

Officers Report

Case Reference: PL/2025/1190
Location: 11 Trent Avenue, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3EX
Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension including raised platform and glass balustrade to the rear, dormer to both sides, application of render and alteration to fenestration following demolition of existing dormer to side and detached garage
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Majid Mir

Location

The application relates to no. 11 Trent Avenue, a detached bungalow located in a residential suburb in Milnrow. No. 11 is located at the end, and by the turning circle, of the cul-de-sac. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 26 Trent Avenue to the west and no. 9 Trent Avenue to the east. No. 26 is located to the side, and like no. 11, it is located close to the shared boundary. No. 9 is located in advance of the front elevation of no. 11 and is set at a 90 degree angle to no. 11.

The rear curtilage boundary backs onto open land.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of two flat roof dormers to both sides of the roof slopes, following the removal of the existing flat roof facing east and towards the side boundary of no. 9. The dormers would be constructed in grey vertical cladding.

The application also proposes to construct a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed extension would wrap around the side and rear of the host property. The proposed extension will be rendered in a white colour. A balcony/raised platform identified as roof terrace is proposed directly on top of top of the proposed extension. Glass balustrade is proposed along the top of the proposed extension.

The application proposes to replace an existing window on the front elevation with a new front door. Render will be added to where the opening will be infilled.

The existing dormer to the side and the detached garage will be demolished.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection has been received. The objection is summarised below:

Loss of Privacy.

Overlooking.

Overbearing impact.

Loss of light and sunlight.

Loss of parking and access required for extremely vulnerable child.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P3 Improving Design of New Development

DM1 General Development Requirements

T2 Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

Amendments

N/A

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Design

Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The proposal seeks to replace the existing dormer with two dormers on either side of the roof slope. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes "dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof." Section 5.17 expands on this with a number of principles.

The proposed flat roof dormers would occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof slope and would be constructed in grey vertical cladding. The overall size and scale, and use of cladding will fail to adhere to the SPD and the proposed dormers would nevertheless be disproportionately large and comprise a dominant form of development in the context of the existing dwelling.

Regards have been given to the existing street scene, where substantial full-width flat roof dormers are prevalent additions to bungalows in the area. Whilst flat roof dormers have become ubiquitous in the immediate area, it appears many of these were consented prior to the adoption of the SPD, and any cases where two dormers are present on a single dwelling only serve to highlight the visual harm which would arise.

The application proposes to construct a flat roofed single storey extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the host property. The addition of the flat roof extension would appear at odds with the character of the host property and would not be in keeping. The use of render would only exacerbate the poor design of the extension and would make it more prominent.

The poor design further characterised by the eaves height of the proposed extension sitting above the eaves height of the host property, and the addition of the balcony that incorporates glass balustrades and wall screen. The wall screen will protrude above the eaves and the roof line. The overall design of the proposed extension sits at odds with the host property.

The addition of the door on the front elevation is considered to be acceptable.

Taken both individually and cumulatively, the overall design of the proposed development, would significantly undermine the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore is considered unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they “do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ which states that new developments ‘should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.’ Section 5.17 of the SPD states “dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD].

The proposed dormers would accommodate three bedrooms with two windows facing towards no. 9 and one facing towards no. 26. The windows would be sited approximately between 5m and 8.8m from the shared side boundary with no. 9. In regard to the windows facing no. 9, it is noted that there is already a dormer with two bedrooms facing towards no. 9. The proposed dormer would reduce the distance by approximately 1.6m. The proposed windows would not directly face any windows and would have an obscured views of the windows on dormer of no.9. Furthermore, the main garden area is located to the rear of no. 9 and the distance exceeds 10.5m. Considering the existing arrangement, it is considered the proposed extension would not substantially alter existing arrangement to warrant a refusal.

In regard to no. 26, the window would be sited approximately 1.6m to the shared boundary and would face towards the roof of no. 26. The dormer would fail to adhere to SPD space standards set out in paragraph 4.1. There are no windows in the roof plane of no. 26 and the windows on the ground floor are not principal windows. Although the proposal fails to meet the minimum standards set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD, it would not lead to overlooking of principle windows of habitable rooms. This arrangement would undoubtedly prejudice certain forms of development enjoyed under permitted development rights such as the insertion of roof lights.

The SPD states that 'balconies and elevated terraces can result in adverse overlooking of neighbouring private garden areas or habitable room windows if they are located in close proximity to the boundary of the curtilage. They should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.' The roof terrace would be located close to the shared boundary with no. 26 and would be approximately 1m tall. This would not provide sufficient screening and would lead to undue overlooking of the neighbouring properties private garden space and therefore unduly impact on the privacy of the occupiers of no. 26.

The rear element of the proposed single storey extension would project out by 4m when measured from the shared boundary from the rear elevation of no. 26. As such it would adhere to standards set out in paragraph 5.6 of the SPD.

Along with not unduly impacting on the amenity of neighbour properties, developments are required to provide a high standard of amenity for the occupiers of the application property. As noted above, the proposed dormer facing west towards no. 26 would be sited in close vicinity to no.26. The application proposes a bedroom window that would directly facing the roof of no. 26. Considering the distance between the properties, and a lack of any additional windows, the outlook from the window would be poor due to the proximity to no. 26.

The remaining habitable rooms would receive an adequate amount of light and outlook. Furthermore, a sufficient amount out of outdoor amenity space would be retained.

Taken as a whole, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 26 and the host property and would fail to accord with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to "provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location."

The proposal would see an increase in the number of bedrooms from three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy. The addition of the proposed single storey extension would see the existing drive to the side reduced. The proposed extension would see the length of the existing drive reduced to approximately 8.2m. The SPD

requires a minimum of 4.8m per parking space. It is however noted that there is sufficient space for additional parking to the front, if required.

It is noted that an objector stated that due to the loss of the parking space, this could lead to obstructions, inconvenience and safety concerns. The reduced parking may lead to blocking or restricting of neighbouring properties access and thereby prevent drivers or emergency services accessing properties. Consideration is given to the Equality Act. However, in this regard, it is noted that illegal parking would be dealt with through other legislation. The property will still retain one off-street parking space, with space available for additional off-street parking space if required.

On balance, the proposed parking arrangements are considered acceptable and accord with policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (3)

- 1 By virtue of its size, height, design and materials, the proposed dormer extensions and single storey front and side extension constitutes a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the host dwelling which would represent poor design and appears out of keeping to the appearance of the host dwelling. The proposed development represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and constitutes undue visual harm to the character and visual appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed raised platform would offer unrestricted views into the rear garden areas of adjacent number 26 Trent Avenue and would result in an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property through an unacceptable loss of privacy. Furthermore, by virtue of their proximity, the side facing bedroom windows within the proposed dormer would face towards no.26 at such proximity that their amenity would be unduly harmed, should they undertake works under extant permitted development rights. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 The proposed dormer facing west and towards number 26 Trent Avenue would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of outlook to the proposed upper floor bedroom through insufficient space between the bedroom window and number 26 Trent Avenue. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

1 The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

2 For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Planning: Proposed and existing plans. Drawing number: PL01 rev B
- Planning: Proposed and existing plans. Drawing number: PL02 rev B