

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00687/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00687/HOUS
Location:	5 Bridge Bank Road, Littleborough, OL15 8QU
Proposal:	Two storey side extension including front and rear dormers
Applicant:	Mr John Kearns
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 06.09.2024	EXT OF TIME 29.10.2024
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. 5 Bridge Bank Road, a two-storey semi-detached dormer bungalow located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 7 Bridge Bank Road to the north, adjacent to no. 3 Bridge Bank Road to the south and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear curtilage boundary backs into the side curtilage of no. 1 Lodge Bank Road to the north-west.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 2.59m from the side elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with matching ridge and eaves height. The enlargement also comprises the side extension of the existing front and rear dormers by 2.55m. The dormers would match the existing in its height and depth.

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

Relevant History

78/D07659 - Private Garage – Grant

77/D04943 - Extension Of Front Porch – Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed development retains one off-street parking space and as such Highways have no objections to these proposals.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received with the following representations:

- ☐ Concerns relating to potential use of the property for business purposes and its impacts on privacy, parking provisions and highway safety.
- ☐ The host dwelling cannot facilitate additional parking space.
- ☐ Concerns relating to potential use of access via neighbouring property.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ By submitting a householder application, the applicant hereby confirms the proposed development would be ancillary to the use of the host property as a dwellinghouse. Planning permission would be required in the event a change of use has taken place. Notwithstanding, concerns relating to privacy is addressed under the 'Amenity' section of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to parking provision and highway safety are addressed under the 'Highways and Parking' section of the report.
- ☐ Concerns over access to the neighbouring property relate to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

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

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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.
- ☐ The proposal seeks to construct a two-storey side extension comprising front and rear flat roof dormers. 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 host dwelling is a semi-detached dormer bungalow, an established house type design prevalent in the surrounding street scene and wider area. It comprises front and rear flat roof dormers which occupy the full width of the roof slope. The proposed front and rear dormer would match the existing in terms of their siting, scale and materiality. On this basis, the site context justifies a relaxation of the above guidelines and therefore no concerns are had in respect of the design of the dormers.
- ☐ Likewise, the use of a dual-pitched roof form would match the host dwelling and appear in keeping.
- ☐ Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed two-storey side extension would share the same ridge and eaves height of the host dwelling and thus not appear subservient, given the built forms of the dormer bungalow, it is considered the proposal would better respect the design and character of the street scene and would be acceptable in this regard.
- ☐ No concerns are had regarding any potential harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’, given the built form of the host dwelling and its siting on an elevated position from the pair of dwellings comprising nos. 1 and 3 Bridge Bank Road.
- ☐ 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 proposed extension would remove existing space for refuse bins to be stored away from public view. However, it is acknowledged the surrounding street scene comprises dwellings with refuse bins to the front of properties. Given this existing arrangement, it is considered a refusal on grounds of visual amenity could not be reasonably substantiated.

- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted 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.”*
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed front dormer does not project beyond the existing front elevation, as such no concerns are had with the amenity impacts to front-facing no. 50 Bridge Bank Road. Likewise, the proposed rear dormer does not project beyond the existing rear elevation and does not directly face any properties.
- ☐ 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 three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposed side extension would sever the existing driveway, resulting in one residual off-street parking space. Notwithstanding the presence of on-street parking, Bridge Bank Road is not a classified road and is low-trafficked. Therefore, it is considered the addition of one vehicle to the highway would not result in unacceptable levels of harm to highway safety. On this basis, it is considered a refusal on highway grounds could not be reasonably substantiated in this instance.
- ☐ 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. 11215724/05 received 15/07/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan and Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 11215724/01 received 15/07/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 11215724/02 received 15/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Cross Section Plan – Drawing No. 11215724/03 received 15/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 11215724/04 received 15/07/2024

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, 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.

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, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	22/10/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	28/10/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen

