OL11 2HP
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear including rear dormer , following demolition of out building
Applicant:	Mrs Jamila Siddique
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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 proposal relates to 23 Rhodes Crescent, a two storey semi-detached residential property.
- The property sits on the bend in the road.
- The property enjoys a comparatively larger garden area to the side than properties on Rhodes Crescent.

Description of Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension. The existing out building will be demolished to make way for the proposed side and rear extensions.

Relevant History

Not applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties, no responses were 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

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should

ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Additionally, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states:

> *"Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities 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."*

In addition, Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof. Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD states the principles that will apply to dormer extension:

(i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;
(ii) They should be set back from the eaves line;
(iii) They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;
(iv) Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;
(v) Dormers which wrap around the side ridges of a hipped roof are not acceptable;
(vi) Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;
(vii) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and
(viii) Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.

The overall size of the dormer is considered to be large as it cover a large proportion of the roof plan of the host property. It is noted that it is only possible to construct a dormer of such a size with the addition of the proposed two storey side extension, which would suggest that the dormer in itself is far too large for the host property. It is however noted that the proposed dormer extension is set back slightly from the eaves and boundary to the adjoining properties, and is set below the ridge height.

The SPD states that that flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area. Though it has been noted that there are properties in the wider area that have flat roof dormers, however, within the close vicinity of the property, there are no properties with dormer extensions. Therefore it is considered that whilst dormer extensions exist in the wider area, in this particular location it is considered that the presence of other, unsympathetic dormers in the wider area do not justify allowing one in this area. Additionally, though the proposed dormer extension would be to the rear, due to the property sitting on a corner plot, the proposed dormer would be visible from the street scene.

Moving to the proposed side extension, the materials of the proposed extensions would match that of the host property. Additionally, the proposed two storey side extension would adhere to design principles of the host dwelling; for example the hipped roof of the proposed extension would match that of the host property.

The width of the host property is approximately 6.4m whereas the width of the proposed extension would be 3.6m, which equates to an addition of 56%. This would exceed the 50% limit by 6%, however, the proposed extension is set back from the front elevation by approximately 1m and the ridge height of the proposed extension would be set below that of the host property. Additionally, at its widest, the proposed two storey side extension would be approximately 1.8m from the shared boundary with no. 21. It is therefore considered that on its own that there would be a sense of subservience to the host property.

The chamfered edge towards the side and rear would be ungainly, however, it would be largely screened from view and would have limited impact on the visual amenity of the street scene.

The proposed single storey rear extension would use materials that are in keeping with host property and on its own would be a subservient addition.

However, when considering the whole proposal, with the addition of the proposed dormer, the two storey side extension and the single storey rear extension, it would substantially increase the volume and footprint of the property, to the point that it is considered that the proposal would not be in keeping or a subservient addition to the host property. The proposed extensions would lead to limited space around the property and it is considered that it would lead to an over development of the plot. The proposed extensions would unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property to the detriment of the host property and character of the local area.

The bins would be stored to the side of the proposed extension. It is noted that the bins are presently stored to the side of the host property. It is therefore considered that the location of the bins to the side of the proposed extension would not result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the street scene over the existing.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposal would constitute a poorly designed addition. This would be contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

On the first floor of the proposed side extension, the applicant proposed to have a window for an ensuite to the rear and a window for a bedroom to the front. The bedroom window would adhere to the separation distances contained within section 4.1(i) of the SPD. In regards to the rear element of the proposed two storey side extension, it is noted that it would not project beyond the rear elevation of the host property and would not lead to any greater loss of privacy.

The neighbouring property of no. 21 has windows on the first floor and ground floor side elevation. However, these appear to not to be principal windows to habitable rooms.

Due to the layout of the plots and the siting of the properties, the single storey rear element of the proposed extension would face towards the rear garden of no. 21. Due to the single storey nature of the proposed extension, it is considered sufficient screening could be applied through boundary treatment to prevent undue loss of privacy.

In regards to the proposed single storey rear extensions relationship with no. 25. The proposed extension would project out by 3m and accord with the requirements of section 5 of the SPD.

The proposed dormer would not project beyond the rear elevation of the host property. It is considered that the addition of the proposed dormer would not lead to lead to any greater loss of amenity for neighbouring occupants over the existing.

The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms.

Paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that '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. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable.' Due to the property sitting on a corner plot, the property already has a small triangle shaped rear garden. The addition of the proposed single storey extension and the proposed two storey side extension would lead to limited out door amenity space. The rear garden that would remain would be a small plot of land and due to its shape it is considered that it would not be a functional outdoor amenity space.

Due the lack of sufficient outdoor amenity space for the occupants of the applicant property, it is considered that the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the applicant property and therefore would not accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The property would retain provision for two off-street parking spaces and therefore 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 size, scale and design, the proposed extensions and alterations to the property, constitute disproportionate additions over and above the size of the host property. The proposal would constitute poor design and an incongruous addition that would dominate the host property

and would significantly impact upon the character and appearance of the host property. The addition of the proposed flat roofed dormer extension would only exacerbate the negative impact on the street scene caused by the proposal. 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.

2. The proposal would see a substantial reduction in the size of the property's outdoor amenity space. It is considered that adequate outdoor recreational space would not remain for the number of occupants likely to be within the dwelling once the proposed development is completed. As such the proposal would not accord with paragraph 5.4 of the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development supplementary planning document, policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

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

Location plan
Existing site plan, existing floor plans and existing elevations. Drawing no: 1713/1
Proposed site plan and proposed floor plans. Drawing no: 1713/2
Proposed elevations. Drawing no: 1713/3

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	11/05/21	Signed: MM
Authorisation	14/05/2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir