

Application Number:	22/01165/HOUS
Location:	258 Oldham Road Middleton M24 2DP
Proposal:	Front dormer extension and alteration to existing rear dormer - Retrospective
Applicant:	Mr Bradley Marshall
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
Recommendation:	Refuse

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 refers to no.258 Oldham Road, a two storey mid-terraced dwelling located on a row of architecturally similar dwellings in North Middleton. The dwelling faces north-west on to the highway, positioned opposite the junction between Temple Street and Oldham Road. The property is adjoining to no.260 to the north-east and adjacent to no.256 to the south-west. The applicant dwelling benefits from a single storey rear extension and a sufficiently sized rear yard.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for a front dormer extension and alterations to the existing rear dormer which was granted a certificate of lawfulness under application ref: 21/00324/CPL. The proposed front dormer extension would have a length of 4.4m, height of 1.79m, depth of 3.39m and an overall volume of approx. 13.35m³. The dimensions of the existing rear dormer have been changed, so that the dormer has a length of 4.97m, height of 2.03m, depth of 3.48m and an overall volume of approx. 17.56m³. Therefore, the dormers would result in an additional 30,91m³ of cubic content. The rear dormer would feature a Juliet balcony to a bedroom and the front dormer would feature windows to a shower room and bedroom.

Relevant History

<u>77/D05648</u>	Residential Development of 2 ND Phase Oldham Road Decision: Withdrawn
<u>19/00404/CPL</u>	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a rear dormer including velux rooflights to front elevation Decision: Grant
<u>21/00324/CPL</u>	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a rear dormer Decision: Grant

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The proposed dormers have little impact on the surrounding highway network.

We do not envisage any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of development.

The servicing and parking arrangements would not be affected by the development.

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the neighbouring properties, no representations were received relating to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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

Amendments

None applicable.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires *“development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.”* Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all new development must *“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.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway. Therefore it is important that 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 of the SPD offers the following principles that should apply in the determination of applications that include dormer extensions:
 - (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*
- ❑ Criterion (vii) of Paragraph 5.17 states that *“the materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof.”* The dormers are finished using grey slate. The colour and materiality is well

related to the colour and materiality of the existing roof slate. This limits the visual impact of the dormers and would be considered acceptable.

- ❑ The front and rear dormer extensions would be set back from the eaves line and set in from the side walls of the existing dwelling. However, the dormer extensions would incorporate flat roofs which would correspond poorly with the gable roof of the original build and extend up to the height of the existing ridgeline, with the rear dormer incorporating a rooflight which would protrude slightly above the existing ridgeline.
- ❑ In respect of the front dormer, the SPD makes it clear that such extensions would not normally be supported and in the case of this site the immediate street scene setting is generally devoid of dormer extensions. The provision of a dormer to the front of this property would significantly detract from the existing appearance of the property and be in stark contrast to the character and appearance of the neighbouring properties, resulting in undue harm to the street scene. In addition to this, the dormer as proposed would be poorly designed with its excessive height and flat roof structure. The dormer would also be constructed off centre and include fenestration that would not match or align with that beneath. The front dormer would therefore be an unacceptable addition to the property and be contrary to policy P1, P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the SPD.
- ❑ I regards the rear dormer, it is recognised that dormers to the rear can be more acceptable than those positioned to the front. However, in the case of this application, the property is immediately bordered by Highfield Street to the rear. Given this relationship with the highway, despite the buffer of a garden, the roofscape is highly visible from the highway and any addition could therefore have an impact on the visual amenity of the wider street scene. It is recognised that a similar rear dormer extension was approved under certificate of lawful development 21/00324/CPL. However, this application applies for something different to that previous accepted as lawful and it does not comply with legislation set out in the General Permitted Development Order, e.g. it exceeds the height of the ridge line.
- ❑ Looking at the details of the rear dormer, the design includes a flat roof that would extend up to the existing ridge line with a roof light extending slightly above. The dormer would also cover most of the width of the property and include a Juliet balcony. This would poorly correlate with the design language of the host dwelling by adding an incongruous contemporary feature and detract from the existing roof scape and appearance of the property.
- ❑ Further to the above, Oldham Road and the immediate adjacent street settings are mostly comprised of rows of terraced properties with similarities in scale, massing and materiality. It is considered that the provision of front and rear dormers would detract from this existing character and result in harmful additions that would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance and character of the host property and the surrounding area. The design is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact and Privacy

- ❑ DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not “adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.” Paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the SPD states that “dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in section 4.”
- ❑ Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires “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 curtilage.” The plans confirm that the proposed front dormer extension would measure approx. 16m to the front elevation of no.1 Temple Street and 17m to the front elevation of no.289 Oldham Road. Whilst these distances fall short of the 21m limit set out in the SPD, it is considered that the application property directly faces the junction between Temple Street and Oldham Road. Therefore, views shared between the application property and the aforementioned properties would be at oblique angles. The rear dormer would measure approximately 18m to the opposing boundary of curtilage and would comply with the 10.5m SPD requirement. It is therefore considered that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring amenity through an unacceptable loss of privacy or increased overlooking.

Occupier Amenity

- ❑ The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

Summary

- ❑ In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ The proposed development would not impact the current provision of parking available at the property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

1. By virtue of their design, scale and siting the proposed front and rear dormer extensions would have an incongruous design which would harmfully impact the character and uniformity of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable developments. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	06/12/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	08/12/2022	Signed: RC

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Location Map. Drg no. OR-R00-PREX-101
- Site Plan. Drg no. OR-R00-PR-101
- Site Plan. Drg no. OR-R00-EX-101
- Proposed As Built Elevations. Drg no. OR-R00-EX-103
- Proposed As-Built Roof Plan / Sections. Drg no. OR-R00-EX-104
- Proposed As-Built Floor Plans. Drg no. OR-R00-EX-102
- Pre-Existing Floor Plans. Drg no. OR-R00-PREX-102
- Pre-Existing Elevations. Drg no. OR-R00-PREX-103

Report Author Bob Melling