

Application Number:	23/00912/HOUS
Location:	33 Crowshaw Drive, Rochdale, OL12 0SR
Proposal:	Alterations to roof including raising the ridge height together with rear dormer
Applicant:	David & Michelle Monks
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 33 Crowshaw Drive, a detached bungalow located in a residential estate in Healey which comprises a mix of two-storey detached dwellings and bungalows. The dwelling is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac and is adjacent to no. 35 Crowshaw Drive to the north, adjacent to no. 31 Crowshaw Drive to the south, and faces the highway to the east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 29 Crowshaw Drive.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of alterations to the roof of the dwelling, including the raising of the ridge by 1.48m and the construction of a flat roof rear dormer to accommodate two additional bedrooms and bathroom. The proposed dormer is constructed from hanging tiles and measures 12.27m in length, 2.6m in height, and 3.38m in depth.

The submitted plans also indicate the addition of four roof lights on the front roof slope.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extension would seem to have no impact on current parking provision and arrangements for this property, which are in line with Council parking standards.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed dormer extension.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

In conclusion, Highways would raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received with the following concerns:

- Loss of privacy on the adjacent property;
- Overshadowing impacts to the windows of the adjacent property;
- The proposed development is not in keeping with the properties, which comprises a mix of detached dwellings and bungalows.

Officer's Comments:

- Concerns regarding overlooking and overshadowing impacts of the proposal are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- Concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area are addressed under the 'Design' heading of the report.

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 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.”*
- Paragraph 134 states *“development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”*
- 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 host property is a detached bungalow sited in a late 20th century housing development of detached two-storey dwellings and bungalows which vary in

design, built forms, scale, massing and materiality. In particular, the host dwelling is one of three bungalows within the immediate vicinity (alongside nos. 29 and 31), though by virtue of its siting away from the adjacent dwellings, the host dwelling is more commonly read together with two-storey detached dwellings of nos. 35, 37 and 39 Crowshaw Drive.

- The proposed raising of the ridge height by 1.48m would markedly increase the scale of the host dwelling, particularly when compared with existing bungalows in the estate, which have not been subject to such alterations. However, in the context of adjacent nos. 35, 37 and 39, the enlarged dwelling would not appear dominant in the street scene and would retain the built form and pitched roof form of a bungalow. On this basis, the design of this element of the proposal in isolation would be acceptable on balance.
- The application also proposes the construction of a flat roof 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.”*

- The proposed dormer would fail to comply with point (i), (iii) and (iv) of Section 5.17 by virtue of its excessive scale and flat roof form. The dormer would occupy the full width of the dwelling and dominate the rear roof slope. Moreover, flat roof dormers are not characteristic of dwellings within the estate and as such, the proposed dormer constitutes an incongruous addition to the host dwelling which would be out of character with the surrounding area.

- Whilst it is noted the proposed dormer would be sited on the rear roof slope which would not inflict as much visual harm as a front dormer extension, the proposed dormer would still be visually prominent from public vantage points on Crowshaw Drive to the south-west and south-east of the dwelling.
- For the reasons set out above, the proposed rear dormer would cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does 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 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.”*
- In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *“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;*
 - (ii) *14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.”*
- As it stands, the north-facing side elevation wall of the host dwelling is sited at an oblique angle to the front elevation of adjacent no. 35 with a separation distance of 5.24m, though an acceptable level of amenity for no. 35 is maintained due to the single-storey form of the host dwelling. However, the proposal would raise the ridge height to 5.49m, which would effectively block the outlook and access to natural light to the first-floor bedroom of no. 35, thus inflicting adverse harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.
- 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.”*
- The proposed rear dormer does not project beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling, does not directly face any properties and retains the existing separation distance of the host dwelling from the side curtilage boundary of no. 29, thus the amenity impacts would not be significant 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.

- Notwithstanding, the proposed raising of the ridge height would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of adjacent no. 35 and would fail to be 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 increase the number of bedrooms from two to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the provision of which would be retained under the proposed plans.
- The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, flat roof form and design, the proposed rear dormer constitute an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling which dominates the roof slope and inflicts undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposed development would not be well-designed 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.
2. By virtue of its siting and excessive height and scale, the proposed raising of the ridge height of the dwelling would result in undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by means of loss of light and outlook to the first-floor habitable windows of no. 35 Crowshaw Drive. The proposed development therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD 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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan – received 17/08/2023
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3101.2 dated 08/2023
- Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. 23.3101.1A dated 03/2022
- Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. 23.3101.SC3.1B dated 04/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	20/11/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	18/11/2023	Signed: RK