

APPLICATION NUMBER: 22/01263/HOUS

Application Number:	22/01263/HOUS
Location:	89 Seven Acres Lane Rochdale OL12 7RW
Proposal:	Dormer Loft Conversion
Applicant:	Mr. J Mitchel
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

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 89 Seven Acres Lane, a detached bungalow located in the Norden ward of Rochdale. The property hosts an attached garage to the rear and side elevations and benefits from a generous driveway to the front and side of the dwelling. The dwelling also benefits from a large rear yard to which it borders a small alleyway - Back Lane. The overall street scene features predominantly bungalows where dormers of a mixed design are collective among many of the dwellings. The host dwelling is situated next to No.87 Seven Acres Lane to the North and No. 85 Seven Acres Lane to the South and sits 5m West of designated Green Belt Land.

Description of Proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for a dormer loft conversion addition to the dwelling situated to the front part of the existing roof. The overall dormer projects a length of approx. 5.3m, a width of 4m and would be 1.7m in height. The roof of the dormer is proposed to sit 0.3m above the existing roof ridge line of the bungalow and features two side windows to the South elevation. The dormer would feature a virtually flat roof on either side.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

6 letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties. No letters of representation 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

- Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states all new developments must ensure they “are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”. Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires all new developments to adhere to high standards of design and follow design principles therefore new developments must “enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general”.
- The Rochdale Councils SPD Guidelines for a dormer extension outlines the possibility of a dormer being visually prominent, “particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited”. The SPD also states dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. The relevant design principles for dormer extensions are set out below;
 - (i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling
 - (ii) Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host dwelling and character

- (iii) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and
 - (iv) 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.
 - Space Standards set out in Section 4 highlights the impact of unacceptable harm as a result of development on neighbouring and existing dwellings. Space standards would require a 21m distance between directly facing principle windows of habitable rooms at an upper floor level.
- ☐ The material pallet of the proposed dormer would be constructed to match the anthracite grey cladding on the existing front elevation. The proposed roof of the dormer would match that of the existing dwelling.
- ☐ It is noted the adjoining property (87 Seven Acres Lane) also currently hosts a dormer extension which would partially align with the one proposed. It is also noted there would be two side windows to the South elevation and a blank elevation to the North. As proposed, the blank elevation would be directly adjacent to the dormer of No.87 and would constitute poor design given the North elevation can be seen from the public highway.
- ☐ Although the SPD states “dormers with flat roofs should be avoided”, it is noted a flat roof would better respect the character of the area given dormers with flat roofs are collective amongst the wider street scene.
- ☐ The plans indicate the proposed dormer to sit 0.3m above the ridge height of the existing roof line therefore constituting poor design and not acceptable by Council standards. It is important to note although the adjoining dormer hosted by No.87 sits above their ridge height, planning history would indicate permission for the dormer was granted in the late 1970’s therefore not a design which would be acceptable under today’s standards. Planning history for the wider street scene also indicates that permission for most of the dormers on Seven Acres Lane would pre-date the current SPD (2016).
- ☐ The proposed scale and height of the dormer would be disproportionate to the host dwelling and would not be subservient to it.

Summary

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the SPD states development proposals “are compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users;” and “do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.
- ☐ The proposed plans do not raise any immediate amenity concerns for surrounding dwellings given the North elevation is blank and the windows located on the South elevation of the dormer are not directly facing any windows from No.85 Seven Acres Lane.

Summary

In view of the above assessment, 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

- ☐ The proposed development would not impact the existing provision of off road parking available at the property given the property hosts a generous driveway and side garage. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale and design, and particularly its height above the ridge of the existing dwelling, the proposed dormer extension would be of poor design and as such, the development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to accord with the visual amenity aims of 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.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	04.01.23	Signed: CP
Authorisation	27.01.23	Signed: AT

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo