

Application Number:	23/00410/HOUS
Location:	22 Higher Cleggswood Avenue Littleborough Rochdale OL15 0DJ
Proposal:	Addition of a dormer extension to front first floor elevation
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Genty
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	no
	Neighbour comments received?	No

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	No

Location

The application relates to 22 Higher Cleggswood Avenue, a single-storey, semi-detached property in Smithybridge. The street scene comprises similar semi-detached bungalows which contribute to a predominantly residential neighbourhood. Smithybridge is surrounded by open countryside and sits on the north-west shore of Hollingworth Lake.

The adjoining property to the east is 22 Higher Cleggswood Avenue, and the adjacent property to the south-west is 24 Higher Cleggswood Avenue. The rear north-facing boundary borders the curtilage of 31 Heald Close. The south-facing principle elevation overlooks the highway and 27 and 29 Cleggswood Avenue.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the addition of a flat-roofed dormer to the front first floor elevation, including the instillation of two windows. The width of the dormer measures 6.3m; the height to eaves is 1.8m; the maximum height measures 2.1m; and the depth measures 3.7m. The volume of the dormer is therefore 27.2m³. The dormer is set just below the ridge line, and is set back 1.8m from the eaves line of the host property.

Relevant History

23/00395/HH42 – prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension – refused.

Reason: The proposal does not constitute permitted development by virtue of non-compliance with the requirements of Criterion (g) and (k) of Class A, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) as the plans indicate that the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have a single storey and would exceed 4 metres in height. The plans also indicate alterations to a raised platform and to part of the roof of the dwelling.

23/00602/CPL – single storey rear extensions and alterations to existing decking – pending consideration.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties 05/06/2023.

Policy

National

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

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area
G/D/2 Green Belt

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

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Policies P1, P3 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and enhance the borough's identity and sense of place, 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. In addition, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
- ☐ Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that they are carefully designed and sited. Therefore, under section 5.16 and 5.17, the following principles will apply to dormer extensions:
- 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;
 - The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof;
 - dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof
 - dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted;
 - dormers should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;
- ☐ The proposal fails to comply with the above guidance relating to dormers on several fronts. Firstly, the proposed dormer would be situated to the front elevation, spanning the full front roof slope and would subsequently be highly visible from nearby public vantage points. The proposed dormer would also be contrary to SPD guidance as it includes a flat-roof and uses UPVC cladding which does not match the existing roof materials.
- ☐ Taken cumulatively, the proposals would constitute poor design due to its prominent location and excessive scale and massing, and would form an incongruous massing which is not typical of the immediate street scene. The proposed dormer would not constitute an acceptable standard of design and would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and its host dwelling.

- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord 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.
- ❑ No concerns are had in respect of privacy as the dormer would be front facing thus the separation guidance set out in section 4.1 of the SPD is not relevant as surrounding occupiers would ordinarily expect a reduced level of privacy between front facing neighbours. Notwithstanding, the windows within the dormer would have a similar separation distance to the existing front facing windows.
- ❑ In terms of overshadowing, the dormer would not project forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling and as such would not amount to an unacceptable impact.
- ❑ The proposal would therefore unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF .

Recommendation:

Refuse:

1. By reason of its scale, massing, low-quality materiality and highly prominent position, the proposed dormer would comprise an incongruous and visually harmful form of development which would fail to sit sympathetically with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. Overall, the development proposals are not well-designed and therefore fail to comply with the requirements of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

Notes for applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, this application relates to drawings:

Proposed floor plans and elevations: 22HIGHER-D02
Existing floor plans and elevations: 22HIGHER – D01
Existing site plan and location plan: 22HIGHER – DL01
Proposed site plan: 22HIGHER – DL02

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	26/06/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	28/06/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg