

Application Number:	22/01442/HOUS
Location:	22 Milbury Drive Littleborough Rochdale OL15 0BZ
Proposal:	Single storey front extension, two storey rear extension including side dormers, alterations to fenestration (re-submission of 22/01054/HOUS)
Applicant:	MR STEVE DAVIES
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. 22 Milbury Drive, a detached bungalow with dormer windows located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 20 Milbury Drive to the north-east, adjacent to no. 24 Milbury Drive to the south-west, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear of the curtilage borders the side and rear curtilage of no. 6 Woodheys Road to the north-west.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey front extension which projects approx. 1.2m from the front elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjacent no. 24 and approx. 1.7m from the front elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjacent no. 20. It comprises of a surround of a contemporary design constructed in white render and a front elevation wall constructed in vertical timber cladding.

The existing side dormers are proposed to project close to the front and rear elevation of the host dwelling, whilst the width of the dormers would remain unchanged.

A part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension is also proposed, projecting approx. 4.5m on the ground floor from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjacent no. 24 and approx. 2.4m on the first floor from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundaries of adjacent no. 20 and 24. It is characterised by a pitched roof with a matching roof pitch. It has a ridge height of approx. 4m and an eaves height of approx. 2.86m.

The application also proposes the alteration of fenestration on all elevations of the host dwelling, most notably, a set of contemporary gable windows on the front elevation of the first floor, a set of bi-folding doors on the rear elevation of the ground floor, and the addition of dormer windows to accommodate the change in internal layouts. The proposed side elevation windows would be obscurely glazed.

The walls and roofs of the proposed rear extension and dormers, and proposed fenestration would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

02/D40869 – Alteration and extension to side dormer – Grant subject to conditions

22/00454/HOUS – Front extension including balcony, single-storey rear extension, side dormers, including alterations to fenestration – Refuse

Reason for Refusal:

- By virtue of its design, form and massing the proposed extension would be an unsympathetic and non-subservient addition to the host dwelling, and it would significantly erode the character and uniformity of the wider streetscene. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

22/01054/HOUS - Front extension with Juliet balcony, single-storey rear extension, side dormers, including alterations to fenestration - Resubmission of 22/00454/HOUS – Refuse

Reason for Refusal:

- By virtue of its excessive scale, massing and box form, the proposed dormer extensions would be an unsympathetic and wholly dominant addition to the host dwelling, which appear incongruous and would cause significant visual harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene. This harm would be compounded by a number of poorly thought through features including the French doors and Juliet balconies which would intersect the bargeboards, and the use of materials which fail to match the roof slope, increasing the prominence of the proposals. Taken as a whole the

development proposals would represent a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design and therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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)

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

- Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 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.”*
- Paragraph 134 seeks to encourage *“innovative designs which... help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”*
- 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.”*
- As noted in previous officers’ reports, bungalows along the building line of the host dwelling maintains uniformity and cohesiveness in its building form and style. This is characterised by single-storey bungalows featuring pitched roofs, with gables fronting the highway and in the case of numerous dwellings, flat-roofed side dormers set back from the eaves.
- 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 design and sited”*. 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.”*
- Though the application proposes an extension of the existing dormers towards the front and rear elevation of the host dwelling, the width and ridge height of the dormers would remain unchanged. As such, the overall form of the proposal would not be significantly enlarged when viewed from the

highway. It is also noted flat-roofed dormers are already featured on the host dwelling and on numerous neighbouring bungalows. For these reasons, on balance, it is considered there would not be undue harm to the character of the street scene arising from the proposed development.

- ☐ The proposed ground floor front and rear extension is of a single storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a pitched roof form on the single-storey rear extension would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had in respect of the alterations to the front elevation at ground floor level, where they are appropriately designed for this context.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ Suitable materials can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore 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.”*
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ Given the approx. 23.71m separation and approx. 11.16m to the rear facing boundary of the curtilage in addition to the oblique angle which ensures that the windows are not directly facing, the impact on the occupiers of adjoining no. 4 Woodheys Road is considered to be acceptable.
- ☐ Furthermore, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ☐ *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposal projects 4.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjacent no. 24, which would ordinarily exceed the

maximum standard for detached properties. However, it is noted the siting of the adjacent no. 24 is significantly set back from the application dwelling, therefore it is considered the rear extension would not be overbearing or result in undue loss of light or privacy for adjacent no. 24.

- ☐ The proposal also projects approx. 2.4m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjacent no. 20. The rear elevation of no. 20 is also set back from the host dwelling, therefore there are no concerns regarding overbearing and loss of light or privacy on the adjacent dwelling.
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey extensions to detached dwellings projecting *“beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ☐ The proposed two storey rear extension projects approx. 2.4m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. Given the rear elevations of adjacent no. 20 and no. 24 are both set back, it is considered the two storey extension would not result in unacceptable harm for neighbouring dwellings.
- ☐ The plans confirm 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 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 retain its current three bedrooms and would retain two off-street parking spaces, as required by Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy. 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 - 21.2782.3A
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans - 22.2782.1
- ☐ Existing Elevations - 22.2782.2
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans - 22.2782.SC4.1
- ☐ Amended Proposed Elevations - 22.2782.SC4.2B

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. 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the windows installed at the first floor on the side elevations facing southwest and northeast shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy 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	04/01/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	04/01/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen