

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00650/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00650/HOUS
Location:	6 Turf House Close, Littleborough, Rochdale OL15 9LR
Proposal:	Construction of a rear dormer extension. Extension of existing front dormer and alterations to fenestration on the rear ground floor and side elevations
Applicant:	Mr Aiden Stevenson
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 02.09.2024	EXT OF TIME 11.10.2024
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. 6 Turf House Close, a semi-detached dormer bungalow located within a small residential development in Shore. The property is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac and is adjoined by no. 8 Turf House Close to the north, adjacent to no. 4 Turf House Close to the south-west, and faces the highway to the west. The rear curtilage boundary borders the rear curtilage of no. 46 Tintern Avenue to the east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a rear flat roof dormer which measures 6.64m in length, 2.42m in height and 3.42m in depth. The proposal also seeks to extend the existing front flat roof dormer by 2.11m. The proposed dormers would be constructed from composite cladding.

The submitted plans also indicate alterations to the rear and side elevation fenestration which would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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)

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 enlarge the host dwelling through the extension of the front dormer and the construction of a rear flat roof dormer. 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 forms part of a cluster of bungalows on Turf House Close, where front flat roof dormers appears to be original features. Given this site context, the principle of the front dormer extension would be acceptable. The proposed front dormer extension continues the built form of the existing and would be adequately set away from the side wall.
- ☐ The proposed rear dormer comprises a flat roof form which is consistent with the existing roof forms and is not considered to occupy a disproportionate portion of the roof slope owing to its siting away from the ridge, party walls and eaves.
- ☐ The proposed dormers would be constructed in composite cladding which would be an appropriate material palette. The proposed windows would also appear smaller than the existing fenestration which would be acceptable.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed dormers would comply with all points of Section 5.17 and would constitute a satisfactory standard of design and appearance.
- ☐ 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 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 rear dormer would be sited, at its minimum, 6.24m from the directly facing curtilage boundary of no. 46 Tintern Avenue, which falls short of the space standards set out in Section 4.1 of the SPD. However, due to its enclosed position, no. 46 is subject to reduced separation distances from the surrounding properties, particularly from no. 10 Turf House and the host dwelling, which is sited on a higher position to no. 46. Given this spatial relationship, it is considered the additional overlooking impacts from the rear dormer would not amount to unacceptable harm and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The proposed front dormer extension does not project beyond the existing front elevations and thus no concerns are had relating to amenity impacts in this regard.
- ☐ 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 proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property. 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, Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 01 Rev. 01 received 09/07/2024

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	09/10/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	11/10/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen