

**Application Number** 19/00715/FUL

**Proposal** Proposed first floor extension to front of property with extension/alteration to roof above

**Site** 3 Linksfield, Denton, Tameside, M34 3TE

**Applicant** Mr Alistair Rutherford

**Recommendation** Refuse planning permission

**Reason for report** A Speakers Panel decision is required because, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Allison Gwynne has called in the application.

## **1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a first floor front extension to be erected above an existing front extension and outrigger. The extension will project approx. 4.9m beyond the first floor front elevation of the existing house and will have a gabled frontage. A high level obscure glazed window will be inserted into the north gable.

## **2.0 SITE & SURROUNDINGS**

2.1 3 Linksfield is a two storey detached dwelling set within an established residential area of Denton. The property has an existing single storey outrigger to the front projecting approx. 4.9m beyond the front elevation which has been extended so that it now encompasses the full width of the front of the original house (application 15/00820/FUL refers). The houses along Linksfield are all similarly proportioned detached properties with pitched roofs that pitch towards the street; single storey front outriggers are an original and integral feature of both Linksfield and the wider estate.

## **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 15/00820/FUL - Erection of single storey extension to replace the existing together with the addition of a pitched roof over the extension and garage. Approved 02/11/2015.

## **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

### **4.1 Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Allocation**

Unallocated, within the Denton North East 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 (SPD)

#### 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.

### 5.0 **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.

### 6.0 **RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

6.1 Not applicable.

### 7.0 **SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES RECEIVED**

7.1 No third party representations have been received.

### 8.0 **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

#### 8.2 **Impact on character and appearance of surrounding area**

Policies C1 and H10 of the 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 SPD goes on to state that extensions to existing dwellings should acknowledge existing character.

- 8.4 With regard to front extensions, the SPD acknowledges that extensions to the front of a house can fundamentally alter its appearance, detract from surrounding character and create an unwanted precedent. RED9 of the SPD states front extensions will rarely be considered acceptable but that certain exceptions may be considered. These exceptions include: a porch that is modest in scale and reflects the style and materials of the existing house; or an extension that does not disrupt the building line, aligns with the architectural style of the host dwelling and is appropriately proportioned, does not detract from the existing streetscene and character, does not impact neighbour's light or outlook and does not affect existing disabled access.
- 8.5 The extension would be built of matching brick with a upvc panel feature to the front right hand side and would not extend further than the existing ground floor extension and outrigger. However, the extension would result in a two storey projecting gable that would dominate the host dwelling adding considerable bulk and massing to the front of the dwelling. Though the building line along this section of Linksfield is staggered, there is uniformity in the roof design and proportions of individual properties which make an important contribution to the street scene. By contrast, the extension would alter significantly the scale and mass of the existing dwelling, would fail to respect the existing roof style and would result in the loss of the original frontage and outrigger which are characteristic of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the UDP and RED1 and RED9 of the SPD.
- 8.6 **Impact on residential amenity**
- 8.7 The extension will project approx. 4.9m beyond the front of the existing first floor adding considerable bulk at first floor level. The existing dwelling runs adjacent to the common boundary with No. 4 Linksfield that sits to the north of the application site. Once extended the resulting dwelling would have a two storey gable wall approx. 12.8m in length that would extend for two thirds the length of the rear garden at No. 4 Linksfield.
- 8.8 Policy H10 of the UDP seeks to ensure that development safeguards appropriate levels of residential amenity. RED9 of the SPD states front extensions should not, amongst other things, impact neighbours' light or outlook. RED3 of the SPD relates to the size of rear extensions to avoid loss of privacy or outlook for neighbours. Whilst RED3 of the SPD applies to rear extensions, the Officer finds it relevant to the proposed scheme in this instance due to the impact on neighbours' outlook.
- 8.9 Given its very close proximity to the boundary shared with the rear garden of No. 4, the resulting dwelling would appear unduly overbearing and oppressive when viewed from the rooms at the back of No. 4 and also from its rear garden. By virtue of its orientation to the south of No. 4 and by virtue of being two storeys in height, the extension would result in undue overshadowing and a loss of light to the rear of No. 4 contrary to RED3 and RED9 of the SPD. The proposal therefore conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy H10 of the UDP which seek to ensure that development safeguards appropriate levels of residential amenity.
- 8.10 The proposed first floor side window to the north elevation will be high level and obscure glazed so is not anticipated to result in any undue overlooking of neighbouring property.
- 8.11 The applicant highlights that no objections were received from any of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, the NPPF is clear in applying judgement to both present and future users of land and buildings, and the lack of objection is a neutral matter rather than carrying weight in favour of the application.

## 8.12 Other matters

- 8.13 The applicant's agent has made reference to extensions on other properties elsewhere on the estate at 10 Thornside, 21 and 25 Lower Bank and 62, 65 and 66 Broadhurst. Whilst the Officer acknowledges there are existing extensions elsewhere on the estate, the examples provided are historic extensions that have not been assessed against the same current adopted policies and guidance as the current proposal. In addition, the current proposal is for a much larger front extension than has been viewed elsewhere on the estate so these examples are not comparable. In any case, this application has been assessed on its own merits and the specifics of this case, the presence of historic extensions elsewhere in the estate does not set a precedent which has to be followed.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 To conclude, it is considered the proposal would conflict with Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside UDP, and RED1 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design SPD. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## 10. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):

1. By virtue of its proximity to the common boundary with the rear of No. 4 Linksfield and the excessive two storey gable that would be approx. 12.8m in length along this boundary, the resulting dwelling would appear unduly overbearing and oppressive when viewed from the rooms at the back of No. 4 and also from its rear garden. In addition, by virtue of its orientation to the south of No. 4 Linksfield the extension would result in undue overshadowing and a loss of light to the rear of this property. The proposal would therefore result in undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupants and conflicts with the NPPF, Policy H10 of the Unitary Development Plan and RED3 and RED9 of the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document which seek to ensure that development safeguards appropriate levels of residential amenity.
2. The extension would result in a two storey projecting gable that fails to respect the roof style and proportions of the host dwelling and which would dominate the host dwelling, adding considerable bulk and massing to the front of the dwelling. The extension would therefore appear as an uncharacteristic and incongruent feature that would be overly prominent within the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with the NPPF, Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan and RED1 and RED9 of the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document which seek to ensure development complements or enhances the appearance of the surrounding area.