# **Application Number 19/00080/FUL**

Proposal Single storey extension to front elevation and conversion of garage to

habitable room

Site 5 Harmol Grove, Ashton-under-Lyne, Tameside, OL7 9NW

**Applicant** Mrs Elaine Grainger

**Recommendation** Refuse planning permission

Reason for report A Speakers Panel decision is required at the discretion of the Head of

Planning. This is because the application was initially referred to Speakers Panel by Councillor Lorraine Whitehead who is no longer an elected

Tameside Council councillor following the recent elections.

#### 1. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a single storey front extension and garage conversion. The front extension will project 1.5m from the front elevation of the original house and 1m beyond the existing front/side extension. The extension will have a bay window projecting a further 0.6m beyond the front of the proposed extension.

#### 2. SITE & SURROUNDINGS

5 Harmol Grove is a two storey extended semi-detached property set within a predominantly residential area of Ashton. There is an existing single storey garage extension to the side that projects 0.5m beyond the front of the original dwelling. The dwelling fronts onto Harmol Grove to the north and is bounded by residential curtilages to all other aspects. Neighbouring properties along Harmol Grove are predominantly two storey semi-detached houses built in matching style with red brick and hipped roofs. Number 5 adjoins its neighbouring pairing at 7 Harmol Grove to the west.

## 3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 03/01042/FUL Rear conservatory and change of roof shape. Approved 11/09/2003.
- 3.2 03/00409/FUL First floor extension on side elevation. Refused 06/05/2003.

# 4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

## 4.1 Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Allocation

Unallocated, within the Ashton Waterloo ward.

#### 4.2 Part 1 Policies

1.3: Creating a Cleaner and Greener Environment.

1.5: Following the Principles of Sustainable Development

# 4.3 Part 2 Policies

H10: Detailed Design of Housing Developments

C1: Townscape and Urban Form

#### 4.4 Other Policies

4.5 Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document

# 4.6 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Section 2: Achieving sustainable development Section 12: Achieving well designed places

## 4.7 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

4.8 This is intended to complement the NPPF and to provide a single resource for planning guidance, whilst rationalising and streamlining the material. Almost all previous planning Circulars and advice notes have been cancelled. Specific reference will be made to the PPG or other national advice in the Analysis section of the report, where appropriate.

#### 5. PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT

5.1 Neighbour notification letters were issued in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

### 6. RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

6.1 Not applicable.

#### 7. SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES RECEIVED

7.1 No third party representations have been received.

### 8. ANALYSIS

- 8.1 In accordance with the revised NPPF and the Tameside UDP, the main issue(s) raised by the application relate to the following:
  - Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
  - Impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties

### Impact on character and appearance of surrounding area

- 8.2 The proposed front extension would project 1m from the front of the existing porch/side extension, the resulting overall projection would be 1.5m from the front elevation of the original dwellinghouse. Policy RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design SPD provides guidance on front extensions to residential properties, stating 'extensions to the front of a house can fundamentally alter its appearance, detract from the surrounding character and create an unwanted precedent'. An exception may be considered if the extension does not disrupt the existing building line, aligns with the architectural style of existing dwellings, does not dominate the façade, does not detract from the street scene, does not impact on neighbour's outlook and will not affect disabled access.
- 8.3 Harmol Grove follows a linear projectory and is lined with semi-detached properties to both sides. Numbers 5-19 Harmol Grove form a consistent and uniform building line along the south side of Harmol Grove that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The proposal would encompass more than half of the existing front

extension at ground floor. By virtue of its length and projection from the front of the house, the extension would disrupt the building line along Harmol Grove, appearing disproportionately large in relation to neighbouring properties and would be overly prominent within the streetscene. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy RED9 of the Residential Design SPD.

## Impact on residential amenity

- 8.4 The proposed extension is sited sufficient distance from neighbouring property and habitable room windows such that no undue harm to neighbour amenity is anticipated.
- 8.5 The extension would be approx. 9.8m from a ground floor rear-facing window to 3 Harmol Grove. Though this separation distance falls short of the guidance in policy RED2 of the SPD, this policy refers specifically to levels of sunlight and privacy. The extension would not include any windows to the side elevations so would not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy to this property. By virtue of being single storey, its siting on the host dwelling and the existing mature boundary treatments, the extension is not considered to result in any undue loss of light to this neighbour.
- 8.6 There are no other neighbouring properties considered to be impacted by the proposals and no objections have been received.

#### Other matters

8.7 The applicant's agent has stated that the extension is required to allow the applicant's elderly relative to move into the family home as their care needs grow, and that the extension will be funded privately without the need for council funding. The personal circumstances of the applicant are not a material planning consideration and so cannot be taken into account as part of this planning application.

# 9. CONCLUSION

9.1 To conclude, it is considered the proposal would conflict with Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan, and Policies RED1 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

### 10. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed extension would create an incongruent feature that would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene along Harmol Grove. By virtue of its scale and massing, and by encompassing more than half of the building's frontage at ground floor, the extension would disrupt the building line along Harmol Grove and would form an overly prominent structure that would contrast negatively with the character of the existing streetscene. As such the proposed extension fails to comply with policies RED1 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document and would be contrary to policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan.