APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01385/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01385/HOUS
Location:	7 Alexander Drive Milnrow OL16 3LY
Proposal:	Front and rear dormer extension including increase of ridge height and alterations to roof pitch after removal of existing roof, balcony to the rear, single storey front extension, conversion of garage, removal of bay windows to the rear and render to sides and rear elevations
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Trevor Birtwistle
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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. 7 Alexander Drive, a detached bungalow towards the end of a cul-de-sac in Rochdale. No. 7 faces southwest towards the highway. No.7 does not directly facing any property to the front. To the northwest of no. 7 is no.6 Alexander Drive and to the southeast is no. 8 Alexander Drive. No. The attached garage of no. 7 projects beyond the front elevation of the host property. No. 6 and no. 8 sit level with attached garage of no. 7. To the rear of no.7 is open land identified as protected open land.

The properties on Alexander Drive are predominantly detached bungalows. However, the properties vary in height and design.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes the following:

- Removal of bay windows and construction of extension to the front of the host property. The extension to the front will also see a new porch constructed,
- Conversion of garage into a store room and utility room,

- Increase of ridge height and alliteration to pitch of roof after the removal of the existing roof,
- Erection of three gable dormer extensions to the front and two gable dormer extensions to the rear,
- Two roof windows to the rear roof and one roof window to front roof,
- Balcony to the rear,
- Render to the side and rear elevations, and
- Removal of bay windows to the rear.

Relevant History

Not applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of representation were sent out to neighbouring properties and a site notice was placed within the vicinity of the site. No representation has been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

The proposal has been amended to reduce the projection of the dormer to the front over the existing garage. Additionally, the proposed middle dormer has been placed more centrally between the two proposed front dormers on either side.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- It is noted that the properties along Alexander Drive differ in design, size and height. A number of properties have had the roof height increased and the pitch of the roof changed. There are also a number of properties with dormers to the front and rear. Furthermore, the design of the dormers also differ. There are a number of properties with gable dormers, similar to those that are proposed by the applicant. Additionally it is noted no. 6 Alexander Drive has had similar alterations made to the front as is proposed by no.7. However, the neighbouring property of no. 8 has had no alterations to the roof and does not have any front dormers. However, the ridge height of the roof on no.8 is slightly higher than that of no. 7. It is therefore considered that the principle of increasing the ridge height and altering the pitch of the roof is considered acceptable.
- In regards to the front dormers, the SPD states that dormers to the front will not normally be permitted. However, the neighbouring property of no. 6 and a number of other properties on Alexander Drive have had front dormer extensions. Furthermore, as noted above, the design and size of dormers differ, with the properties either having flat roof dormers or gable roof dormers. It is therefore considered that the principle of having front dormer extension in this location is acceptable.
- The application proposes three small gable dormers to the front and two to the rear. The dormers to the front will be placed at either end of the property and one centrally. The design of the proposed dormers would be similar to those of no.6. It is considered that the design and size of the gable dormers is appropriate.
- The existing front elevation of no.7 is brick facing. The applicant proposes to have a random stone facing with quoin corner design. Though these design features would considerably differ from the existing, and would differ from the majority of properties on Alexander Drive, it is however noted that four other properties on the street have stone front elevations with quoin corners, including the neighbouring property of no. 6. Furthermore, there are other properties with stone facing front elevations or render finished front elevations. Considering the variance in design and materials used for the front elevations along Alexander Drive, the use of random stone facing and quoins for the front elevation is considered acceptable.
- The application proposes to render the side elevations and rear elevation of the host property in a limestone white colour. Though the render to the side elevations would be visible from the street scene, due to the variation in design along Alexander Drive, it is considered acceptable. Furthermore, in regards to the render to the rear, it is noted that there are no properties to the rear. Therefore, the render to the rear will not be visible from the street scene.
- With the added 1.8m projection to the front of the host property, no. 7 would sit almost level with the neighbouring properties of no. 6 and no.8. Additionally, the proposed front extension would not project beyond the front elevation of the attached garage. The porch would be level with the garage.
- The fenestration would generally line up and is considered to 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 and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- There are no properties that directly face no.7. Furthermore, the proposed extension to the front would not project beyond the front elevation of the

attached garage and would not project beyond the front elevation of the neighbouring properties of no.6 and no.8. It is therefore considered the alterations to the front of no.7 would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the neighbouring properties.

- The SPD states that balconies should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties. The proposed balcony would be set closer towards the shared boundary with no. 8. It is noted that the boundary treatment along the shared boundary is a low level boundary treatment. The addition of the balcony would not lead to an unreasonable increase of overlooking of no.8. It is considered that the balcony is sufficiently set away from the shared boundary with no.6 to not cause an unreasonable increase in overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 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 proposal would not see any changes to the supply of off-street parking available at the property. The property would retain the two off-street parking spaces available at the property.
- The proposed parking arrangements are 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:

   - Location plan. Drawing no: 2237.02
   - Existing site plan. Drawing no: 2237.03
   - Proposed site plan. Drawing no: 2237.04 Rev A
   - Existing & proposed floor plans & elevations. Drawing no: 2237.01 Rev A

   and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 the details submitted with this application in colour, form, type, size and texture. For the avoidance of doubt, the render will limited to the side elevations and to the rear elevation as annotated in the existing & proposed floor plans & elevations drawing (Drawing no: 2237.01 Rev A) and painted in limestone white colour.

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 Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	11/01/21	Signed: MM
Authorisation	14/01/21	Signed: KN

Report Author Majid Mir