APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/01406/HOUS

Application Number:	18/01406/HOUS
Location:	566 Oldham Road Middleton M24 2EB
Proposal:	Two storey side and rear extension, alterations to roof including side dormer extension and alterations to front elevation
Applicant:	Mr Mrcela
Case Officer:	Osian Perks
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**

Location

This application relates to detached property sited within the Middleton Township. It is built in red brick with a slate, dual pitched roof. To the front of the property is a front porch, built with a mono pitched roof and a brick built bay window. To the rear, is a two storey rear projection.

The property is sited at the end of a row of terrace properties which are of a similar architectural style to the host dwelling, with similar roof design, window openings and exterior materials.

A similar row of terrace properties is situated on the opposite side of Oldham Road.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- The replacement of the roof of the property including an increase in ridge height from 8.2m to 8.85m and the re-orientation of the ridge to run front to back;
- The insertion of a contemporary dormer style extension within the East side roof slope.
- A side extension to the property, increasing its width from 5m to 6.1m;

- A two storey rear extension measuring 3.15m in depth;
- The creation of an integral garage and front porch and the re-positioning of a window with the front elevation of the host dwelling;
- Alterations to the roof to create a front facing gable and of the application property.

Relevant History

n/a

Township/Member comments

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

Whilst this is a very small development I do not believe it can operate safely without significant disruption to the immediate area.

The site incorporates an internal garage parking space.

In order to make this space accessible it will be necessary to prevent parking on Oldham Road at this location. Mills Hill Station is very close to this location and on street parking is particularly problematic at this location. Therefore to ensure the garage space remains free it will be necessary to introduce a TRO on the road outside the property. To ensure that adequate space is available for a car to be seen entering the highway at this location it would be a significant TRO that would require introduction of approximately 30m. It is unlikely that any such TRO would be supported and introduced I could not therefore guarantee this proposal can operate safely.

I do believe that if this application is permitted we will be granting permission for an access that cannot operate safely and will result in road accidents.

I object to this application on safety grounds.

Representations

None 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

By virtue of their size, design and materials, the residential properties in the existing street exhibit a high degree of uniformity. The proposed increase in the roof height of the application property; alteration to create a front facing gable and the erection of the box dormer window will overwhelm the character of the host dwelling and the resultant property will appear out of keeping with the character of the street scene. As such, it is considered that the proposal would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Whilst the principle of a two storey side extension and a two storey rear extension may be acceptable, these elements of the proposal do not appear as subservient additions to the existing dwelling but original parts of the substantially redesigned property which is proposed. Therefore, these elements of the proposal cannot be assessed in isolation and as with the elements of the proposal assessed in the above paragraph, by virtue of their design, these elements of the scheme would appear as incongruous additions to the street scene.

Currently, at ground floor level, the host property has a large bay window. This application seeks to replace this ground floor window, in part with an up and over garage door. This garage door would cover a large proportion of the front elevation of the resulting property. Due to its featureless, stark appearance and its size, covering a considerable expanse of the front elevation of the dwelling, it is considered that the removal of the existing bay window and the erection of the proposed garage would visually harm the appearance of the host dwelling. In addition, the increased width and height of the property would result in large expanses of brickwork across the remainder of the front elevation, which would similarly detract from the character of the street scene.

The proposed porch is of a considerable width and has a flat roofed design. It is considered that its design and size make it appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling.

The proposal as a whole would therefore significantly detract from the character of the street scene. As such, it is considered that the proposal would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed side extension would not be sited within close proximity to any residential properties. As such, it would not overshadow or have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of neighbouring properties. The proposed roof alterations and alterations to the front elevation of the application property would, by virtue of

their scale and design, not result in the substantial overshadowing or overlooking of any nearby properties.

The neighbouring No.564 has a single storey rear extension. To ensure that a two storey rear extension to a residential property extension does not result in the substantial loss of light to or have an overbearing impact upon adjoining properties paragraphs 5.8 to 5.10 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (2016) stipulate that planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to semi-detached dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4 metres along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s). This distance is extended to 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the neighbouring property where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary.

Measured along the common boundary from the first floor rear elevation of No.564, close to the boundary, the proposed extension would measure approximately 2.4 metres and would therefore accord with the above guidance.

However, it is noted that paragraph 5.3 of the SPD acknowledges that in some circumstances, development that complies with the standards may nevertheless have an unacceptable impact. To the West of the first floor window of No.564 closest to the common boundary is a two storey outrigger measuring 3 metres in depth. To the rear (South) is a steep incline and large established trees. Both of these restrict the level of light to and outlook from said window. It is considered that the erection of the two storey rear extension will contribute to a tunnel effect upon said window, further restricting the levels of light to and the outlook from this neighbouring property's window to an unacceptable degree.

Paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that "*it is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable."*

The proposal would result in the creation of four-bedroomed family dwelling. The size of the remaining outdoor amenity space is not considered sufficient to serve a dwelling of this size and type.

As such the proposal would not accord with the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed garage would result in vehicles reversing onto the heavily trafficked A664 Oldham Road, in a location with restricted visibility due to the presence of vehicles parked on the highway.
The consultee from Highway and Engineering has indicated that significant parking restriction would need to be imposed in order for the garage to operate safely as a car parking space. In this location, close to Mills Hill Train Station, such restrictions are unlikely to be supported. As such, it is not considered that the garage could operate safely as a car parking space. It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to policy T2 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, including the increase in the roof height; alteration to create a front facing gable; the erection of the box dormer window and creation of the front porch and vehicular garage entrance door would overwhelm the character of the host dwelling and the resultant property would appear out of keeping with the character of the street scene. As such, the proposal 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.

2. The erection of the two storey rear extension would result in a substantial loss of light to and outlook from the rear facing, first floor window of no. 564 Oldham Road closest to the common boundary. As such, it would not accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed development would result in the provision of insufficient outdoor amenity space to meet the reasonable needs of the future occupiers of the dwelling. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The proposed garage would result in vehicles reversing onto the heavily trafficked A664 Oldham Road, in a location with restricted visibility due to the presence of vehicles parked on the highway. As such the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety and would fail to accord with policy T2 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.

Informative

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

- Proposed site plan;
- Proposed floor plans (Drawing ref 201)
- Proposed elevational drawings (Drawing ref 210)
- Existing floor plans, Elevations and site plan (Drawing ref 001A)
- Site Location Plan

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	28/02/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	06/03/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Osian Perks