APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00320/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00320/HOUS
Location:	24 Lynton Avenue Rochdale OL11 3HW
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and part single storey/part two storey rear extension with rear dormer including removal of chimney and existing single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Mohammad Amin
Case Officer:	Emily Sykes
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 application refers to 24 Lynton Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached house in the Castleton area of Rochdale. The property is southwest facing towards the highway and faces the front elevation of no.21 Lynton Avenue. The property is adjoined to no.22 Lynton Avenue to the southeast and adjacent to no.26 to the northwest. The property has a direct rear facing relationship with no. 63 and no.65 Abbott Street, where the boundaries of the rear gardens adjoin. No.24 Lynton Avenue benefits from a front garden and off-street parking and a rear garden that are connected along the side curtilage to the northwest side of the property.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes a two storey side extension. It also involves the construction of a part single storey/ part two storey rear extension, following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension. The proposed development also features the addition of a rear dormer extension, following the removal of the existing chimney and a hip to gable roof conversion. It will be constructed in matching materials to the host dwelling.

The proposed development will be the same as that under planning application 20/01218/HOUS, except with the proposed two storey side extension being set back

1m from the front principal wall of the host dwelling on both the ground floor and first floor level. A mono-pitch lean-to roof connects the elevations with an approximate height to eaves of 2.3m and a ridge height of 3.1m. The ridge height of the side extension matches the original dwelling at approximately 7.6m and the height to eaves is approximately 0.6m higher at 6m. The development extends to the rear wall of the host dwelling and forms the side elevation of the part two storey rear extension. The front elevation is complete with a double window at each level. The side elevation features a single obscurely glazed window on the first floor which would lead to a bathroom.

The proposed rear extension projects a total of 5.5m from the rear of the property, with the part two storey accounting for approximately 2m and the part single storey to the rear of this accounting for approximately 3.5m of the projection. This would be formed with a dual-pitched gable style roof with a height to eaves of approximately 6m and a ridge height of 6.5m.

This assessment aims to consider if the resubmission of this application addresses the reasons for refusal within planning application 20/01218/HOUS, which are listed in the below section of this report.

Relevant History

19/01475/HOUS – Two storey side and rear extension with rear dormer including removal of chimney and existing single storey rear extension

Refused
Reasons for Refusal:

1. As a result of its scale, design and siting in close proximity to the adjacent dwelling, the proposed two-storey side extension would lead to the dwelling appearing as a terraced property rather than a separate dwelling. The changing of the hipped roof to a gable, removal of the existing chimney stack and poor fenestration detailing would compound the visual harm. In addition, the proposed dormer extension would occupy a disproportionate amount of roof space and would not constitute a high standard of design. Taken as a whole, the development would represent an overdevelopment of the plot with the proposed alterations failing to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance in respect of the dwelling itself and resulting in significant visual harm to the street scene. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The failure to provide a bin store to the front of the property would leave the relevant bins exposed and in a prominent position in the street scene. This would unduly harm the appearance of the street scene and as such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed rear extension would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear garden areas and rear facing windows of No.63 and No.65 Abbott Street, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. In addition, the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the rear windows of no.22 and no.26 Lynton Avenue and have an overbearing impact on the

rear outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

20/01218/HOUS – Proposed two storey side extension and part single storey/ part two storey rear extension with rear dormer including removal of chimney and existing single storey rear extension - Resubmission of 19/01475/HOUS

Refused
Reasons for Refusal:

1. As a result of its scale, design and siting in close proximity to the adjacent dwelling, the proposed two-storey side extension would lead to the dwelling appearing as a terraced property rather than a separate dwelling. The changing of the hipped roof to a gable and removal of the existing chimney stack would compound the visual harm. Taken as a whole, the development would represent an overdevelopment of the plot with the proposed alterations failing to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance in respect of the dwelling itself and resulting in significant visual harm to the street scene. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The failure to provide a bin store to the front of the property would leave the relevant bins exposed and in a prominent position in the street scene. This would unduly harm the appearance of the street scene and as such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed rear extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the rear windows of no.26 Lynton Avenue and have an overbearing impact on the rear outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding neighbours and no representations 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

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host dwelling and generally should be subservient to it. The proposed development will be constructed with matching materials to the host dwelling and is therefore considered to be in keeping with the design language of it.

The proposed development has been amended so that the two storey side extension is set back 1m from the front principal wall of the host dwelling. Whilst a greater level of subservience would be preferred, with the roof ridge being set down from the roof ridge on the host dwelling, it is considered that the proposed design is sufficient in ensuring that the proposed development appears subservient to the host dwelling.

As the proposed two storey side extension is set back 1m, it is considered that the terracing effect is now avoided, as per paragraph 5.12 of the SPD.

However, there are still concerns about the proposed development causing undue harm to the visual amenity of the host dwelling and surrounding local area. This application proposes a hip to gable dormer extension which would drastically alter the character and appearance of the host property and unbalance the appearance of the pair of semis.

As noted in the assessment for the planning applications 19/01475/HOUS and 20/01218/HOUS, the visual harm caused through the drastic changes to the roof and removal of the existing chimney stack (a defining architectural characteristic of the

property and surrounding properties) would result in an unacceptable degree of harm to the surrounding street scene. It is considered that the proposed development is not sympathetic to the character of the host dwelling or local area, with the previous refusal points not fully being addressed within this application.

As access between the front and rear curtilage of the property will be blocked, the storage of wheelie bins will be at the front of the property. As the plans indicate the lack a bin store, it is assumed that bins will be stored to the front of the property and left in view of much of the street, causing undue harm to the appearance of the host dwelling and immediate street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Under planning application 20/01218/HOUS it was established that the proposed development caused undue harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at no.26 Lynton Avenue.

Although the two storey rear extension is in compliance with the guidelines within the SPD, the addition of the part single storey rear extension results in the proposed development having an overbearing impact on the neighbouring rear garden area. This will cause an undue loss of light and outlook to the rear windows and have an overbearing impact on the rear garden at no.26 Lynton Avenue.

As the proposed development has only been amended to be set back 1m from the front principal wall of the host dwelling, it is considered that this refusal point under planning application 20/01218/HOUS has not been addressed.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of no.26 Lynton Avenue, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires that all development proposals provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring and servicing arrangements, taking into account the proposed use and location.

The proposal will not affect the existing parking arrangements, with off-street parking for two vehicles being available, this would be sufficient for a property of this size. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The changing of the hipped roof to a gable and removal of the existing chimney stack would result in visual harm to the character of the host dwelling. Taken as a whole, the proposed alterations fail to result in a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance in respect of the dwelling itself and resulting in significant visual harm to the street scene. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Supplementary Planning

Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The failure to provide a bin store to the front of the property would leave the relevant bins exposed and in a prominent position in the street scene. This would unduly harm the appearance of the street scene and as such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed rear extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the rear windows of no.26 Lynton Avenue and have an overbearing impact on the rear outdoor amenity space. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted 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 relates to the following plans:

- 00 Site Location Rev A
- 01 Existing Building
- 02 Proposed Building Rev A

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	19/04/2021	Signed: ES
Authorisation	22/04/2021	Signed: KN

Report Author Emily Sykes