

Application Number 21/01194/FUL

Proposal Single storey front extension (part retrospective) (re-submission further to 20/01108/FUL)

Site 13 Norman Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 8QG

Applicant Mr Farzand

Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions.

Reason for Report A Speakers Panel decision is required because, in accordance with the Panel's Terms of reference, the application raises issues about which a member of the public has requested the opportunity to address the Panel before a decision is made. Accordingly, the applicant, or their agent, has also been given the opportunity to speak.

1. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for an extension to a residential dwelling. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey front extension. The proposed extension measures 7.15m in width, 2m in depth and an eaves height of 2.45m.
- 1.2 This planning application was originally sought for the erection of a single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and external alterations to the existing conservatory, part retrospectively. Through the course of consideration of the application, the plans for the single storey rear extension and alterations to the conservatory have been removed, and therefore a decision is to be made solely on the part retrospective single storey front extension.
- 1.3 This planning application is as a result of a planning enforcement complaint regarding the previous approved application reference 20/01108/FUL, as the front extension was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans.
- 1.4 The application is supported by the following drawings:
 - Proposed plans and elevations – dwg no. 41A date received 24 December 2021
 - Proposed block plan – dwg no.34 date received 10 October 2021
 - Location plan – date received 1 November 2021

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site occupies a prominent location on the northeast corner of Norman Road and Poplar Grove. Northeast of the site is Oasis Academy Broadoak Primary School. Off street parking is provided by the front driveway, accessed via Norman Road.
- 2.2 The existing property is a two storey detached dwelling. A front and rear dormer, single storey side extension, rear conservatory and front porch have previously been added to the property. To the front and rear are generously sized gardens.
- 2.3 The design and appearance of the existing property is of a considerable scale and non-traditional design in relation to other properties on Norman Road and Poplar Grove.
- 2.4 There is a vacant plot to the northwest of the application property, which has extant permission for a detached dwellinghouse (approved under 18/00604/FUL and later refused

under 20/00671/FUL). As such, there is a boundary wall northeast of the dwelling, separating the application property and the proposed new dwelling.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 02/00625/FUL: Single storey extensions on both sides, front porch, rear conservatory and front dormer. Approved 24 June 2002.
- 3.2 02/00851/FUL: Erection of 1 no detached dwellinghouse (on land adjacent to). Approved 8 August 2002.
- 3.3 04/01632/FUL: Rear dormer (retrospective). Approved 17 January 2005.
- 3.4 05/00188/FUL: Two storey front extension, first floor rear extension plus dormers to front and rear (Amendment to planning permission 02/00851/FUL for erection of 1no. dwellinghouse). Refused 13 April 2005.
- 3.5 05/01005/FUL: Two storey rear extension, front and rear dormers and construction of ground floor window in gable (Amendment to planning permission 02/00851/FUL for the erection of 1no. detached dwellinghouse). Approved 25 August 2005.
- 3.6 06/01409/FUL: Amendment to planning permission 02/00851/FUL for the erection of 1no. detached dwelling comprising two storey front extension, extension of front and rear dormers plus alterations to roof, windows and brickwork. Approved 21 November 2006.
- 3.7 12/00314/FUL: Two semi-detached houses with parking. Refused 13 September 2012.
- 3.8 13/00194/FUL: Detached House in garden of no. 13 Norman Road. Application returned.
- 3.9 18/00604/FUL: 4 Bedroom detached house with off street parking. Approved 30 August 2018.
- 3.10 20/00671/FUL: 4 Bedroom detached house with off street parking. Refused 9 November 2020.
- 3.11 20/01251/MATCH: Changes to front door, relocation of the kitchen door and window, removal of rear window first floor, changes to front ground floor window, larger roof light to rear, changes to window height at first floor level, changes to boundary wall, side and frontage and driveway. Refused 11 May 2021.
- 3.12 20/01108/FUL: Front and rear single storey extensions and external alterations to conservatory. Approved 11 January 2021.
- 3.13 21/00074/PLCOND: Discharge of conditions of approved application 18/00604/FUL 03 Material, 05 to confirm the side extension has been demolished and 07 drainage water details. Approved 23 September 2021.
- 3.14 21/01101/MATCH: Changes to window and door opening location to the front extension. Application returned.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 4.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 4.2 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

4.3 **Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Allocation:** Unallocated

4.4 **Part 1 Policies:**

- 1.5: Following the Principles of Sustainable Development;
- 1.11: Conserving Built Heritage and Retaining Local Identity;
- 1.12: Ensuring an Accessible, Safe and Healthy Environment.

4.5 **Part 2 Policies:**

- H10: Detailed Design of Housing Developments
- C1: Townscape and Urban Form

4.6 Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document:

- RED1: Acknowledge Character
- RED9: Front Extensions

4.7 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

- Section 2: Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 12: Achieving Well Designed Places

4.8 **Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

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.

4.9 **National Design Guide (2021)**

Illustrate how well-designed places that are beautiful, healthy, greener, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice. It forms part of the Government's collection of planning practice guidance and should be read alongside the separate planning practice guidance on design process and tools.

5. **PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT**

5.1 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and the Tameside Statement of Community Involvement, the adjoining owner or occupiers were notified of the proposed development:

- Neighbour notification letters were sent to six addresses
- Display of site notice

6. **RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

6.1 No consultees were consulted on this application.

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

7.1 In response to the neighbour notification letters, there have been eight representations received. The following concerns have been raised, which are summarised as follows:

7.2 Inaccuracy of plans:

- The inaccuracy of the existing and proposed plans – no dormer shown, or side elevations windows.
- There are no dimensions which is a 'must' as stated in TMBC policy.

- The block plan is incorrect, due to the new boundary wall that splits the site in two. By not showing the boundary wall gives the illusion that the existing house (including proposed extension) is on a much larger plot.

7.3 Design issues:

- The proposed front and rear extensions will add to the overdevelopment of the site, as front and rear dormers, a single storey side extension and a rear conservatory have previously extended the property.
- The proposal is out of character.
- The front extension would dominate the building's façade, disrupt the building line and act as unwanted precedent.

7.4 Amenity issues:

- Impact on privacy, overlooking overshadowing and loss of light (relating to the proposed rear extension).

7.5 Enforcement issues:

- Outstanding enforcement issue – unauthorised overbuild of the front extension and therefore a breach of the previous approved planning application (20/01108/FUL).

7.6 Parking issues:

- Concerns regarding parking provision relating to the alleged proposed conversion of the property to a HMO. Parking is more of an issue in this area due to the nearby school.
- Poor parking provisions will result in safety issues for children, parents, staff and residents.

7.7 Other matters:

- Noise and disturbance.
- Poor quality workmanship of the build – the build is apparently unsafe.
- We received no prior notification for the previous planning application (20/01108/FUL). Our right to raise objections against the original application was denied to us (and others), which in turn may have influenced the approval decision reached previously. *Neighbour notification letters were sent to immediate neighbours, and a site notice was erected. The address of this objector did not receive a notification letter, as their property and its curtilage, does not bound no.13.*

8. ANALYSIS

8.1 The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- The principle of the development;
- Residential amenity; and
- Design and local character.

9. PRINCIPLE

9.1 Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 further states that decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive, as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.

- 9.2 Locally, Policy H10 and C1 of the adopted Tameside UDP states that new development will be required to be of a high quality design that complements or enhances the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 9.3 Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) (the SPD) provides further guidance for household extensions. Policy RED1 requires that proposals should apply an architectural style that reflects the existing dwelling and surrounding area and should not alter the scale and mass of the existing dwelling. Policy RED9 sets out detailed principles for front extensions, acknowledging that they must not disrupt the existing building line, align with the architectural style of the property and surrounding area and so are not detracting, inappropriately proportioned, and does not impact on the neighbours outlook or natural light.

10. DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

- 10.1 The existing dwelling is of considerable scale and bulk in comparison to the immediate area/neighboring properties, occupying a substantial corner plot on Norman Road and Poplar Grove. Its appearance is generally out of character relative to the other properties in the surrounding area.
- 10.2 Policy RED9 of the Residential Design Guide states extensions to the front of a house can fundamentally alter its appearance, detract from the surrounding character and create an unwanted precedent. As such, front extensions are not always considered acceptable.
- 10.3 In this instance, the proposed single storey front extension remains a subordinate addition to the existing property, and therefore does not dominate the building's façade, respecting the scale and mass of the existing dwelling.
- 10.4 The orientation of the existing property does not follow the existing building line formed by the properties on Norman Road and Poplar Grove, and therefore the addition of a front extension would not disrupt the building line.
- 10.5 The proposed front porch generally aligns with the architectural style of the existing dwelling, appropriately incorporating the existing porch feature. The proposed gable roof feature is the same in size and scale to the existing gable roof feature over the retained porch, and is therefore an acceptable addition.
- 10.6 The current part retrospective planning application is a resubmission further to 20/01108/FUL, due to the front extension being built larger than that shown on the approved plans. It is noted that the proposed front extension approved under 20/01108/FUL projected the same distance from the principal elevation as the existing front porch. Yet upon construction, the front extension projects beyond the existing front porch, by 0.2m.
- 10.7 Considering the proposed front porch has previously been approved planning permission, albeit of a reduced scale to what has been constructed, the additional impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area is not sufficient enough to warrant a refusal.
- 10.8 Overall, the proposed single storey front extension is deemed to meet the standards and guidelines set out under SPD Policies RED1 and RED9, Policies C1 and H10 of the adopted Tameside UDP and the NPPF, and remains acceptable on balance.

11. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

- 11.1 Paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.
- 11.2 Locally, the adopted Tameside UDP Policy H10 requires that any development, including extensions, should not have unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy nor overshadowing.
- 11.3 In addition, Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) (the SPD) contains specific standards and guidelines for different development types to ensure that no undue amenity impacts are caused to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Policy RED9 of the SPD states front extensions should not impact upon neighbours outlook and natural light.
- 11.4 Given the orientation of the existing property (in relation to the properties on Norman Road and Poplar Grove), given the separation distance to no.29 Poplar Grove, and the existing boundary treatment, the proposed front extension is not considered to significantly harm the outlook from neighbouring occupiers, or result in a loss of natural light.
- 11.5 In light of the above, the proposed front extension is deemed to meet the standards and guidelines set out under the SPD Policy RED2 and RED9, Policy H10 of the adopted Tameside UDP and the NPPF.

12. HIGHWAY SAFETY

- 12.1 The proposed scheme would have no additional or different impacts on highway safety over the existing situation and is acceptable in this regard.

13. NON-MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 13.1 In relation to the concerns regarding the conversion of the property to a HMO, there is nothing in the submitted planning application that suggests this change of use is proposed. This application must be considered on its own merits and based on the submitted information before the Council.

14. CONCLUSION

- 14.1 The proposed single storey front extension, having previously been approved, albeit of a slightly smaller scale under 20/01108/FUL, would have no additional impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. In addition, the front extension would not significantly harm the outlook or result in a loss of natural light to the surrounding neighbours. For the above reasons, the proposed single storey front porch is deemed acceptable against Policies RED1 and RED9 of the Residential Design Guide, Policies C1 and H10 of the adopted Tameside UDP and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed single storey front extension is considered to remain a subordinate addition, which does not dominate the building's façade, or disrupt the existing building line. Having regard to the previously approved front extension (20/01108/FUL), the proposed scheme respects the scale, mass and design of the existing dwelling, whilst not unreasonably detracting from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As a result of the

above, the proposed front porch is not considered to significantly harm the outlook of neighbouring occupier, or result in a loss of light. The proposed single storey front porch is therefore deemed acceptable against Policies RED1 and RED9 of the Residential Design Guide, Policies C1 and H10 of the adopted Tameside UDP and the NPPF.

1. The development hereby permitted must begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the following amended plans/details received 24 December 2021:

Proposed plans and elevations – dwg no.41A.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and in accordance with UDP Policies and relevant national planning guidance (Policies RED1, RED2, and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design SPD; Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside UDP).

3. The external materials shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality, in accordance with UDP Policy C1: Townscape and Urban Form.