

Application Number:	23/00227/HOUS
Location:	8 Mercer Lane Rochdale OL11 5RN
Proposal:	Two storey rear and two storey front porch extension with the erection of two front dormers to facilitate loft conversion. Alterations to side fenestration including new doorway and the addition of a raised, timber decked patio area and glass balustrade to the rear elevation with a maximum height of 2.2m
Applicant:	NADEER & NABEELA KHAN
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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?	Yes

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

8 Mercer Lane is a detached bungalow dwelling located in the Norden ward of Rochdale benefitting from generous garden space (consisting of a variation of ground levels), a garage to the front elevation and high vegetation along the rear and partial side curtilage boundaries. The plot is of substantial size to which it borders the rear gardens of 7 Minorca Close to the rear and 19-27 Bankfield Lane to the east and sits adjacent to 6 Mercer Lane to the west. The form of the four dwellings along Mercer Lane to which this property is sited within would appear uniformed in appearance however those adjacent have been the subject of development to which many would appear to have lost their original bungalow form.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey rear extension projecting 4m from the existing rear elevation together with 2.2m raised decking including a glass balustrade constructed along the common boundary shared with 6 Mercer Lane. The two-storey

rear extension would be constructed with a gambrel roof form, 1no roof light to the east roof slope and would match the material palette of the existing dwelling.

Permission is also sought for a two-storey front gable extension projecting 0.8m from the existing front elevation with a steep angled gable and large bespoke glazing. Two steep gable roof dormers matching the roof form of the proposed front porch are also proposed to the front roof slope projecting 1.7m from the existing roof ridge to facilitate a loft conversion.

Proposed works also include minor alterations to existing fenestration on both the front and side elevations with the addition of 2no windows to the side elevations.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The only issue for Highways associated with this application is parking provision.

The application would result in the loss of the existing garage so although the application form indicates there would be no impact on parking it is unclear from the submitted plans where the displaced parking would be located. For the size of the extended dwelling Council standards require the provision of two viable off street parking spaces.

We would not expect that the proposed development would have any impact on road safety.

There would appear to be no issues arising from the servicing of the development.

Highways raise no objection to this application, subject to the provision of the parking spaces, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. One letter of objection was received.

Design

- Black UPVC fenestration not in keeping with surrounding bungalows
- Lack of subservience, overly dominant, intrusive, overdevelopment and detrimental to visual amenities when viewed from surrounding properties along Newhouse Crescent, Bankfield Lane and Minorca Close

- Change of apex roof to gambrel out of keeping with appearance of existing dwelling and incongruous in comparison to neighbouring bungalows. Negative impact regarding standard of amenity for future and existing occupiers.

Officer Response Assessed in 'design' section of report

Amenity

- Two-storey rear extension in close proximity to common boundaries therefore not meeting Section 4.1 Space Standards guidelines for principal windows
- Loss of view and light to neighbouring rear gardens
- Decking and glass balustrade poses overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties at the rear creating unacceptable living conditions for current and future occupiers.

Officer Response Addressed in 'amenity' section of report

Trees

- Application does not state the removal or pruning to the 25m tree located in the rear garden of 8 Mercer Lane between the common boundary shared with the application property and those adjacent to the east. Tree would have to be removed for proposed development
- Loss of tree would negatively impact public visual amenity which improves the outlook of the neighbourhood, provides privacy, provides wildlife habitats and benefits environmental quality

Officer Response *The trees located in the rear garden of 8 Mercer Lane are not protected and would not require a TPO for their removal. In the instance of an approval, a tree report may be requested to ensure substantial damage is not caused.*

Surface Water Flooding

- Development would result in the loss of up to 40 square metres of permeable surfaces i.e., flower beds and lawns, which may contribute to increase surface water run-off. Development also has potential for exacerbating surface water flood risk in neighbourhood.
- The junction between Bankfield Lane and Clay Land and Springbank Lane are medium long-term risk of surface water flooding therefore extensive development in the interest of occupiers at 8 Mercer Lane pose long-term effects for wider community.

Officer Response *8 Mercer Lane is not directly located within a Flood Risk Zone. A large expanse of the rear garden area is grassed and no permeable paving is posed.*

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape. Section 5 of the SPD sets out guidance for house extensions to which it states they should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally be subservient to it.

With reference to the overall design approach of the scheme, it should be first noted and acknowledged many dwellings along Mercer Lane have been the subject of development in previous years, many of which pre-date the Adopted 2016 Core Strategy and SPD. With reference to the dwellings adjacent to the application property at the front, many have lost their overall bungalow form with the additions of first floor and large front dormer extensions. However, 8 Mercer Lane is the first in a row of four uniformly aligned bungalows, hosting a strong building line and of matching scales, with the exception of the dormer additions to 6 Mercer Lane (approved prior to the Adopted Core Strategy and SPD).

The proposed two-storey front porch is of an incongruous addition to the front elevation and would significantly undermine the existing bungalow form. The porch would not be built sympathetic to the existing build with a large front facing steep-gable proposed and large bespoke glazing hosting the hallway

and would appear at odds with the row of bungalows. Together with the two pitched-roof front dormers, the development to the front elevation is considered to be visually intrusive and detrimental to the existing build. Although the existing bungalow will be retained, the additions would present an overdevelopment of the plot and would not be appropriate in the setting presenting an overbearing impact to the original form of the dwelling.

The proposed two-storey rear extension would also appear discordant with the visual appearance of the bungalow form and also present an incongruous addition not built sympathetic to the existing build. The gambrel roof would appear at odds and not respect the visual form of the rear elevation presenting a roof design not found within immediate or adjacent settings therefore not appropriate in this location.

The alteration to existing fenestration on the front and side elevations are considered acceptable with proportions which would match those on the existing. In the instance of an approval, amendments would have been sought to reposition the loft windows on the west side elevations hosting the en-suite and the window on the east side elevation hosting the bedroom (4) to fall centrally within the side elevations on the gable. The current plans position the windows off-center which would appear at odds. Furthermore, amendments would have also been sought to better align the rear windows on the proposed two-storey extension ensuring they were correctly aligned for a higher quality of design.

The presence of the raised decking forming a new patio area at the rear together with a glass balustrade all with a height of 2.2m is considered acceptable in design terms. It is acknowledged the formation of decking is significantly larger than the existing patio area however is not considered detrimental given it is proposed to the rear, out of public view points and surrounded by boundary fences and high vegetation.

The overall concept of the proposal would not visually respect the form of the original dwelling as well as forming a disproportionate addition and being out of character within the surrounding row of bungalows. In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under the SPD and Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy to which it states "All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings" and "proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties".

Loss of Privacy

Paragraph 5.9 states "Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)". Given the adjacent dwelling to the west, 6 Mercer Lane, currently hosts a 2m rear conservatory to which the plans indicate the extension would only project 2m forward of, the extension is considered to be acceptable in reference to 6 Mercer Lane in this regard.

The addition of the front porch and dormers are not considered to pose any loss of privacy impact given the front porch windows do not host habitable rooms and the dormer bedroom window is at a distance of approx. 25m from the adjacent dwelling to the front, no.5 Mercer Lane, to which the SPD requires 21m for directly facing principal windows.

In reference to the required 21m separation distance between principal windows at upper floor level, the proposed loft bedroom window on the east side elevation would pose an unacceptable loss of privacy on the first floor rear window of 27 Bankfield Lane given the separation distance between the bedroom windows would only be 17m therefore not in accordance with Section 4 Space Standards.

Overlooking

Further to the east side window not meeting Section 4 Space Standards requirements, the window is also considered to pose an unacceptable overlooking impact to the rear garden of 27 Bankfield Lane given the orientation of the application property is 90 degrees west of 27 Bankfield Lane.

Paragraph 4.4 of the SPD 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". It is noted due to the variation in ground levels, the fences constructed along the common boundary shared with no.6 and no.8 Mercer Lane slopes down slightly in the middle. The presence of elevated decking projecting further than the current rear patio area would pose an unacceptable degree of overlooking into the rear garden of 6 Mercer Lane give it will be constructed along the common boundary and would therefore be unacceptable. It is not considered for the decking to pose an overlooking effect to the adjacent dwelling to the east, 25 Bankfield Lane given the decking is constructed approx. 3.7m away from the shared common boundary.

The development is not considered to pose any overlooking impact to any of the other surrounding rear gardens which border the rear garden of the application property given no side windows are proposed to the two-storey extension and is also constructed away from common boundaries.

Occupier Amenity

The proposed works ensures the provision of a suitably sized rear garden would be retained post-development. The works would also not pose any detrimental impact to the provision of adequate light and outlook to existing internal rooms of the host property.

In view of the above assessment, the presence of a loft window on the east side elevation would pose a loss of privacy to occupiers at 27 Bankfield Lane with reference to the upper floor principal window. Furthermore, the elevated decking would pose an overlooking impact to the rear garden of 6 Mercer Lane therefore not constructed in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

In line with comments received from the highways officer, in the instance of an approval, the applicants would be required to demonstrate where two viable off-street designated car parking spaces can be accommodated. However, with the application subject to a refusal, this was not deemed necessary in this instance.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed two-storey rear extension, two-storey front porch extension together with two front dormers would constitute a poorly designed addition to an otherwise modest sized bungalow dwelling. The works have not been designed to be sympathetic to the existing build and would significantly undermine the established character of the street. The works are considered to be an overdevelopment of the plot and would erode the character and visual appearance of the existing dwelling. As such, the proposal would not 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. The proposed development would result in a harmful loss of privacy to the occupants of 27 Bankfield Lane, resulting from the addition of a first-floor height side-facing window on the east elevation at close proximity to the rear elevation and rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling, below separation distances set out in the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' In addition, the proposed elevated decking would pose an unacceptable degree of overlooking to the rear garden of 6 Mercer Lane. 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 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	03.05.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	11.05.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- LOCATION PLAN
- 22.3020.4 EXISTING AND PROPOSED BLOCK PLANS
- 23.3020.3D PROPOSED FLOOR PLAND AND SECTION

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo