

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00101/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00101/HOUS
Location:	8 Alexander Drive, Milnrow, OL16 3LY
Proposal:	Front and rear dormers, application of external render to all elevations, alterations to fenestration on front side and rear elevations including formation of new front entrance
Applicant:	Lee & Jackie Jackson
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 08.04.2024	EXT OF TIME
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. 8 Alexander Drive, a detached bungalow located in a residential neighbourhood in Milnrow. The street scene comprises a mix of bungalows of various built forms, materiality and design. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 7 Alexander Drive to the north-west, adjacent to no. 9 Alexander Drive to the south-east, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto Protected Open Space and the River Beal to the north east. The property benefits from a detached garage to the rear curtilage and associated hardstanding.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of alterations and reconfigurations to the dwelling, including:

- ☐ The addition of two gable-fronted dormers on the front roof slope which measures 1.46m in length, 1.63m in height, and 3.06m in depth.
- ☐ The addition of a flat roof dormer on the rear roof slope which measures 9.19m in length, 2.1m in height, and 3.81m in depth. All dormers would be constructed from dark grey composite cladding;
- ☐ The alteration of fenestration on all elevations, including the relocation of the front entrance door from the south-east side elevation to the front elevation; and
- ☐ The application of render to all elevations of the dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no comments regarding this application.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One supporting letter was received.

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:

Policy 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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ☐ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ☐ 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 proposal seeks to remodel the existing bungalow through alterations to the internal layouts and the construction of two gable-fronted dormers and a flat roof dormer on the front and rear roof slope respectively. 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.”*

- ☐ The proposed rear dormer is of a flat roof form and would occupy a large portion of the rear roof slope, which would be contrary to points (iii) and (iv) of Section 5.17. However, regards have been had to the existing enlargements of neighbouring bungalows, in particular nos. 6, 9, 11 and 12 Alexander Drive, which feature large flat roof rear dormers. Given this site context, and the siting of the proposed dormer to the rear, which would lessen its prominence when viewed from the highway, it is considered the rear dormer would not detract from the established appearance of the area and would justify a relaxation of the above principles.
- ☐ The proposed front-gable dormers are of a form and design consistent with the existing front dormers of nos. 1, 6, 11 and 12 Alexander Drive and thus, the principle of the front dormers in this context would be acceptable. The front dormers are modestly-sized and suitably sited on the roof slope to align with the proposed ground-floor front fenestration. The proposed use of dark grey composite cladding would also constitute appropriate materiality. The design of the front dormers would therefore have an acceptable impact on the street scene and would accord with all points of Section 5.17.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and position appropriately and, particularly with reference to the relocation of the entrance door to the front elevation, would result in a more legible and regular layout to the dwelling.
- ☐ The proposed full application of render to the dwelling would greatly differ from its existing brickwork appearance, but is not considered to significantly detract from the varied materiality evident in the adjacent dwellings, which is characterised by a mix of redbrick, render and stone cladding. Notwithstanding, suitable materials can be secured via condition as to not harm the character and appearance of the street scene.

- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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 alterations in fenestration would retain the existing separation distances between the host dwelling and adjacent properties. Moreover, the proposed dormers do not project beyond the existing front and rear elevation of the dwelling. On this basis, the proposal is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers which would be acceptable.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient 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.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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 increase the number of bedrooms from two to three and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the provision of which would be retained in the existing driveway.
- ☐ 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 – received 31/01/2024
- ☐ Site Plan – Drawing No. 22.2958.6 received 01/02/2024

- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Section Plan – Drawing No. 23.3273.1 received 31/01/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3273.2 received 31/01/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. 23.3273.SC1.1B received 31/01/2024

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. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 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	08/04/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	08/04/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen