

Application Number:	23/00657/HOUS
Location:	Stormont, Buckley Hill Lane, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 4BU
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and erection of rear dormer with balcony to facilitate loft conversion. Alterations to fenestration on side and rear elevations - Retrospective
Applicant:	Mrs Georgina Garner
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 'Stormont', a detached bungalow located in a leafy residential neighbourhood in Buckley Hill Lane, Milnrow. The dwelling is adjacent to 'Manningtree' to the north-east, adjacent to 'Meadowrise' to the south-west, and faces the highway to the north-west. The rear curtilage of the boundary borders the rear curtilages of nos. 10, 12 and 14 Stanney Close. The surrounding street scene is generally characterised by large detached redbrick dwellings of various architectural styles and built forms. The host dwelling is one of the few bungalows in the area and is distinct in its part-stone, render and brickwork construction. The adjoining building line along Buckley Hill Lane is sited in a slightly elevated position to properties along Stanney Close.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning application is sought for a single-storey rear extension which projects 3.35m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. It is characterised by a flat roof form with a rendered finish and has a ridge height of approx. 2.93m. It

comprises a set of bi-folding doors as well as access doors into two ground-floor bedrooms.

The proposal also seeks retrospective permission for a flat roof dormer on the rear roof slope of the dwelling. It measures approx. 7.39m in width, approx. 2.65m in height, and approx. 3.67m in depth. It comprises a set of bi-folding doors and would be constructed in grey PVC cladding.

An additional open balcony is proposed to project approx. 3.52m from the rear dormer, bounded by glass balustrades on all elevations.

Relevant History

81/D12711 - Double Garage - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extensions would not appear to have any impact on the current parking provision for this dwelling.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

Highways do not expect that there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

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

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Five objection letters were received with the following concerns:

- ❑ The proposed open balcony would be an overly dominant feature which would appear overbearing to the adjacent properties ;
- ❑ The proposed open balcony would have a full view of the rear amenity spaces of adjacent properties and result in direct overlooking harm;
- ❑ The use of bi-folding doors and proposed balcony would encroach on the privacy of bedrooms and landing areas of rear-facing properties;
- ❑ The rear dormer is excessive in scale and dwarfs the host property;
- ❑ There is no precedent for first-floor balconies or dormers of this size in the area, and the development appears out of character with the surrounding properties;

- ☐ The sum of the extensions increases the massing of the bungalow with no hiping of the roof;
- ☐ The eaves height of the single-storey rear extension is greater than that of the host property and appears overly dominant;
- ☐ Concerns over the structural integrity and passive fire protection of the development;
- ☐ The proposed fenestration do not match ones already constructed.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating to the overlooking and overbearing impacts of the proposal are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to the scale of the proposal are addressed under the 'Design' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to compliance with building regulations are not material planning considerations.
- ☐ Discrepancies between the constructed fenestration and of ones indicated in the proposed plans have been corrected in the amended plans.

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

The applicant has submitted amended plans indicating the addition of 3.35 x 1.8m obscured glazed screens on the side balustrades of the proposed balcony.

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.*”
- ❑ Subservience is not defined within the Framework or any adopted local policy or guidance, however for the purposes of assessing an extension to a dwellinghouse, it is generally taken to mean a form of development which is subordinate to the host property, predominantly in terms of its scale, but also form, design and materiality.
- ❑ The single-storey rear extension comprises a ridge height that is greater than the height to eaves of the host dwelling, effectively obscuring much of the original built form of a bungalow when viewed from the rear.
- ❑ The width, height and projection of the extension, the use of a flat roof form, in addition to the use of render and the placement and design of fenestration across the rear elevation cumulatively produce an extension which is unduly dominant and discordant with the design language of the original dwelling and those in the surrounding area. Whilst its siting to the rear of the host dwelling would obscure those views from Buckley Hill Lane, the arrangement of surrounding dwellings means that the extension would be a very conspicuous feature which would be visible from surrounding vantage points, particularly the first floor rear facing windows of those properties which back onto the application property.
- ❑ Overall, the proposed rear extension would be unsatisfactory in terms of its design and visual appearance and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
- ❑ The proposal also comprises a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes “*dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important 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.*” Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:

- (i) *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of 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 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.”*

- ❑ Despite the mixed street scene, dormers are not characteristic of the surrounding dwellings, and where present, they are modest in scale and feature sympathetic roof forms and materiality.
- ❑ Whilst it is acknowledged the rear dormer is set in from the side walls of the host dwelling, the dormer occupies a substantial 7.39m of the rear roof slope and adjoins the roof of the proposed single storey rear extension, appearing an entirely disproportionate addition which dominates the modestly-sized bungalow.
- ❑ Notwithstanding its siting to the rear, the use of a flat roof form further deviates from the built form of the original bungalow and surrounding properties, resulting in an addition which appears incongruous and out of keeping with the surrounding design context.
- ❑ The dormer fenestration also relates poorly with ones of the original dwelling and rear extension. In particular, concerns are had with the use of bi-folding doors, which constitutes an excessive use of glazing when viewing the rear elevation as a whole, with the windows to the hallway and ensuite also appearing as poorly thought through features.
- ❑ The use of grey uPVC cladding does not constitute good quality material, and when combined with the mismatched red roof tiles, white render, white uPVC gable end cladding and brickwork, creates an unresolved and confusing material palette.
- ❑ By virtue of its scale, siting, roof form, fenestration and materiality, and the visual prominence of the dormer from the surrounding properties, the rear dormer fails to comply with point (ii), (iv), (vi) and (vii) of Section 5.17.
- ❑ Given the absence of balconies in the immediate locality, the proposed open balcony constitutes an uncharacteristic and imposing feature, particularly due to its excessive footprint above the rear extension. This harm is exacerbated by the addition of the large privacy screens, the size of which would appear unsightly from the adjacent properties.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the single storey rear extension, rear dormer and proposed balcony, when taken individually, or particularly when considered

cumulatively comprise a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design and would inflict undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not 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.”*
- ❑ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*
- ❑ 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).”*
- ❑ Section 5.17 of the SPD states *“dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- ❑ The single-storey rear extension does not project beyond its existing 3.35m rear projection and the rear conservatory of adjacent Manningtree. It also projects a marginal 0.87m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjacent Meadowrise. As such, it is considered the single-storey extension would not result in significant overshadowing impacts to adjacent occupiers in this regard.
- ❑ It is noted that properties along Stanney Close are sited in a lower position to the host property to a degree where the ground floor of Stormont is level with the first-floor windows of its rear-facing dwellings. The single-storey rear extension and rear dormer are sited at a minimum 26m from the directly-facing principal windows of nos. 12 and 14 Stanney Close and 12m from a directly facing curtilage boundary, in excess of the standards stated in Section 4.1. Moreover, the properties benefit from substantial landscaping and fencing which ensures sufficient levels of screening. On this basis, notwithstanding the prominence of the development when viewed from the rear, it is considered the overlooking impacts to the rear-facing neighbouring occupants would be acceptable.
- ❑ The proposal includes an open balcony which spans the width of the rear dormer and has the same projection as the single-storey rear extension.

Section 4.4 of the SPD states balconies *“should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”*

- ② Having examined the possible viewpoints and sight lines from the balcony, it is considered the proposal would result in unrestricted elevated views into most of the private garden spaces of adjacent Manningtree and Meadowrise, taking into account of the existing conservatory and outbuilding of Manningtree which sit close to the common boundary.
- ② It is noted that boundary treatments comprising of timber fencing and soft landscaping separates the host dwelling from the adjacent properties. However, given the first-floor siting of the balcony and the minimum 2.47m separation distance from the boundary, such treatments offer little in the way of screening and would not prevent views into the adjoining gardens.
- ② Whilst it is accepted the addition of obscure glazed screens to the balcony in the amended plans may alleviate some direct overlooking harm, particularly to its side elevations, by virtue of its sheer size and close proximity to the adjoining common boundaries, it is considered the privacy screens would not sufficiently overcome this harm. Notwithstanding, the privacy screens have been assessed as poorly designed features which the LPA would not wish to rely on in order to achieve a suitable relationship between the balcony and surrounding dwellings.
- ② It is also noted that whilst a balcony may not be in use for all times of the day, it would nonetheless remain a permanent imposing presence from the adjacent rear amenity spaces and would increase the perception of being overlooked by the host occupiers.
- ② No concerns are had with the residential amenity of the occupiers, given the submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms (provided the doors to the rear-facing ground-floor bedrooms are installed with glazing which could be secured via condition) and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout has been retained. Notwithstanding, by virtue of the unacceptable loss of privacy, the proposed balcony would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would not accord with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ② 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.”*
- ② The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from two to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the provision of which would be retained in the existing front driveway.
- ② The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, excessive scale, flat roof form, materiality, window proportions and design, the single-storey rear extension constitutes an unduly dominant addition to the host dwelling with a design language that is

discordant with the surrounding context. Likewise, the rear flat roof dormer constitutes an incongruous and obtrusive addition which appears dominant and out of keeping with the host dwelling. Additionally, the adjoining first-floor open balcony constitutes an imposing feature that is uncharacteristic of the immediate locality. The resultant development, taken individually or particularly when taken cumulatively, would not be well-designed and given its prominence from the surrounding properties, would result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails 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 siting, size and design, the proposed rear balcony would offer unrestricted views into the rear garden areas of adjacent Meadowrise and Manningtree. Such a relationship would result in an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties through an unacceptable loss of privacy, contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the 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:

- ② Location Plan
- ② Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 2503_MIL_04_Planning_Rev_A received 14/08/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	24/08/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	24/08/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen

