

Application Number:	22/01425/HOUS
Location:	4 Sydney Gardens Littleborough Rochdale OL15 9PZ
Proposal:	Rear dormer extension & insertion of rooflights to front elevation (Resubmission of application 22/01021/HOUS)
Applicant:	RITA PENNINGTON
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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. 4 Sydney Gardens, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 2 Sydney Gardens to the east, adjacent to no. 6 Sydney Gardens to the south-west and faces the highway to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto Howard Way and is adjacent to Stansfield Estate Play Area to the south.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a dormer extension to the rear elevation roof of the host dwelling to accommodate two additional bedrooms. The dormer has a width of approx. 5.09m and would be set against the ridge of the host dwelling.

The application also proposes three rooflights to be installed on the front elevation roof and one rooflight to be installed on the rear elevation roof.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The application is a resubmission of a previously refused application (ref: 22/01021/HOUS) with amendments made of the following:

- ❑ Proposed front dormers removed and replaced with rooflights;
- ❑ Reduction in the width and height of the proposed rear dormer, set in from the party wall and set back from the eaves line; and
- ❑ Alteration of the rear dormer from a flat roof to a pitched roof form.

Relevant History

83/D15137 - Improvement of dwellinghouses incorporating the replacement of existing concrete panel external walls with traditional brick (136 Dwellings) - Grant subject to conditions

96/D32982 - Single and two storey side extension to dwelling - Grant subject to conditions

22/01021/HOUS - Front and rear dormer extensions and insertion of rooflight to front roof elevation – Refuse

Reason:

- ❑ As a result of its siting, scale and design, the proposed flat-roofed dormer with would constitute an incongruous addition to the rear roof slope and the two pitched roof dormers to the front elevation would also be out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed dormers would therefore be visually harmful and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 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.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The Highways representatives raise no objection and request no specific planning conditions. The proposal has no impact on the highway network.

Representations

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

Policy

National

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

- ☐ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“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, 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 application proposes a single dormer to the rear roof slope of the host dwelling. 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 design and sited”*. 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 rear dormer would not exceed the ridge height of the host dwelling, would be set back from the eaves line, and would be set in from the party walls of the host dwelling; being approximate to half the width of the host dwelling. The use of a pitched roof would further mitigate the visual impact of this development.
 - ☐ It is considered the proposed windows and rooflights are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
 - ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
 - ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would be in accordance with all points of section 5.17 of the SPD.
 - ☐ Notwithstanding the visual prominence of the proposed rear dormer from Howard Way, Drake Road and Stansfield Estate Play Area, on balance, the proposed development represents a substantial reduction in size in relation to the original submission and would comprise a satisfactory standard of design.
 - ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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."*
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *"it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupants."*
- ☐ In particular, section 4.1 states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - ☐ *"21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage."*
- ☐ 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.”

- ☐ Given the approx. 22.64m minimum distance between the principal windows of the proposed rear dormer and the front elevation of no. 2 and 4 Howard Way, and the rear curtilage of the host dwelling not adjoining any neighbouring curtilage, it is considered the amenity impacts on no. 2 and 4 Howard Way through overbearing and overlooking would be acceptable.
- ☐ The plans demonstrate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout to the front curtilage would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure acceptable standards of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would be in accordance 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 result in the addition of bedrooms from four to six and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed development would retain two parking spaces to the rear curtilage of the host dwelling and would not impact on the provision of existing on-street parking spaces on Sydney Gardens.
- ☐ 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans - 22.2925.1A
- ☐ Existing Elevations - 22.2925.2A
- ☐ Existing Sections - 22.2925.3A
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan - 22.2925.4B
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans & Section Plan - 22.2925.SC3.1A
- ☐ Proposed Elevations - 22.2925.SC3.2B

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 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	22/12/2022	Signed: SY
Authorisation	23/12/2022	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen