

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01198/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01198/HOUS
Location:	859 Rochdale Road Middleton Rochdale M24 2RA
Proposal:	Side dormer extension to facilitate loft conversion and the insertion of two velux windows to existing roof on the rear elevation
Applicant:	Gyorgy Muszikevics
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 859 Rochdale Road, a two-storey semi-detached property in Middleton. Rochdale Road (A664) is a main road linking Rochdale with Manchester, and the site is located on a rural stretch comprising a row of semi-detached houses surrounded by open fields. The property falls within designated green belt land as per UDP Policy G/D/2.

The applicant property faces east, overlooking the public highway and facing an allocated housing site. The property is adjoined by no. 861 to the north and flanked by no. 857 to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces west and borders open green belt land.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a side dormer extension, comprising a pitched roof, and an obscurely glazed side window. Proposed materials include grey slate tiles and grey UPVC cladding and fascia boards. The plans also include the installation of two velux windows to the rear roof plane.

The dormer would measure 3.96m (maximum width) X 3.65 (maximum projections) X 2.38m (maximum height).

Relevant History

24/00132/HOUS: Approved

Hip to gable roof extension, together with single-storey front porch.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 11/12/2024; 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
JP-G9	The Green Belt

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Green belt/ principle for development: JP-G9

The application site is allocated as Green Belt under policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024). Policy JP-G9 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in order to maintain the framework of open land separating and surrounding the urban areas of the borough.

Core Strategy policy G4 seeks to restrict development within the Green Belt to the limited types of development which are deemed appropriate by national planning policies unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

Paragraphs 152 and 153 of the NPPF state that, as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF indicates that "a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt", subject to the following exceptions:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

In respect of the above policy guidance, Section 5.20 of the of the Council's adopted '*Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development*' (2016) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that normally, in principle, extensions that result in up to a 35% increase in floorspace or volume over and above the original dwelling would normally be considered appropriate and not disproportionate (this calculation would include previous extensions to the original dwelling, which is defined as the dwelling as it was first built or as it stood on 1 July 1948).

The current volume of the house measures approx. 334m³, and the proposed volume measures approx. 20m³. This constitutes an increase of approx. 6% in volume, therefore complying with the SPD. The proposed roof extension would not therefore be considered disproportionate development and would be acceptable within the Green Belt.

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and 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. In addition, the SPD requires extensions to be subservient to the host dwelling so as not to appear domineering or undermine its predominant architectural features.

In view of the above, the SPD offers guidance for dormer extensions, recognising that if not designed to a high standard, dormers can be incongruous features which harm the appearance of a house. The proposed dormer complies with the SPD on the following principles:

- (i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the 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 ridges 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.

By virtue of its compliance with the above design principles, the proposed dormer considered acceptable, and would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. 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. 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.

Due to its siting and modest scale, the impact of the dormer on the amenity of neighbouring occupants would be negligible. The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties, through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy, 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 current 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 plans and elevations: ZT24-196-04
- Proposed site plan: ZT25-196-03
- Location plan: PP-13608419v1

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.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt, this permission relates to the proposed dormer extension only. The existing and proposed elevations indicate a raised platform and trellis, for which planning permission has not been located. The applicant is advised to submit a separate planning application, requesting retrospective permission for the raised platform and trellis to the rear, or risk being in breach of planning regulations.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	24/01/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	27/01/2025	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg