

Application Number:	23/00173/HOUS
Location:	17 Egremont Road Milnrow Rochdale OL16 4EP
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension, front and rear dormer extensions, alteration to fenestration on side elevation following demolition of existing rear conservatory
Applicant:	Jack Noon
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. 17 Egremont Road, a semi-detached bungalow located in Milnrow. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 19 Egremont Road to the south-west, adjacent to no. 15 Egremont Road to the north-east, adjacent to no. 16 Egremont Road to the north-west, and faces the highway to the north-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto an alleyway between Cartmel Avenue and Ashfield Lane, and faces the rear of no. 18 Ashfield Lane. The surrounding area comprises of semi-detached bungalows, many of which feature substantial front and/or rear dormer extensions.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey extension which projects approx. 3.15m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, following the demolition of the existing conservatory. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 3.15m.

The proposal also seeks to construct flat roof dormers to the front and rear roof slope. The proposed front dormer measures 6.55m in length, 2.31m in height and 3.37m in depth. The proposed rear dormer measures 6.6m in length, 2.78m in height and 4.27m and would be adjoined to the rear dormer of adjoined no. 19 and joined to the proposed single-storey rear extension.

In addition, the proposed plans indicate the ground-floor side elevation window to be removed and replaced with brickwork.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main highway issue regarding this application is parking provision.

For the size of the extended dwelling, Council standards require the provision of two off-street parking spaces which would be required as part of the development proposals. There should be no impact on highway capacity if the development was to be approved.

The application would have no impact on the existing servicing arrangements for the dwelling.

If the driveway issue could be resolved Highways would raise no objection to this application.

Representations

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

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

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 dormer to the front and 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 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 wider street scene comprises of dwellings with substantial front and rear dormer extensions. A number of the front dormers occupy the full width of the dwellings and are set above the ridge lines. On this basis, it is considered the principle of a front dormer would be acceptable in this particular context.
- ☐ The proposed dormers would not accord with points (ii), (iii) and (iv) by virtue of its scale, non-subservience, lack of set back from the eaves and party wall, and flat roof form. However, it is noted the proposed dormers would not appear proportionally larger than the existing dormers in the neighbouring dwellings, particularly with adjoined no. 19, which comprises a full-width flat roof rear dormer flush with the rear elevation wall. The flat roof form would also appear consistent with the roof forms of other dormer extensions and would not significantly detract from the appearance of the area. Taking into account of this local context, on balance, it is considered the proposed development would not result in adverse additional harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene and would be acceptable.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is of a single storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ☐ Given the built form and pitched roof of the bungalow and the modest size of the proposed rear extension, it is considered the use of a flat roof would not appear incongruous and would be acceptable.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is on balance 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 occupiers."*

- ❑ 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.”*
- ❑ Additionally, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ❑ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ❑ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ❑ The proposed rear extension does not project beyond the existing rear conservatory of the host dwelling and the rear elevation of adjacent no. 15. It also projects a marginal 0.15m along the common boundary from the rear conservatory of adjoining no. 19.
- ❑ Section 5.17 of the SPD also 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].”*
- ❑ The proposed front dormer does not directly face any habitable room windows and retains approx. 16.8m from the front curtilage boundary of no. 16 Egremont Road. The proposed rear dormer has a distance of approx. 36m from the rear habitable room windows of no. 18 Ashfield Lane and approx. 20m from its rear curtilage boundary.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ 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 proposals would result in the addition of bedrooms from one to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ❑ As it stands, the current parking arrangements comprise of a single off-street parking space to the front driveway which would be retained under the

proposed plans. Whilst the proposal is likely to add an additional on-street parking space to the highway, given the fact that similar parking arrangements are present in neighbouring properties, and the low-trafficked nature of Egremont Road, on balance, it is considered the addition of one vehicle to the highway would not result in undue harm to highway safety.

- ☐ 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 – Drawing No. (60)-003
☐ Site Plan – Drawing No. HC-22644-(60)-004
☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. HC-22644-(60)-005
☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. HC-22644-(60)-001
☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. HC-22644-(60)-002
Rev. A

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	20/04/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	21/04/2023	Signed: RG