

ITEM 2

Application Reference	DC/082006
Location:	20 Brook Road Heaton Chapel Stockport SK4 5BZ
PROPOSAL:	Erection of single storey rear extension and side dormer extension
Type Of Application:	Householder
Registration Date:	21.07.2021
Expiry Date:	
Case Officer:	Mark Shaw
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs C Rocks
Agent:	Mr Dan Newport, Re- form Architects

DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS

Heatons and Reddish Area Committee. The application has been referred to Committee as a result of the 5 neighbour objections that have been received.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

This planning application involves the refurbishment, alteration and extension of 20 Brook Road, comprising the erection of a single storey rear extension and a dormer roof extension.

The single storey extension would project 3.6m from the existing rear elevation with a width of 6.7m occupying the whole house width. This extension would incorporate a flat 'green' roof with a height of 3.25m.

The second proposed extension to the dwelling would be the addition of a dormer roof extension on the left hand side of the gable roof (when viewed from Brook Road). The proposed dormer has been reduced in size from 7.8m long to 5.5m and will now be tiled rather than clad in zinc.

Other works include the conversion of the detached garage located behind the house into a gym and formation of a morning terrace to the side, with double doors opening out onto this area. It is also proposed to erect an enclosed bin store positioned further towards the front elevation, but behind double gates.

Members should note that a pergola which was shown attached onto the rear extension has now been omitted from the scheme.

The proposed works can be seen in the plans attached to this report.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a 1930's style two storey detached house with a gable roof running front to rear and a double height bay on the front elevation. It is one of seven similarly designed houses on Brook Road, the other houses on the road are two and three storey semi-detached and terraced houses and appear Edwardian and Victorian in age.

To the left hand side of the house is a driveway leading to the detached garage. The side elevation of No. 22 sits on the shared boundary. The right hand side elevation of the application property forms the site boundary with No. 18, which also has a driveway down the side of the house.

Brook Road is a short road with bollards across physically separating either end, and the road is bounded at either end by Wellington Road North (A6) and Manchester Road (A6188).

POLICY BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("PCPA 2004") requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan includes-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted 31st May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; &
- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17th March 2011.

Saved policies of the SUDP Review

CDH 1.8: RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

SD-2: MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING DWELLINGS

H-1: DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

CS8: SAFEGUARDING AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT

SIE-1: Quality Places

SIE-3: Protecting, Safeguarding and enhancing the Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless, it does provide non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (adopted in February 2011) states that the issue of design is a highly important factor when the Council assessed proposals for extensions and alterations to a dwelling. The Council require all development to be designed to a high standard in order that it makes a positive contribution to the provision of an attractive built environment.

National Planning Policy Framework

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 20th July 2021 and replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & revised 2018 and 2019). The NPPF has not altered the fundamental legal requirement under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations (such as the NPPF) indicate otherwise.

The NPPF representing the governments' up-to-date planning policy which should be taken into account in dealing with applications. If decision takers choose not to follow the NPPF, then clear and convincing reasons for doing so are needed. In respect of decision-taking the revised NPPF constitutes a "material consideration".

Para.1 "The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied".

Para.2 "Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise".

Para.7 "The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development".

Para.11 "Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Para.47 "Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing".

Para.126 "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. 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. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process."

Para. 130 "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:
a) 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;
b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate

and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

Para.134 "Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes."

Planning Practice Guidance

The Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a web-based resource which brings together planning guidance on various topics into one place (launched in March 2014) and coincided with the cancelling of the majority of Government Circulars which had previously given guidance on many aspects of planning.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no planning history that is relevant to this case.

NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of 12 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the original application. Letters of objection were received to the application from 5 neighbouring properties. The grounds of objection are summarised below:

- The rooftop dormer extension is too large and unsightly. Whilst Brook Road is not in a conservation area it's important that any alterations carried out to properties suit the style of the houses. It is not in keeping with the style of the house or using materials the same as the roof. It will overlook my garden and will be an eyesore. I would not object to a smaller dormer with much more effort put into making it look existing/matching the style of the houses
- On Brook Road the character of the houses has been retained. The dormer extension, shape, materials and size will totally spoil that character There are no dormer extensions on the road and this kind of change setting a precedent and will be an eyesore. I am concerned a dormer window that runs across the whole of the roof which will not blend and will dramatically change the sky line. This is a very attractive and well maintained road. I respect the fact that no 20 is in need of repair and needs a total upgrade but I feel that this could be done without spoiling the road. We need to be caring for and looking after our historic buildings.

- We have some reservations/ questions. These relate to privacy (windows and opening capability) and aesthetics. Will the dormer have a line of vision into our front first floor windows that will affect our current level of privacy? In relation to the proposed material for the dormer i.e. zinc cladding. Given the proposed significant size - our reservation is about the potential effect on the overall look of Brook Road which currently retains a significant amount of original and unique charm which makes the road so attractive. With this in mind, it should also be noted that on entering our bedroom on the first floor of our property, the over-riding view for us will be the zinc cladding side of the dormer rather than trees, which is a view we value.
- My amenity appears to have been overlooked completely, evidenced by the fact that the drawings do not show my house sufficiently in context with No 20. Critically, I have both dining room and kitchen windows to the east side of my house. My kitchen window directly faces the extension. I currently enjoy the morning sunlight rising in the east and the daylight for the rest of the day. This proposal will have a massive detrimental impact on the light to my house. My house is less than 3m from the proposed extension. Currently the shared timber fence abuts the main wall of the house and then continues along the rest of the garden, which gives a unified appearance to my garden. The proposals seem to indicate removal of the shared fence and for the new wall to be built flush with the existing house. The expanse of such additional brickwork being so close, is very much 'in my face'. From my kitchen window at the moment, I see the wooden fence with the horizon above it. The outlook I will experience, will be a visual bulk of wall, within 2.69m from my kitchen window, so overbearing by comparison. No 20's wall is also my boundary. Additionally, it is noted on the drawings that the brickwork will be 'constructed overhand to avoid impinging upon neighbouring property'. The laying of bricks and pointing of overhand brickwork is likely to be unsightly. The proximity of the sedum/grass roof is of further concern as the vegetation could grow high and encroach onto my land, giving an unkempt appearance and further loss of light.
- I am very concerned about the height of the extension. The extension seems to project very high above the fence. Although single storey, the extension is still very high. The proposed roof is flat, but this gives a more dominant height along my boundary, and is just too overbearing.
- The east side of No 20 will be a 'morning terrace', but on that side their neighbour at 22 does not have an extension on the boundary. The east side of my own house however, as a result of the proposals, will be thrown into dark shadow and this will affect my enjoyment of my space and amenity detrimentally.
- The facing brickwork is said to be 'dark grey' in colour, also with a zinc clad external wall panel wrapped around the south corner. This will not harmonise at all with the existing 1920's red brickwork elsewhere, it will be bitty and unsightly, poor quality overhand work.
- I am concerned about the presence and shape of the dormer window that runs across most of the east side of the roof, the huge extent of its flat roof and the harsh metal covering, all of which will not blend in with the existing tiled rosemary roofs and roofline.

- While not in Heaton Moor Conservation area, we live very close to it and we take a pride in our street scene.
- The addition of this dormer window is such an alien feature and if permitted it may set a precedent for further incongruous forms in the future. The dormer will be very noticeable and made of metal, does not marry well with natural tiles and disrespects the local area character. Besides being an eyesore, such a dormer along two bedrooms and bathroom would create privacy issues.
- It would appear that in the new living kitchen there is a cooker abutting the wall that directly fronts my drive. I hope respect will be shown that there will be no impingement of space or cooker/other extract proposed in the future to this side, particularly as the drive is so narrow and any discharge of smells would be likely to linger and be unwelcome.
- The drawings of the west elevation seem to indicate the presence of a rainwater pipe from the main house roof. I would like to note that there is no drainage pipe here at present and that any required drainage, discharge or overhang would need to be wholly on the land of No 20 and not my own land.
- Whilst we have no objection to the single story extension, both in terms of the size or contemporary materials being proposed, we do however object to the very large rooftop dormer extension. All seven detached properties on the street retain the same character and rooftop elevation. Whilst other properties in the street have had attic conversions, these have been carried out sympathetically, with velux-style roof windows, so as not to alter the style of the property. We would therefore want the plans to be revised with no dormer extension.

3 letters of support have also been received. Comments made in support of the application are as follows:-

- I live a few doors away from the property. In the last decade it had fallen into a very poor state of repair, looking somewhat neglected amongst all the other houses on the road which are generally very well maintained. Several neighbours were therefore delighted to learn that a young family had chosen to invest in the house turning it into their forever home. It saddens that their application for improvements to the property have been objected to by a small number of neighbours on the road.
- I support the application as the new owners are prepared to invest £100,000+ into renovating the property which will really improve it from an aesthetic standpoint, and can only be positive for the road as a whole.
- The plans they do not appear outside the works that are generally allowed under the permitted development rules. The dormer is set back from the existing pitch line of the roof in order to minimise its impact and size falls within the 50 cubic metres allowed for detached houses. The ground floor rear extension is similar in size to two other extensions already in place on the same style of house on Brook Road. Indeed, the works being proposed appear to be no different at all to those that have been completed on a number of houses nearby. Several houses of this style have had side dormers and single storey rear extensions added so precedent for such works certainly exists within the locality.

- I cannot see that the works would interfere with the privacy of any adjoining houses. There will be no adverse impact on parking, traffic or highway safety. Nor will any noise nuisance result. The property is not a listed building and does not sit within a conservation area and the proposed new layout is not at odds with other such layouts on houses that have had similar works completed. Further, it does not appear that the proposed works at No.20 will interfere with the views already enjoyed by the houses surrounding it.
- I wholeheartedly support the application and the efforts of this young family to breathe new life and soul into the hitherto, rather neglected 20 Brook Road.
- The proposal will transform what had become a very run down looking house into a beautiful family home. This will serve to lift and enhance the Brook Road whilst at the same time making the layout of the house more family friendly. I live opposite No.20 and it will be great to see it being enjoyed again to its full potential as an attractive and inviting family home.
- There are a number of similar houses close by purchased by families and then been extended to accommodate the needs of a growing family. The build looks to comply with all the parameters set down and when the work is completed, will look fantastic. It will not result in any adverse impact on parking, traffic, noise or safety on the road and will not obstruct anyone's views or light.
- We are entirely in favour of the proposed changes, the dormer is directly opposite our house but we are confident that it will not present an eyesore and will be a good addition to the house, providing much needed space. The proposed extension appears to be completely standard and in line with ones one could find on any house in the UK.
- The house was previously a rental and quite scruffy, standing out among the well kept houses. The new residents have really improved the look of the house already. I would encourage the Council to agree to the proposal changes as they are developing the house into a sustainable home for a growing young family which can only benefit the road and area more generally providing a more mixed and dynamic community.

CONSULTEE RESPONSE

None in this case.

ANALYSIS

The proposal involves the renovation, refurbishment and extension of this detached two storey house involving an enlargement of the ground floor to the rear and the extension of the house into the roof space requiring the installation of a side dormer window. The application is one of seven similarly designed two storey detached houses on Brook Road, with front to rear gable roofs and double height rounded bay windows on the front elevation. On the rear elevation were single storey outriggers and some are still in place. Another feature of the houses is that the right hand side elevation, when viewed from Brook Road, sits on the site boundary. There has been considerable interest in the proposal, both for and against, and the two extensions will be discussed in turn followed by any other matters raised.

Dormer extension

The submitted application included a flat roof dormer measuring 7.8m wide and clad in zinc on the left hand side of the roof, with the existing roof itself measuring 9.7m wide. This is to facilitate the formation of two double bedrooms and a shower room within the roof space. However, due to concerns regarding its size and external finishes, amendments have been made to the application to reduce the width of the dormer extension to 5.5m and it now has a tiled rather than zinc external finish.

A number of residents have pointed out that there are no dormer windows on Brook Road, which is correct, with the exception of the two rear dormers on the rear of no 3 Brook Road. However, the application property is not listed, nor is it adjoining a listed building, is not within or adjoining a conservation area and enjoys full permitted development rights. It would be very difficult to defend a position of resisting any dormer extension, in principle, which leads to the question as to whether the details proposed are acceptable.

Given the reduction in size and appearance of the dormer extension, this element of the application is now considered to be acceptable. It is still quite a large dormer, but is now considered proportionate in size to the left hand roof slope and will not be an unsightly or unduly obtrusive feature within the street scene, where it will primarily be viewed side on.

With regards to privacy, the main dormer windows would be to serve en-suite shower and would be frosted. The two bedroom windows will each have a triangular shaped window at either end of the dormer. The rear bedroom window will have indirect views over the neighbouring property, but this applies to most residential properties where bedroom windows are on the rear elevation. This is not therefore considered to be a significant issue.

Rear extension

The proposed single storey rear replaces the existing single storey rear outrigger and occupies the full width of the house, measuring 6.7m wide with a 3.6m projection out from the main rear elevation. The extension will incorporate a flat 'green' roof and the elevations will be a combination of glass and zinc with a largely brick side elevation along the boundary with No. 18 Brook Road.

However, as mentioned above in relation to the dormer, the property has full permitted development rights and can extend out to the rear up to 4m, being detached, although the height limitation of 3m within 2m of any boundary is exceeded by 250mm and a further proviso requires that materials must be similar. In relation to materials, the agent has agreed not to use grey brick but a red brick to match the house given this side elevation will not be viewed by the applicant but by the neighbour at No 18. The agreement of facing materials will be dealt with as a condition of any approval.

There are similar sized rear extensions to that proposed at Nos. 24 and 30 Brook Road. The proposal accords with the rear extension guidelines which limits rear extensions to 3m projection where adjoining the rear habitable room window of an adjoining dwelling. The submitted plans show a distance of 2m plus to the respective side elevations of both Nos. 18 and 22 Brook Road, thus satisfying the requirements

of the rear extension guidelines. The issue in this instance is the side kitchen and dining room windows in the side elevation of No. 18 Brook Road. The windows on the side of No.18 may lose a limited amount of additional daylight/sunlight as a result of the proposed rear extension. However, given the sunlight/ daylight received is already restricted due to the close proximity of the two dwellings, the rear extension is considered to be acceptable in this case.

This takes into account the change in facing brick, the south east facing rear gardens, permitted development allowances which would allow for an extension of equal impact without planning permission, and also the design of the extension with a flat roof which is less imposing than a pitched roof. It is also noted that two other dwellings in this row of 7 already have similar extensions. The proportions of the rear extension are considered reasonable and similar examples can be found throughout the town and beyond

The rear extension will have a modern, attractive contemporary appearance and finish and will help bring the property up to current standards and requirements and is considered to be of good design quality. The green roof will reduce the carbon footprint of the extension.

Other works

The application also involves the conversion of the existing detached garage in the rear garden into a gym and utilisation of the area to the left hand side of the house as a morning terrace including double doors to replace the existing dining room window. These works are considered to be acceptable, are largely outside of planning control, and should not present any issues for the neighbouring property. The pergola shown on the original submitted plans has now been deleted from the application.

The application does not appear to involve any encroachment and the neighbour has made it clear that this will not be permitted in any event.

SUMMARY

The proposal would not unduly impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties or prejudice a similar development by a neighbour, in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

The general design of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its relationship to the existing dwelling, the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

Other material considerations such as the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the NPPF have also been considered and it is judged the proposal also complies with the content of these documents.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant with conditions