

Application Number:	24/01105/HOUS
Location:	18 Sefton Road, Middleton, M24 4AB
Proposal:	First floor side extension, single storey front extension and rear dormer (part-retrospective).
Applicant:	Mr Antony Bamford
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 03.01.2025	EXT OF TIME 22.01.2025
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 18 Sefton Road, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which sits within a row of mid-20th century housing in a residential area of Middleton. The dwelling faces the highway to the south, is adjoined by no. 20 Sefton Road to the west and adjacent to no. 16 Sefton Road to the east. The application property is set back some 25m from the street and the rear boundary of the curtilage is shared by nos. 17 and 19 Sunny Brow Road. The application property is set forward of no. 16 Sefton Road by approximately 1m and benefits from an existing single-storey wraparound extension, a rear dormer and a hip-to-gable roof conversion.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor side extension, a single-storey front extension and a rear dormer (part retrospective). Although a Certificate of Lawfulness was granted for a rear dormer in 2021 (ref. 21/01102/CPL), the dormer has been rendered in a magnolia colour which is contrary to the approved plans and would not comply with the conditions of Class B of the GPDO. The existing dormer has not been in situ for more than 4 years has therefore been deemed unlawful. The current application proposes to extend the existing dormer and replace the render with

concrete hanging tiles in a colour to match the main roof tiles. Therefore, the proposals seek to regularise the current unlawful development.

The proposed first floor side extension would be set back 0.6m behind the main front wall with the ridgeline set down accordingly. This reduced ridge height would mean that the dormer extension would also step down in height. The proposed first floor and ground floor extensions would be finished in magnolia render.

Relevant History

21/01102/CPL	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a rear dormer extension – Grant (September 2021)
17/01489/CPL	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for the proposed enlargement of roof from hip to gable to accommodate loft conversion – Grant (January 2018)
17/01275/HOUS	Single storey side and rear extension and formation of pitched roof over existing first floor bay window on front elevation together with demolition of existing garage – Grant STC (January 2018)

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One letter of objection was received which raised concerns around a loss of privacy and the resultant impact on property value. Whilst the latter is not a material planning consideration, the impact on privacy will be assessed under the 'Amenity' section of the following report.

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

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

Amendments were sought to change the materials for the rear dormer.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ The NPPF establishes that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.
- ☐ Whilst the proposal would demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling, it is noted that it would not meet the requirements of the SPD relating to the 'terracing effect'. The proposed first floor side extension would be set back 0.6m from the existing principal elevation at first floor level, which would fall

short of the 2m set back required by the SPD to avoid neighbouring properties appearing as a terrace. Whilst not ideal, it is noted that the application property is set forward of no. 16 Sefton Road by approximately 1m and they have contrasting roof designs. Additionally, the properties are set well back from the street further reducing their visibility. Given the above, it is not considered that a visual terracing effect would result.

- ② Forward projections at ground floor level are common along the building line and the proposed front extension would therefore not appear unduly prominent in views along Sefton Road. Furthermore, the aforementioned set back from the street would reduce the impact of the proposed development.
- ② Although the use of render is not characteristic of the original building, it is noted that the existing brickwork would be retained. Furthermore, it is noted that the existing extensions to the host dwelling have been rendered. On balance, this aspect of the design is considered acceptable.
- ② 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 designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.”* 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.”*
- ② Although the proposed dormer would have a flat roof and occupy a large proportion of the rear roof slope, it is not considered to result in an unacceptable degree of visual harm given the scale and design of the existing rear dormer. Furthermore, an amendment has been sought to replace the existing render with hung tiles to match the existing roof tiles. This would soften the visual appearance of the dormer which would, on balance, have an acceptable design.
- ② Taken as a whole, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with CS Policies DM1 PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which 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.”
- ☐ The proposed dormer windows would measure 8.2m to the rear boundary and 19.9m to the true rear elevation of no. 19 Sunny Brow Road. Whilst this level of separation would fall short of the minimum space standards set out in Section 4.1 of the SPD, it is not considered that the local authority would be able to substantiate a reason for refusal on these grounds given the existing Certificate of Lawfulness (ref. 21/01102/CPL). Although the current proposals include a Juliet balcony, it should be noted that Juliet balconies can also fall within permitted development rights. Therefore, whilst the proposed rear dormer would not meet the separation distances outlined in the SPD for residential development, the local authority must be mindful of the existing Certificate of Lawfulness and the Government’s position on Juliet balconies.
- ☐ In light of the above, it is considered that a strong justification in the context of Paragraph 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 exists and provides clear justification for departing from the development plan in this case.
- ☐ For the avoidance of doubt, the submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

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 Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations. Dwg no. 3465-01. Submitted on 16/12/2024
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations. Dwg no. 3465-02. Submitted on 16/12/2024

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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 - this includes a requirement for hung tiles to match the main roof for the proposed rear dormer extension.

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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	10/01/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	17/01/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling