APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01258/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01258/HOUS
Location:	3 Greenbank Drive Littleborough OL15 0ER
Proposal:	Rear dormer extension and bifolding doors to rear elevation
Applicant:	Mrs Barbara Smyth
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
Recommendation:	**Grant subject to conditions**

DELEGATION	**Applicant a Council Member or officer?**	**Y**
	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 3 Greenbank Drive, a semi-detached bungalow located within a cul-de-sac in Rochdale. No. 3 faces south west on to Greenbank Drive. To the north, no. 3 is adjoined to no. 1 Greenbank Drive, and to the south, no. 3 shares a boundary with no. 5 Greenbank Drive. To the rear, no. 3 shares a boundary with no. 37 Bridge North Drive.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes the construction of a rear dormer with bifolding doors to the rear elevation of the host property.

Relevant History

Not applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring property and 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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- The SPD provides guidance for dormer extensions in paragraph 5.17. It requires that dormer extensions follow a number of principles. Those principles are as follows:

  (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.

- The proposed dormer would be constructed close to the shared boundary with the adjoining property of no.1 and be close to the side wall. It is noted that all the bungalow properties on Greenbank Drive all have dormers that are set close to the boundary and side wall. It is therefore considered that constructing the proposed dormer close to the boundary and side wall is, on balance, acceptable in this particular location.
- The proposed dormer will have a flat roof, however, no. 3 already has a front dormer extension which has a flat roof. Additionally, all the bungalow properties on Greenbank Drive have flat roof dormers to the front and rear. It is therefore considered that a flat roof dormer would be in keeping with the character of the area.
- The roof of the proposed dormer would be set at the same height on the roof plane as the dormer of the no. 1 and the existing front dormer of no.3. However, the dormer is set further forward than that of no. 1 and no. 5. Whereas, the dormer on no.1 is set approximately 1.7m from the eaves and the dormer on no. 5 is set approximately 1.2m from the eaves, the proposed dormer for no.3 would be set approximately 0.6m from the eaves. Additionally, it has been noted that the dormer on no. 7 is flush with the rear elevation of the host property. There is a level of uniformity in the size of the front dormers on Greenbank Drive, however, this is not the case for the rear dormers, as there is a variation in sizes. The proposed dormer would not be disproportionately larger in size than the dormers on the neighbouring properties to the extent that it would merit a refusal.
- The proposed dormer extension would be to the rear. The proposed dormer would be visible from the highway, however, it would only visible at the end of the cul-de-sac. Therefore the visual amenity impact on the street is considered to be minimal.
- The fenestration to the rear of the property is considered acceptable.
- On balance, 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 proposed dormer would be approximately 18.3m to shared boundary with no. 37 Bridge North Drive and would be approximately 29.8m from a principal windows of habitable room at no. 37. Additionally, no. 37 does not directly face towards no. 3. It is therefore considered that proposed dormer extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of no.37.
- It is considered that the proposed dormer extension and the bifolding doors would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the other neighbouring properties.
- All habitable rooms in the property will retain access to an appropriate levels of light and outlook.
- 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 will see the existing bedrooms increase in size and therefore no additional bedrooms will be added. Additionally, the proposal will see no

reduction in the supply off street parking and the property would retain sufficient space for at least two vehicles.

- 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
   Proposed site plan. Dated: October 2020
   Existing plans, existing elevations, proposed plans and proposed elevations. Plan 1 of 1. Dated: 17 September 2020.

   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 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	21/12/2020	Signed: MM
Authorisation	23/12/2020	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir