APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00032/HOUS

Application Number:	19/00032/HOUS
Location:	24 Field View Lane, Rochdale
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and front and rear dormers
Applicant:	Mr Craig Travis
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 a detached, domestic property sited within a residential area of Rochdale. It is built with a stone exterior and has slates to roof. The property is sited on very recent housing development on which the dwellings have a high degree of uniformity in regards to their design, exterior materials and density.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- The erection of a dual-pitched dormer window within the front roof slope.
- The erection of a large dormer to the rear. This would be built with two dual pitched roofs and a flat roofed element.
- The erection of a single storey rear extension. This would be built with a mono-pitched roof and would have a depth of approximately 2.9m

Relevant History

15/00397/FUL- Full planning application for the construction of 42 residential units (Use Class C3), with parking, new pedestrian and vehicular access, highways works (from 942/944 Edenfield Road to where access road to former Rainshore Mill merges on Over Town Lane, and including access road up to former Mill site), weir and

drainage infrastructure works, ground and landscape works, boundary treatments, public open space and servicing. Approved.

Township/Member comments

n/a

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

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/2 Green Belt

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

Green Belt: G/D/2, G3 and SPD

The application property is sited within a recent housing development located within the Green Belt (as shown on policy maps pertaining to the Rochdale Borough Unitary Development Plan).

Policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy indicates that development in the Greenbelt will be limited to those types which are not deemed inappropriate by national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that an extension or alteration of a building in the green belt should only be considered

acceptable if it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.

In respect of the above policy guidance, Section 5.20 of the of the Council's recently adopted '*Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development'* (2016) Supplementary Planning Document states that normally, in principle, extensions that result in up to a 35% increase in floorspace or volume over and above the original dwelling would normally be considered appropriate and not disproportionate (this calculation would include previous extensions to the original dwelling, which is defined as the dwelling as it was first built or as it stood on 1 July 1948). However, the guidance goes on to state that the characteristics of properties and proposals will vary significantly and there may be instances when a 35% increase would be considered disproportionate and other occasions when a greater than 35% increase may be considered proportionate.

The existing property has a footprint of approximately 85.5m^2 and the proposed single storey rear extension would have a footprint of approximately 17.4m^2 which would constitute a 20.3% footprint increase.

The existing property has a volume of approximately 611.33m^3. In total, the volume of the proposed extension and alterations would equal approximately 120.24m^3. This would equal a volume increase of 19.7% over that of the original dwellinghouse and would therefore accord with the SPD. It is considered that by virtue of their size in relation to the host dwelling, the proposed alterations and extensions would not constitute a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling and would therefore accord with the SPD, Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design: DM1 and P3

The proposed single storey rear extension would be built with a mono-pitched roof and would have a depth of approximately 2.9m. By virtue of its overall design and size, it would appear as a sympathetic and subservient addition to the host dwelling.

Paragraph 5.16 of the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that dormer windows to the front of a property will not normally be supported. Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD provides more explicit guidance on the design of dormer windows:

'The following principles will apply to dormer extensions:

(i)They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;
(ii) They should be set back from the eaves line;
(iii) They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;
(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;
(v) Dormers which wrap around the side ridges of a hipped roof are not a cceptable;
(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; and
(viii) Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.'

Paragraph 5.18 indicates that there can be some flexibility in the implementation of the SPD guidance.

There would be a dormer window to the front of the property, which would not accord with the guidance in paragraph 5.16 above. However, it is noted that a property within the immediate street scene has two small front dormers (No.30), and as such it is considered that small dormers to the front of the application property would not in principle appear out of character and appearance in the existing street scene.

However, the proposed front dormer would be positioned high up in the roof slope and would cover a large proportion of it. It is considered that by virtue of its overall size and position in relation to the first floor windows directly below, the proposed front dormer would appear as an unduly prominent and alien addition to the host property which would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the existing street scene. The windows of the front dormer would not line up with, and would be greater in size than, the windows at first floor level directly below. As such, the dormer is not considered to follow the fenestration pattern of the existing property. The materials to be used on the exterior of the proposed front dormer have not been given. As such, it is unclear whether they would match the existing roof slope and as such whether it would accord with point (vii) above. Details of these could be secured via condition.

The ground level of the application property is set below that of main highway and as such its rear elevation is easily visible from the main highway to the West of No.20 and No.22 Field View Lane.

The proposed rear dormer would be built partially with a flat roof (thus failing to accord with point (i) of paragraph 5.16 of the SPD), would cover a large proportion of the rear roof slope and would be 2.9m tall. Due to its considerable bulk, flat roof design and the topography of the surrounding area, this proposed dormer window to the rear would constitute a highly prominent and incongruous addition to the host dwelling and wider street scene.

As such, the proposed dormer extensions would fail to accord with the visual amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Rear extension

To ensure that a single storey extension does not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents, the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document provides standards which should be adhered to. Paragraph 5.6 of the guidance document states:

'*The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions:*

For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);
For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s). '

Paragraph 5.7 goes on to state:

'*The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any extension if one exists close to the common boundary. If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a*

45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary. This is illustrated in figures 5 and 6'.

In relation to the neighbouring No.22, the proposed rear extension would accord with the above guidance. Given the small height and depth of the proposed rear extension and the fact that the neighbouring No.22 is set approximately 3m from the common boundary, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not overshadow or have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of this neighbouring property.

In relation to the neighbouring No.26, the proposed rear extension would accord with the above guidance. Given the small height and depth of the proposed rear extension and the fact that the extension is set approximately 7.2m from the common boundary, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not overshadow or have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of this neighbouring property.

The proposed extension would be positioned approximately 5.2m from the rear elevation of No.20. Given its siting to the North and overall size and siting, it is considered that the proposed extension would not overshadow or have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of this neighbouring property.

The proposed master bedroom would have both rear facing and front facing dormer windows. The rear facing dormer window to the ensuite would have limited views of the side elevation of No.20 and would be positioned approximately 10.8m from the shared boundary. Given that No.20 occupies a significantly elevated position in relation to the application property and there is a significant distance of separation between this property and the proposed ensuite bathroom window, it is considered that the ensuite bathroom window would not overlook this neighbouring property to such a degree as to result in a significant loss of privacy.

The proposed central and easterly rear facing dormer windows would be positioned 9.6m and 9m from the side curtilage boundary of No.20 respectively. Views of the rear elevation of No.20 would be substantially limited due to the obtuse angle between the rear elevations of this and the application property. Views across the rear amenity space of No.20 would also be greatly limited by the presence of a garage to the rear of No.20, close to the common boundary.

The proposed front dormer would be positioned approximately 36m from the nearest directly facing residential property. At such a distance, it is considered that it would not overshadow or result in substantial loss of privacy of this property

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would accord with the residential amenity aims of Policies DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As a result of the proposed extensions, the total number of bedrooms within the application property would be increased from 3 to 5. The greater level of occupancy could result in an increase in the demand for car parking space. The property is currently served by 1 off street parking space (as defined by paragraph 3.15 of the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development SPD). It is considered that, given the character and level of off-street parking in the surrounding area, the increased level occupancy would not have a significant adverse impact upon the highway.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons:

1. Due to their siting, size and design, the proposed front and rear dormer extensions would constitute unduly prominent and incongruous additions to the application property and wider street scene. As such the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the character of the host property and the wider street scene and would fail to accord with the Council's *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development* SPD, 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:

- Existing and proposed block plan (Drawing Number 18.1810.4)
- Proposed floor plans (Drawing Number 18.1810.2E)
- Existing & proposed sections/Elevations (Drawing Number 18.1810.3D)
- Existing Details (Drawing Number:- 18.1810.1)
- Site Location Plan

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	08/04/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	09/04/2019	Signed: AT

Report Author Osian Perks