

Application Number 19/00554/FUL

Proposal Single storey side extension

Site 2 Epping Road, Denton, Tameside, M34 2GB

Applicant Mr Dave Myott

Recommendation Refuse planning permission

Reason for report A Speakers Panel decision is required because one of the Denton West Ward Councillors has requested that the application be referred to Speakers Panel for determination to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the meeting.

1. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension projecting 4.5m beyond the north side elevation and along its full depth. The extension will have a mono-pitched roof with eaves at 2.65m and a maximum height to the ridge of 3.65m.

2. SITE & SURROUNDINGS

2.1 2 Epping Road is a two storey detached dwelling set on the junction with Delamere Road which runs along the north west boundary. The house benefits from an existing single storey side extension to the south east elevation, a rear conservatory and a detached garage. The surrounding area is characterised by similarly proportioned detached and semi-detached dwellings; the predominant facing material is red brick.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 None available.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

4.1 **Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Allocation**
Unallocated, within the Denton West 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

Other Policies

4.4 Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

4.5 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Section 2: Achieving sustainable development

Section 12: Achieving well designed places

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

- 4.6 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 One of the Denton West Ward Councillors has requested that the application be referred to Speakers Panel for determination to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the meeting. The applicant has expressed the view that there are a number of comparable developments within the locality.
- 7.2 No representations from neighbouring properties 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 NPPF (2019) attaches great importance to good design:
- Paragraph 124 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
 - Paragraph 127 states that planning decisions should ensure that development 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. Development should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment. In addition, development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.
 - Paragraph 130 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 8.3 Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside UDP state proposals should respect the nature of surrounding fabric and relationship between buildings, and that housing developments should be of high quality, complementing and enhancing the character and appearance of the surrounding area. RED1 of the Tameside Residential Design SPD goes on to state that extensions to dwellings should acknowledge existing character.

- 8.4 With regard to side extensions, RED5 of the SPD states that as a minimum side extensions should be setback by 1m at upper floors or 0.5m over both ground and upper floors. This will help to reduce a terracing effect and ensure existing scale and mass is retained; in some cases a greater setback may be required to maintain an acceptable mass. RED5 goes on to state that extensions should be setback 1m from the side boundary to help prevent a terracing effect and ensure front to rear access is retained, and that extensions must align with their surroundings in terms of mass and scale.
- 8.5 The extension will project 4.5m from the north west side of the host dwelling along its full depth and will be single storey with a mono-pitched roof sloping away from the gable. The eaves will be up to 2.5m and the maximum roof height will be 3.6m. To the rear of the house is an existing conservatory and a detached garage adjacent to the common boundary with 14 Delamere Road.
- 8.6 This extension would be very wide and deep and its shallow pitched roof would not respond well to the traditional hipped roof of the host dwelling. The overall scale and proportions of the extension would not reflect the architectural style and proportions of the host dwelling. The extension therefore conflicts with RED1 and RED5 of the SPD. Furthermore, the extension would disrupt the well-established and clearly defined building line of the nearby dwellings of Delamere Road immediately to the east and west, contrary to RED5 of the SPD. For these reasons, the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling and it would fail to respect the established pattern of development within the immediate locality. Though there is an existing timber panel fence to the boundary with Delamere Road, this would only offer some degree of screening of the extension; the visual harm would still be readily visible from Delamere Road and Epping Road.

Impact on residential amenity

- 8.7 The proposed extension is sited sufficient distance from neighbouring property and habitable room windows such that no undue harm to neighbour amenity is anticipated having regard to RED2 and RED3 of the SPD.

Other matters

- 8.8 The applicant's agent has made reference to other extensions in the wider Dane Bank area. The Officer is not familiar with the precise planning circumstances behind these developments, though notes the majority have been granted prior to the adoption of current Policies and Guidance, and are not within the vicinity of the application site. In any event, each application is considered on its own merits and consequently these other extensions do not set a precedent that the Officer must follow.

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 RED5 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. By virtue of its substantial depth and width and shallow roof pitch, the extension would be an unsympathetic and incongruent addition that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling. In addition, the extension would disrupt the well-established and clearly defined building line of the nearby dwellings of Delamere Road immediately to the east and west being harmful to the character and appearance of the

streetscene as a result. The proposed extension therefore fails to comply with policies RED1 and RED5 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document and would be contrary to policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.