

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00985/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00985/HOUS
Location:	4 Severn Drive, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3ET
Proposal:	Erection of Two first floor side dormers following removal of existing dormer
Applicant:	Mr Robert Summerfield
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 30.12.2024	EXT OF TIME 07.02.2025
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

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. 4 Severn Drive, a detached bungalow located in a residential suburb in Milnrow. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 2 Severn Drive to the west, adjacent to no. 6 Severn Drive to the east, and faces the highway to the north. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the side curtilage boundary of no. 23 Newfield View to the south. The property forms part of a building line of five gable-fronted bungalows, most of which comprise flat roof dormers on either side of their roof slopes, including recent additions to nos. 2 and 6. The host dwelling comprises an existing west-facing flat roof dormer of white uPVC construction and benefits from a detached garage and front hardstanding.

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 west-facing flat roof dormer. The east-facing dormer measures 9.11m in length, 2.04m in height and

2.9m in depth whilst the west-facing dormer measures 8.77m in length, 2.04m in height and 2.9m in depth.

The dormers would be constructed in white uPVC cladding and black slate roof tiles. The side-facing dormer windows would be obscurely glazed.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objections to the proposal.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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:

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

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ 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 the following principles:
 - (i) *"They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
 - (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
 - (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
 - (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
 - (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
 - (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
 - (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*

- (viii) *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.*
- ☐ The proposed flat roof dormers would occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof slope and would be constructed in white uPVC cladding which is at odds with the roof of the host dwelling. By virtue of its excessive scale, flat roof form and materiality, the proposal would fail to comply with points (iii), (iv) and (vii) of Section 5.17.
 - ☐ However, regards have been given to the existing street scene, where substantial full-width flat roof dormers are prevalent additions to bungalows in the area. The effect of this is that, flat roof dormers have become established built forms in the area and as such the proposed dormers are not considered to detract from this existing character.
 - ☐ It is also noted that the surrounding dwellings comprise a mix of materiality, including the white uPVC cladding which is present in many of the existing dormer extensions. The inconsistency in materiality has resulted in a discordant character within the wider street scene. Whilst the use of a matching material of a better quality would be preferred, the use of white uPVC would not appear wholly out of keeping with the existing material palette. Given this specific site context, on balance, it is considered a relaxation of the above guidelines would be justified and the proposal would be acceptable.
 - ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ In particular, 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]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- ☐ The proposed dormers would accommodate three bedrooms with their principal windows directly facing the bedroom windows to the recently constructed dormers of nos. 2 and 6: Bedroom 3 directly facing nos. 2 and Bedroom 2 directly facing no. 6. It is noted the submitted plans have indicated the side-facing windows to be obscurely glazed. Notwithstanding, the dormers would nonetheless result in separation distances of circa 5.7m from the dormer windows of nos. 2 and 6, which falls short of the minimum space standards of 21m, as stated in Section 4.1 of the SPD. On this basis, the proposal would result in significant loss of light to the upper floor bedrooms.
- ☐ Moreover, the use of obscure glazing would effectively restrict the main source of outlook to the 0.43m by 0.5m windows to the north and south-facing elevation of the dormers and would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the host occupiers.

- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the host occupants and would fail to accord with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ 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 increase 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 provision of which would be retained in the front hardstanding.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposed dormers 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 bedrooms through the use of obscured glazing and the severely restricted size of unobscured openings. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	05/02/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	06/02/2025	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

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

- Location Plan – received 07/10/2024
- Existing Site Plan – Drawing no. Ex_004 received 04/11/2024
- Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. Prop_004 received 04/11/2024
- Existing Floor Plans – Drawing no. Ex_001 received 07/10/2024
- Existing Front and Side Elevation - Ex_002 received 07/10/2024
- Existing Rear and Side Elevation - Ex_003 received 07/10/2024
- Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing no. Prop_001 received 07/10/2024

- Proposed Front and Side Elevation – Drawing no. Prop_002 received 07/10/2024
- Proposed Rear and Side Elevation – Drawing no. Prop_003 received 07/10/2024

Report Author Sam Yuen