

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00077/HOUS**

|                                         |                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b>              | 24/00077/HOUS                                                                                 |
| <b>Location:</b>                        | 33 Alpine Drive, Wardle, Rochdale, OL12 9NY                                                   |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                        | First floor rear extension including the raising of existing eaves height and Juliet balcony. |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                       | Lisa Laws                                                                                     |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>                    | Sam Yuen                                                                                      |
| <b>DETERMINATION DATE</b><br>02.04.2024 | <b>EXT OF TIME</b><br><b>12.04.2024</b>                                                       |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                  | <b>Grant subject to conditions</b>                                                            |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>N</b> |

|                   |                                                                             |            |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>CONDITIONS</b> | <b>Pre-commencement conditions proposed?</b>                                | <b>N</b>   |
|                   | <b>Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?</b> | <b>N/A</b> |

**Location**

The application relates to no. 33 Alpine Drive, a semi-detached dormer bungalow located in a residential neighbourhood in Wardle. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 35 Alpine Drive to the north, adjacent to no. 31 Alpine Drive to the south, and faces the highway to the east. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto Knowl Syke Brook and a public right of way to the south-west which backs onto open Green Belt land. The property benefits from a detached garage to the rear curtilage space.

**Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for an extension to an existing dormer on the rear roof slope of the dwelling which measures 3.32m in length, a maximum 3.3m in height, and 3.49m in depth. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form which joins the ridge of the host dwelling. The proposal would be constructed from brickwork to match the existing rear dormer.

The submitted plans also indicate the addition of a Juliet balcony to the first-floor rear bedroom.

### **Relevant History**

23/01207/CPL - Certificate of lawfulness for a rear dormer – Refuse

#### **Officer's Comment:**

The proposal does not constitute permitted development by virtue of non-compliance with the requirements of Class B, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) as the plans indicate that materials used in the exterior of the proposed rear dormer would not be of a similar appearance to those used in the roof of the host dwelling.

23/01208/HOUS - First floor front dormer extension with pitched roof and alterations to fenestration on the first floor side elevation – To be determined at the time of writing

### **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 19<sup>th</sup> 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

- ☐ Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring they are “*sympathetic to local character.*”
- ☐ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ☐ 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 proposal seeks to enlarge an existing dormer on the rear 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.”*

- ② The surrounding street scene is characterised by semi-detached and detached dormer bungalows, many of which have been subject to substantial front and rear flat roof/lean-to dormer extensions. There is a distinct lack of uniformity and cohesiveness in the material palette across the properties, which feature a mix of brickwork, render, and stone cladding. Many of the later alterations to dormers, including of the host dwelling, comprises mismatched tiles, cladding and/or brickwork to the roof materiality. The original dormer window arrangements, and subsequent window additions, are also misaligned with the ground floor fenestration.
- ② The existing flat roof dormer is of brickwork construction and whilst it has no associated planning history, based on available evidence, this addition has existed in excess of 18 years and would constitute lawful development. The proposed dormer extension occupies much of the rear roof slope, is set against the eaves and comprises a lean-to roof which joins the ridge line. It comprises a Juliet balcony and a set of French doors which appears disproportionate in scale with the existing fenestration. It would also be constructed from brickwork matching the existing rear dormer and host dwelling, contrary to the dark grey roof tiles. For these reasons set out, the proposal would fail to comply with points (ii), (iii), (iv), (vi) and (vii) of Section 5.17. However, regards have been had to the surrounding site context, and despite lacking in architectural merits, the proposed extension would nonetheless be consistent with the built forms and design of the adjacent properties, in particular the rear brick-built flat roof dormer extensions of nos. 29 and 31. In addition, owing to its siting to the rear, the proposed dormer would not be readily visible from the highway. Taken as a whole, the proposal is not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and justifies a relaxation of the guidelines of Section 5.17.

- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD 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 4.4 of the SPD states balconies *“should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”*
- ☐ Notwithstanding the use of full height windows, the proposed Juliet balcony is level with the existing rear dormer elevation and marginally set back from the eaves line. As such, it is considered the additional outlook afforded by the balcony is limited and would not result in unreasonable overlooking into the rear amenity space of adjoined no. 35 and would be acceptable.
- ☐ The proposed dormer does not directly face any properties to the rear, thus no concerns are had with the 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 – received 25/01/2024

- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3224.22 received 25/01/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Section Plan – Drawing No. 23.3224.1B received 06/02/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3224.2A received 25/01/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 23.3224.20A received 06/02/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3224.21 received 26/01/2024

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 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.

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 12/04/2024  | Signed: SY     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 12/04/2024  | Signed: RK     |

Report Author Sam Yuen