

Application Number:	24/01187/HOUS
Location:	1 Eton Close, Rochdale, OL11 4DT
Proposal:	Alterations to roof including raising the ridge and eaves height, front and rear dormers and pitched roof to existing single storey side extension; first floor side and single storey front and porch extensions and erection of raised terrace and balustrade to rear, alterations to fenestration and application of render to all elevations
Applicant:	Mr Dean Soro
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national and local policy and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during the site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Location

The application relates to 1 Eton Close, Rochdale, OL11 4DT, a detached bungalow located within a residential area between Mitchell Hey and Crimble. The property is situated within a street scene which exhibits a mixture of detached single storey and two storey dwellings.

The application dwelling itself exhibits an attached garage with a lean-to roof with a very slight inclination to the side of the main building, this results in a staggered rear elevation with the eastern side (which features the garage) projecting 1 metre beyond the main rear elevation. The garden to the rear of the property exhibits a steep gradient which slopes downward toward the rear garden of no.7 Harrow Avenue from the rear of the application dwelling.

1 Eton close sits much higher than the properties on Harrow Avenue, with the ground floor of 1 Eton Close above first floor height of the neighbouring property at 11 Harrow Avenue.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for various alterations to the property. These include the following:

- Increase in roof ridge height by 460mm including new dark grey roof tiles
- Pitched roof to existing western single storey side extension
- First floor extension to the western existing single storey side extension
- Erection of three pitched roof dormers to the front elevation and one large, single rear box style rear dormer.
- Erection of a front porch

-Erection of a raised terrace area a depth of 2m, at a height of 2m above ground level, to rear of the property at ground floor
-Alterations to the fenestration across all elevations including replacement windows in dark grey UPVC, and application of off white render to all elevations and use of dark grey brickwork

Relevant History

21/00129/HOUS - First floor side extension, two storey rear extension, including loft conversion and two front dormers, with the alteration of fenestration on front and rear elevations - Grant subject to conditions

14/00026/HOUS - Contruction of first floor extension including front dormers to create two storey dwelling and single storey side and rear extensions (Resubmission of 13/00889/HOUS) - Withdrawn

13/00889/HOUS - First floor extension to create two storey dwelling including a two storey extension to west facing elevation - Refuse

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:

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

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

The application was publicised by way of neighbour notification. No responses were received.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

The NPPF establishes that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, whereby decisions should ensure that new development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which requires new development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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 varied street scene of detached properties set centrally within their plots, where dwellings lack uniformity in their appearance. The host dwelling is typical of mid-late C20th architecture and does not include any notable quality in its character or appearance.

The application proposes a substantial overhaul of the appearance of the front and rear elevations to provide additional living space at first floor, with the addition of a pitched roof to the existing western side extension and first floor extension and pitched roof to the eastern existing side extension.

The Council's Guidance for Residential Extensions SPD provides advice on the design of dormers; including

'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.'

And

'(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

(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;'

It is noted the proposed front, pitched roof dormers would appear large, without rhythm, and out of keeping in the streetscene, however it is acknowledged that there is a lack of uniformity within the streetscene, with no clear building style or design. It is evident various alterations have been undertaken to neighbouring properties across a period of time which has eroded the prevailing character.

However, the proposed rear dormer, while slightly pitched, would have the character of a flat roof when viewed from the side and rear. Additionally, at a length of 14.3m, the dormer would appear excessively large in width and dominate the entire rear elevation of the property. This would be visible from the rear windows and garden areas of 9 Harrow Avenue, 7 Harrow Avenue, and 3 Eton Close. The presence of the dormer would be exaggerated by the use of off white k-render to the cheeks and walls of the dormer, raising further concerns regarding the visual amenity of the development.

The first floor side extension continues the roof ridge across, with no set down, and has an eaves height much higher than the main eaves height of the building. The first floor side extension in this location would remove the appearance of spaciousness within the plot, and remove the distance between the existing bungalow and No 3 Eton Close, resulting in a cramped appearance. The dormer on this area of the roof would appear squat in appearance and cramped when compared to that on the main roof of the house and further confuses the overall design of the property.

To the front, the proposed porch with a gable design located centrally on the property will expand the property further, and add another gable to the three pitched dormers on the front elevation. While not unacceptable in isolation, this further accumulates an unacceptably poor standard of design. These issues combine with minor misalignments and awkward proportions that appear poorly thought through.

The use of off white render to the whole of the property would change the character of the property, however given the use of off white render in the streetscene it is not considered this element of the proposal would be unacceptable. The use of dark grey brick however would be out of character and remove any resemblance of the former property and would sit poorly adjacent to No 3 Eton Close.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3. 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.

Residential Amenity:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states planning decisions should "create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users."

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to ensure they "do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy." PfE Policy JP-P1 also requires new development to offer a high level of amenity and address microclimate issues such as sunlight and shade (inter alia). The 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD has been produced to assess the matters relevant to residential amenity.

Section 4.1 states *'The following minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties:*

- (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 (Figure 2);*
- (ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 3);*
- (iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 4).'*

Additionally Section 4.4 states;

'Balconies and elevated terraces can result in adverse overlooking of neighbouring private garden areas or habitable room windows if they are located in close proximity to the boundary of the curtilage. They should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.'

The proposed rear dormer would have a 15.7m distance to the rear boundary of the property, shared with the side boundary of No 7 Harrow Avenue. This is therefore in compliance with the space standards as provided in Section 4.1.

However, the unbroken massing of the 14m long dormer with multiple windows, would result in an overbearing structure, with the perception of overlooking for the occupants of No 7. The structure would have an oppressive appearance and exaggerate the incompatibility of the extensions to the host dwelling. The proposal falls contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Oblique views from the rear of the windows would be provided of 9 and 11 Harrow Avenue, however given the varied land levels, the depth of the gardens in comparison to the proposed window mean it would be unlikely any prominent views into these properties would be created.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	✓
Parking provision	✓

The proposals would not impact off-street parking provisions at this location and would retain the provision of at least two off-street parking spaces. This would accord with the maximum parking standard contained within CS Appendix 5.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its size, scale, massing and design, the proposed rear and front dormer roof extensions, and first floor side extension, would constitute an incongruous and poorly designed addition which is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the visual amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed rear dormer roof extension windows would give rise to an unacceptable level of residential amenity for occupiers of No 7 Harrow Avenue, due to loss of privacy and perception of overlooking within the rear garden area. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Standards and Guidelines 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	28/01/2024	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	31/01/2024	Signed: TH

Report Author Rosalind Gralton