

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen

Date of report: 20/10/2020

Ref:65960/FUL

Goldsbrough

Registration: 22/09/2020

LDfC: 19/10/2020

Expiry Date: 17/11/2020

Site Visit: 01/10/2020

Site Notice: N/A

Press Date: N/A

Objections: 0

Con Area: N/A

Adv Type: N/A

Reason for Delay:

EIA: NA

N/A

Dec Level: DEL

Stat Class: HOUS

Proposal: Raise ridge height of roof with loft conversion, hip to gable roof extension and dormers at front and rear

Location: 23 Hereford Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0JA

Description

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling house located on Hereford Drive. The premises has a garden to the front, with a driveway that leads along the side of the premises. A further area of private residential amenity space is located to the rear. The premises has been previously extended at single storey to the rear.

Planning permission is sought to raise the ridge of the dwelling by approximately 625mm and to construct a hip to gable extension. To the front it is proposed to construct two pitched roof dormers one measuring 2858mm in width, and the other measuring 2000mm in width. To the rear it is proposed to construct a flat roof dormer, with roof light that would project approximately 660mm above the ridge of the proposed roof.

Relevant Planning History

None

Publicity

Neighbour letters sent 22/09/2020 and 28/09/2020. No representations received.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

None

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) together with other relevant material planning considerations. The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP Policy will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimization;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Visual Amenity

SPD 6 and UDP Policy H2/3 seek to achieve a high standard of design that compliments the original building, and does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of neighbouring properties and the general street scene.

The immediate street scene is depicted by bay fronted, semi-detached properties the majority of which have hipped roofs however there are some gable roof details visible. Any front dormers visible on properties are limited to single, pitched roof dormers measuring approximately 1.8 metres in width. Flat roof dormers appear to be limited to the rear of properties.

SPD 6 states that the Council will seek to ensure that proposals for dormers preserve the character of the street scene especially where dormers are absent. It further clarifies that dormers that front a highway should not occupy a disproportionate large portion of the roof. SPD 6 confirms that dormers with pitched roofs should not project above the original ridge line, and in all other cases the roof of the dormer should be 0.5 metres or more below the main ridgeline.

The proposed front dormers would be of different sizes, and whilst they line up with the windows at first floor in terms of their proportions, the introduction of two oversized dormers

of differing widths would result in an strident, and out of context additions to the street scene that fail to reflect the other dormer additions to the frontages of properties. In addition whilst flat roof dormers are visible within the locality, the roof lantern proposed would project above the ridge line of the main dwelling which is contrary to guidance. This element in particular would be at odds with the character of the street scene and would lead to a development that neither compliments, nor improves the appearance of the host dwelling.

In relation to raised in ridge height SPD 6 states that proposals to increase the height of a house can appear incongruous and will be assessed on its impact on the character on the street scene. In this instance, the increase in ridge height and hip to gable extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. The increase in ridge of only one of the pair of dwellings appears alien and would lead to a development that has a poor relationship with original building, neighbouring dwelling and street scene.

The NPPF makes it clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental. This is further supported by the National Design Guide. The National Design Guide, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in 2019 states that well designed new development is influenced by " an appreciation and understanding of vernacular.....including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents." It is considered that the proposal fails to meet these requirements and does not reflect the context of the dwellings, and visible extensions within the immediate street scene, leading to a proposal that would not enhance the existing character.

The proposed development would, by reason of its size, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene that is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:

H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and associated Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties

Residential Amenity

SPD 6 and H2/3 seek to reduce the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

- Smaller proposed front dormer relates to a non-habitable room (shower room) and as such aspects not applied..
- Larger proposed front dormer relates to a habitable room (bedroom) and would be located approximately 20 metres from the front boundary of No. 14 exceeding the 10 metres required by SPD 6.
- Proposed side window would relate to a non-habitable room (stairs) and as such aspects not applied.
- Proposed rear dormer windows relate to habitable rooms (2 no. bedrooms) and would be located approximately 13 metres from the directly facing boundary exceeding the 10 metres required by SPD 6.
- It is considered that the raise in ridge height would not be unduly overbearing in terms of residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.
- Due to the nature of the roof lantern no overlooking foreseen.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

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. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy

DELEGATED REPORT

Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would, by reason of its size, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene that is neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan:
H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions and associated Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
Helen Goldsbrough	20/10/2020	DM	13/11/2020