

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01108/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01108/HOUS
Location:	24 Egremont Road, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 4EP
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing extension. The addition of two front dormer extensions to facilitate loft conversion, alterations to fenestration and the application of render to all new and existing elevations
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs B Begiraj
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 03.01.2025	EXT OF TIME 17.01.2025
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. 24 Egremont Road, a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential area in Milnrow. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 22 Egremont Road to the north-east, adjacent to no. 26 Egremont Road to the south-west, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear curtilage boundary borders no. 7 Grange Avenue to the north-west. The surrounding context 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 number of extensions and alterations to the dwelling, including the following:

- ☐ A single-storey rear extension which projects 3.85m following the demolition of the existing rear projection. It is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form which joins the main roof to form a cross hipped roof. It has a ridge height of 5.02m and a height to eaves to match the host dwelling;
- ☐ 2no. gable-fronted dormers to the front roof slope. It measures 2.45m in length, 1.79m in height and 2.61m in depth and would be constructed in vertical hung tiles to match the existing roof;
- ☐ The raising of sill height of the front elevation window and the addition of 1no. window to the side elevation;
- ☐ The addition of two roof lights to the rear roof slope; and
- ☐ The application of cream render to all elevations.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objection to this application which is unlikely to have any noticed impact upon the highway.

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 Policies 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 proposed single-storey rear extension is set below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would appear subservient. The use of the gable-fronted roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ The application also proposes two dormers to the front roof slope of the 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. With this in mind, it is considered the proposed front dormer would not detract from this established context and would be acceptable in principle.
 - ☐ The proposed dormers would be set away from the ridge, eaves and party walls and would be constructed in tiles to match the existing roof. The proposed dormer windows are also modestly-sized and aligned with the ground floor fenestration. As a whole, the proposal would comply with all points of Section 5.17 and would be appropriately designed.
 - ☐ The full application of cream render would drastically alter the traditional brickwork appearance of the original dwelling, which also forms the prevailing materiality of the surrounding locality. It is noted however, a considerable number of dwellings in the estate have been subject to render application in recent years, albeit without planning consent. The effect of this, as well as the inconsistent use of materiality to dormer extensions has result in a discordant and cluttered streetscape. Taking into account of this site context, it is considered the use of cream render would not appear wholly out of keeping with the mixed appearance of the street scene and would not amount to undue levels of visual harm. In any event, a planning condition requiring the submission of material samples has been recommended to ensure a suitable colour palette is applied.
 - ☐ On balance, 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed single-storey rear extension does not project beyond the existing rear extension of adjoined no. 22 which raises no concern. The proposed front dormers are also set back in excess of 2m from the front wall of the dwelling and would not result in adverse overlooking impacts to front facing no. 25 Egremont Road.

- ☐ 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 – received 08/11/2024
- ☐ Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. SLWBB/01/PA received 08/11/2024
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. SLW/BB/02/PA received 11/01/2025

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. 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, 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	15/01/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	16/01/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen