

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00005/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00005/HOUS
Location:	85 Elm Park Way Rochdale OL12 7JQ
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension, part single storey front extension, front and rear dormers
Applicant:	S Nisar
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	n/a

Location

The application relates to no. 85 Elmpark Way; a two-storey dormer bungalow on a residential street in Rochdale. Elmpark Way forms part of a wider housing estate comprising detached houses and bungalows of a similar design and material palette. The area is typically suburban with medium density housing, quiet streets, and a semi-verdant character.

No.85 faces north-west, overlooking its front garden and the adopted highway. It is flanked by no. 87 to the south-west and no. 83 to the north-east. The rear boundary faces south-east, bordering the rear garden of no. 65 Elmpark Gate.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the following works:

- A flat roof single-storey rear extension with two roof lanterns, double doors and a window to the rear, and a side door and window. The rear extension would measure 3.5m (depth) X 8.4m (width) X 2.9m (height). Proposed materials include yellow brick, UPVC windows and doors, and EDPM roof finish.

- A flat roof rear dormer with three windows. The dormer would measure 2.5m (depth) X 8.4m (width) X 2.4m (height). Proposed materials include external cladding, UPVC windows, and EDPM roof finish.
- Two front dormers to replace the existing dormer, both comprising a sloped roof and double window. The dormers would measure 1.5m (depth) X 3.7m (width) X 2m (height). Proposed materials include external cladding, UPVC windows, and matching roof tiles.
- A single-storey front extension to infill the existing recess on the front elevation and create a porch, including a new front door and window. Proposed materials include yellow brick, UPVC windows and doors, and matching roof tiles

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 13/02/2025; no objections were raised.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

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

Front dormer and porch reduction.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Dormers:

Paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 establish principles for dormer extensions to ensure that they are well-designed.

In general planning, permission would not be granted for front dormer extensions. However, paragraph 5.18 states that there may be circumstances that justify the relaxation of the guidelines for dormer extensions, including an existing precedence. No. 21 Elmpark Vale and no. 78 Elmpark Grove are examples of recently-built double dormers within the vicinity, and therefore establish a precedent for the proposed front dormers. Furthermore, to reduce their visual impact, and ensure that they appear harmonious with the host dwelling, the proposed dormers have a sloped roof, use matching materials, vertically align with the ground floor windows, and are set in from the party walls and below the ridge height of the host dwelling.

In terms of the rear dormer, whilst this does not comply with all the design criteria set out under paragraph 5.17, measures have been taken to reduce its visual impact and ensure that it appears subservient to the host dwelling. It is set below the ridge line, in from the party walls, and uses matching materials to the host dwelling. Ultimately however, its design is considered acceptable due to its position at the rear where it has no impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Single-storey rear extension:

The proposed rear extension follows a modest and uniform design which appears integrated with and subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed materials and fenestration are acceptable.

Front extension:

The proposed front extension is a modest addition which corresponds with the profile materials and fenestration of the existing front elevation. It would not appear materially different from the existing building, and therefore its impact on the character and appearance of the street scene would be neutral. Following an amendment to reduce the scale of the porch, the front extension is considered acceptable.

Conclusion:

Overall, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Single-storey rear extension:

In view of the above, paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets a maximum standard of a 4m projection for single-storey rear extensions to detached houses, to be measured from the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling along the common boundary. The proposed rear extension projects 3.5m and therefore complies with paragraph 5.6. By virtue of its compliance, together with its subordinate roof form, the proposed rear extension would not unduly harm the amenity of neighbouring occupants through overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Separation distances:

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD establishes minimum separation distances between habitable room windows at an upper floor level, two-storey elevations, and shared boundaries. The additional windows serving the proposed dormers comply with the minimum distance of 21m between directly facing upper floor habitable room windows, and 10.5m between an upper floor habitable room window and a directly facing boundary. The proposed development therefore would not unduly reduce the privacy of neighbouring or future occupants.

Overall, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development would have no bearing on the existing parking arrangements, and is therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Proposed elevations: 2466-05
- Existing and proposed site plans: 2466-06
- Proposed plans: 2466-04
- Location plan: 2466-01

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	25/02/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	27/02/2025	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg

