APPLICATION NUMBER: 19/00434/HOUS

Application Number:	**19/00434/HOUS**
Location:	48 Cheltenham Road Middleton M24 1HG
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension, rear dormer and alterations to front elevation
Applicant:	Mrs D Lord
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 semi-detached bungalow sited within a residential area of Middleton. It is built in red brick with concrete tiles to roof and a rendered front elevation. A conservatory adjoins its rear elevation. It is one of a large number of similarly designed properties on Cheltenham Road, many of which have been altered and extended.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- The erection of a single storey rear extension. It would have a depth of 7.35m and would be built with a dual pitched roof with varying eaves heights.
- The erection of a dormer window to the rear. The ridge of the proposed extension would intersect its rear elevation and it would have a maximum height greater than that of the application property.
- Creation of a doorway and garage within the front elevation.

Relevant History

07/D48756- Front Dormer And Single Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling. Approved.

No.46 Cheltenham Road. 78/D06682- Two dormer bedrooms. Approved.

No.58 Cheltenham Road. 81/D12788- Rear Dormer Extension to Dwellinghouse. Approved.

Township/Member comments

None received.

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

The proposed dormer window would be located to the rear of the application property and would be of considerable size. The roof of the dormer would exceed the roof ridge of the application property and as a result of this would be visible within the street scene. It is noted that there are similar examples of dormer extensions, which are of a greater height than the ridge of the properties to which they adjoin, in the street scene. Notable examples are at No.58 Cheltenham Road (ref: 81/D12788) and the adjoining No.46 Cheltenham Road (ref: 78/D06882).

In regards to dormer extensions, paragraph 5.17 of the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document (2016) sets out principles which should be adhered to. Particularly relevant to this application are the following:

- ‘They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling’
- ‘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’

In relation to the second point, a large proportion of the dormer windows close to the application property are built with flat roofs and help define the character of the street scene. The creation of an additional flat roof dormer would further reinforce this street scene’s character and would not, in principle, be harmful.

The proposed rear dormer would however have a height which is greater than that of the ridge of the application property and thus would not accord with the first point given above. Due to its height, flat roof and size, the portion of dormer above the ridge of the application property would constitute an awkward, irregular and conspicuous addition the street scene that would not be sympathetic to the character and design of the dwellinghouse. Therefore it would fail to accord with the visual amenity aims of policy DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

There are other rear dormer extensions within the street scene which similarly are visible above the ridge of their host properties (notably at No.46 and No.58). The adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which put a great emphasis on high quality design, were both adopted after the planning approval of the rear dormers at these addresses. It is not considered that the presence of similar dormers in the street scene justifies permitting a dormer extension which does not accord with current policy, is of poor design and the further degrades the character of the street scene.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be built with a varying eaves height and a significant portion of it would intersect the proposed dormer. It is considered that these elements of its design would make it appear as an awkward and ungainly addition to the application property. As such it would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

By virtue of their scale and design, it is considered that the proposed alterations to the front elevation would not have a significant adverse impact upon the character of the application property.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

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'.

The proposed extension would have a depth of 7.35m and would be set a maximum of 5m away from the boundary shared with the adjoining No.46 Cheltenham Road. It would accord with the SPD guidance given above. By virtue of its overall size and the distance of separation between it and the adjoining No.46, it is considered that the proposed extension would accord with the above guidance in relation to No.46 Cheltenham Road.

The proposed rear extension would be positioned approximately 0.5m from the boundary shared with No.50 Cheltenham Road and would extend approximately 8.8m beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property, measured parallel to the side boundary fence. As such, it would fail to accord with the SPD guidance given above. The existing conservatory extends approximately 4.3m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring No.50 and by virtue of the distance of separation between the application property and No.50 Cheltenham Road, accords with the above guidance.

The application property is in an elevated position in relation to the neighbouring No.50 Cheltenham Road. Due to its depth, elevated position and proximity to the shared boundary, it is considered that the proposed extension would have a significant oppressive impact upon the occupants of the Neighbouring No.50 when viewed from the rear facing windows of the property and the rear amenity space. Due to its size, this impact would be significantly greater than that of the existing conservatory.

Whilst the proposed extension would have an oppressive impact upon the occupants of No.50 Cheltenham Road, it would be sited predominantly to the North of this property. By virtue of its orientation, its erection would not result in any substantial overshadowing of this property.

The views from the proposed dormer window would be limited to those of the gardens of the neighbouring No.50 and No.46 Cheltenham Road. Within a residential setting such as this, such outlooks are not atypical and it is considered that the level of overlooking would not be so severe as to result in any significant loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reasons:

1. Due to its height, flat roof and size, the portion of dormer above the ridge of the application property would constitute an awkward, irregular and conspicuous addition to the street scene that would not be in keeping with character and appearance of the dwelling house. As such it would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed single storey rear extension would be built with varying eaves heights and a significant portion of it would intersect the proposed rear dormer. It is considered that these elements of its design would make it appear as an awkward and ungainly addition to the application property. As such it would fail to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Due to its depth and proximity to the shared boundary, it is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would have a significant, oppressive impact upon the occupants of the neighbouring No.50 when viewed from the rear facing windows of the property and the rear amenity space. As such, it would fail to accord with policy DM1 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 elevations, roof and site plan (Drawing No: RC 04195450/3)
- Proposed Layouts and Section (Drawing No: RC 04195450/2)
- Existing Layout, and Elevations (Drawing No: RC 04195450/1)

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	07/06/2019	Signed: OP
Authorisation	10/06/2019	Signed: DR

Report Author Osian Perks