

Application Number:	22/01236/HOUS
Location:	142 Hollin Lane Middleton Rochdale M24 5LB
Proposal:	Alterations to existing roof from hip to gable including new roof, rear dormer and installation of second floor side window -retrospective.
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Davies
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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 no.142 Hollin Lane, a two storey semi-detached property located in a residential area in Middleton. The dwelling faces south onto the highway, adjacent to no.140 Hollin Lane to the east and adjoining no.144 Hollin Lane to the west. The rear boundary of curtilage borders a parcel of Council-owned land, beyond which lies the rear gardens of nos.37 and 39 Kirkstall Road. The property benefits from off road parking sited to the front of the dwelling and a large rear garden.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for a rear dormer extension, a hip to gable roof extension and the installation of a second floor window to the side elevation. The proposed rear dormer extension would have a length of approx. 6.22m, height of approx. 2.23m, depth of approx. 3.86m and an overall volume of approx. 26.77m³. This would however be in addition to the increased roof volume due to the hip to gable roof alteration.

Relevant History

- 99/D36461** Single Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling.
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.
- 19/01178/HOUS** Erection of single storey side and rear extension following
demolition of kitchen/dining room extensions and detached
garage.
Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the neighbouring properties, no representations were received relating to the proposed development.

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

None applicable.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires “*development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.*” Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all new development must “*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.*”

- ❑ The application relates to a rear dormer extension, a hip to gable roof extension and the installation of a second floor window to the side elevation. In respect of this proposal the LPA are mindful of what development would be allowed under permitted development and in this regard the Council have completed an assessment of the extensions against Class B of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

- ❑ In assessing the development under the General Development Permitted Development Order the hip to gable conversion and the dormer extension would comply with Criterion (a) to (f) of Class B, with a combined volumetric increase of 47.42m³.

- ❑ However, although the size and siting of extensions created would comply with the requirements of permitted development, neither element of the proposal complies with the conditions. In regards the hip to gable conversion the development would not comply with Criterion (b) as it would include an upper floor side facing window to the side elevation and this is not shown to be obscurely glazed and non-opening below the height of 1.7m (above floor level). Additionally, the dormer extension would not comply with Criterion (a) of the Conditions, which states; “*The materials used in any exterior work must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.*”. It is therefore clear that the development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of non-compliance with Class B of the GPDO. There is therefore no fallback position to be considered in respect of this application.

- ❑ Assessing the acceptability of the proposed dormer, paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the SPD states that “*the materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof.*” The dormer is finished using dark, horizontal cladding. The colour is well related to the colour of the roof tiles. However, it has introduced a substantial, additional element to the materials palette of the building. This further dissociates the dormer from the dwelling and it appears as an incongruous addition.

- ❑ The proposed rear dormer extension would be set back from the eaves line, sited below the ridge line and the proposed windows would align with the existing fenestration. However, the plans confirm that the rear dormer would occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof slope and would dominate the host property. Hollin Lane and the immediate adjacent street settings have a low degree of uniformity in appearance and are generally

devoid of dormer extensions. No.146 Hollin Lane features front dormers, however has managed to overcome the concern of undue dominance through two front-facing cuckoo dormers with pitched roof forms. Whilst nos. 4 and 20 Hillcrest feature front and rear dormers, it should be noted that these dormer extensions significantly pre-date the current policy documents and would constitute poor design under the current Rochdale Core Strategy and SPD. Additionally, each application must be decided on its own merits.

- ☐ It is therefore considered that the proposed rear dormer would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance and character of the host property and the surrounding area.
- ☐ In respect of the hip to gable alteration it is considered that such a change would be harmful to the appearance of the host property and its setting within the street scene as it would clearly unbalance the existing pair of semi-detached properties. The current hipped roof style is characteristic of a number of the neighbouring properties along Hollin Lane, and although there are some other roof styles in the area (including the standard hipped roofs to the opposite side of the road), these are sited on properties of a different design and are themselves, characteristic of that style of property. The character of the surrounding street scene along Hollin Lane is clearly comprised by a mix of these property styles, with the hipped roof semi-detached houses providing a defining feature within the street scene. It is acknowledged that the application site comprises half of a pair of semi-detached houses that make up the end of a row of these hipped roof dwellings, nonetheless, it would still be set within the context of a row of similarly designed properties and to remove the hipped roof feature would detract from the appearance of the host property, the appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses and their setting within the street scene. This would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and contrary to the requirements of policies P1 and P3 of the Core Strategy.

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

Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact and Privacy

- ☐ DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not “*adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.*” Paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the SPD states that “*dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in section 4.*”
- ☐ Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires “*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*

curtilage.” The plans confirm that the proposed rear dormer extension would measure approx. 25.19m to the opposing boundary of curtilage and would comply with the 10.5m SPD requirement. It is therefore considered that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring amenity through an unacceptable loss of privacy or increased overlooking.

- ☐ Additionally, whilst the side elevation facing no.140 Hollin Lane would see the insertion of a second floor window, the submitted plans confirm that this window would serve a landing area, which is not considered a habitable room. Therefore, this window is not considered to result in an undue loss of privacy for no.140 Hollin Lane. The additional mass added to the property through the alteration of the roof from hip to gable would also not cause any excessive overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

Occupier Amenity

- ☐ The plans confirm the provision of 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.

Summary

- ☐ In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ The proposed development would not impact the existing provision of off road parking available at the property. 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 for the following reason:

1. By virtue of its design, materiality and scale, the proposed rear dormer extension would have a disproportionate scale and an incongruous materiality which would harmfully impact the character and uniformity of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed hip to gable end roof extension would constitute an incongruous addition to the host dwelling. The proposed roof form would be unsympathetic in the context of the adjoining dwelling and surrounding pairs of semi-detached dwellings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposal therefore constitutes poor design and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 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 developments. 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	01/12/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	01/12/2022	Signed: RC

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Pre-Existing & Proposed Plans. Drg no. 2168/P22A
- Pre-Existing Site & Location Plans. Drg no. 2168/P23B
- Existing Site & Location Plans. Drg no. 2168/P25
- Existing Plans. Drg no. 2168/P27
- Pre-Existing & Proposed Elevations 01. Drg no. 2168/P20C
- Pre-Existing & Proposed Elevations 02. Drg no. 2168/P21C
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 2168/P26A

Report Author Bob Melling