

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00187/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00187/HOUS
Location:	16 Dicken Green Rochdale OL11 1TW
Proposal:	Single storey front and two storey rear extensions to dwelling
Applicant:	MR DAVID SMITH
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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?	N/A
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to 16 Dicken Green, a semi-detached, two-storey property in in the Queensway area of Rochdale. Dicken Green consists of a cul-de-sac of semi-detached houses overlooking a central green. The houses follow a matching design and material palette. The wider area comprises a mix of residential and industrial sites as well as Sudden Brook Park to the north.

16 Dicken Green faces south west overlooking a driveway and the street's central green. It is adjoined by no.18 to the north west and sits adjacent to no. 12 to south east. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces north east bordering a former car park and a collection of mature trees.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey front extension and a two-storey rear extension.

The front extension would span the full width of the property, measuring 6.5m in width and projecting 1.4m. It would include a lean-to roof with a maximum height of 3m and an eaves height of 2m, as well as two single windows and a door. Proposed external materials include red brick and UPVC.

The two-storey rear extension would span the full width of the property, measuring approx. 6.5m in width. It would project approx. 3.8m from the rear elevation. It would include a hipped roof with a maximum height of 7.3m and an eaves height of 4.9m. The rear extension includes two first-floor windows, a ground floor window, a single door and a set of bi-folding doors. Proposed external materials include red brick and UPVC.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

None

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 21/03/2024; no responses were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable places

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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension projecting 3.8m from the rear of the property. Paragraph 5.8 of the Council's SPD for Housing Extensions states that two-storey rear extensions can negatively impact on neighbouring occupiers, particularly when close to the common boundary. As such, paragraph 5.9 states that planning permission will not normally be granted for two-storey rear extensions that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling.

Regarding the relationship with no.18, it is assumed that the internal layout of no.18 would be the reverse of the existing layout of the application property. As such the rear facing elevation would include a living room window set closest to the boundary, with the extension sitting south-east. Given that the proposed rear extension would exceed the SPD's limit by approx. 1.4m the extension would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of occupiers of no. 18 Dicken Green through a substantial overbearing and overshadowing impact on the rear facing living room window and garden area. The overshadowing impact would be made worse due to the orientation of the adjoining properties, whereby the extension would sit to the south-east of no. 18.

The proposal would therefore unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in conflict with policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, P/E Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 131 of the

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 139 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Permission is sought for a single-storey front extension spanning the full width of the property, constructed from materials to match the host dwelling.

The scale of the proposed front extension is considered excessive when compared to existing front porch extensions on Dicken Green. The proposed front extension would dominate and wholly change the appearance of the front of the property, rather than appearing subservient, and would be a prominent feature on the street which would be unsympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Dwellings within Dicken Green are generally cohesive in their appearance, and their principal elevations are largely unaltered except for several modestly sized porches. Given the overall scale of the proposed front extension, the proposals would significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling to the extent that it would appear at odds with the character of the surrounding area.

Similarly, whilst the proposed rear extension follows a uniform design and uses matching materials, it would almost double the size of the property and would not appear subservient. However, being largely hidden from public view, the design of the rear extension would not harm the character of the area nor warrant a reason for refusal.

Notwithstanding, the scale of the front extension would warrant the design of the proposal unacceptable, conflicting with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed plans indicate the reduction of the existing driveway. However, the site would still retain one off-street parking space, as per the existing arrangement. Whilst this would not accord with the maximum standard of two off-street parking spaces, on-street opportunities for parking are well-established and functional and therefore the proposals would be acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation:

Refuse for the following reasons:

1. By reason of its excessive size and scale, the proposed rear extension would have an unacceptable and adverse effect on residential amenity of the occupiers of no.18 Dicken Green through overshadowing, reduced outlook and overbearing impact. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the requirements of policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By reason of the design and scale of the proposed front extension which would appear excessive in scale relative to the host dwelling and existing front porch extensions on Dicken Green. The development proposals ultimately fail to amount to a satisfactory standard of design which would respond appropriately to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the application is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

Informative

This decision relates to the following list of plans:

- Proposed elevations: BMAD/0224/DICKEN/PL4
- Proposed site plan and plans: BMAD/0224/DICKEN/PL3
- Location plan: PP-12838810v1

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	01/05/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	03/05/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg