APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00027/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00027/HOUS
Location:	60 Birchfield Drive Rochdale OL11 4NY
Proposal:	First floor side extension above existing garage with inclusion of front dormer. Single storey extension to rear.
Applicant:	Mr Shabaz Rosul
Case Officer:	Richard Whittaker
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 60 Birchfield Drive, a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse located to the north of Sudden. The property is located within a street scene of which exhibits a predominance of single two storey detached dwellings in the same style as that of the application dwelling. This design style exhibits a steep gable to the front in which the first floor aspect is incorporated with a flat roofed projection to the side which incorporates a garage into the home.

The application dwelling has altered the attached garage feature to allow for an expanded lounge and kitchen.

A number of dwellings within the locality have executed alterations to incorporate a cross-gable pitched roof above the garage featuring a former within the front roof plane to allow for the creation of more habitable rooms at first floor level.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for the formation of a cross-gable pitched roof above the garage featuring a dormer within the front roof plane to allow for the creation 2no extra bedrooms as well as a shower room/WC at first floor level. The application also proposes a single storey rear extension allowing for expansion of the kitchen and the dining room.

The first floor side extension aspect would feature a maximum height that matches that of the existing roof (6.6 metres) with a height to eaves that matches that of the existing dwelling at the front (2.6 metres) and a height to eaves of 5 metres to the rear. The proposed front roof plane would exhibit a dormer that would project 2.3 metres outward from the plane and 2.2 metres from it at a width of 2.7 metres. The dormer would feature a gable end design.

The rear extension aspect would project 3 metres from the original rear elevation of the dwelling at a width of 8.5 metres. The rear extension would feature a lean-to roof which would reach a maximum height of 3.7 metres and a height to eaves of 2.4 metres.

Relevant History
N/A

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice posted close to the site. No letters of representation have been received.

Consultations

N/A

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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, P3, SPD

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development, developments are visually attractive, developments are sympathetic to local character, developments establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that all development proposals are expected be of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.

Paragraphs 5.11 and 5.12 of the SPD provide guidance for first floor side extensions and are set out below.

"5.11 Where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, which can harm the character of the property and the area. Proposals that would create this sort of 'terracing effect', or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.

5.12 To avoid the 'terracing effect', two storey and first floor side extensions that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary of the property will not normally be permitted unless either:

> (i) The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house; OR
> (ii) The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house."

Paragraphs 5.16, 5.17, and 5.18 of the SPD provide guidance for the creation of dormer extensions and are set out below.

"5.16 Dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that 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.

5.17 The following principles will apply to dormer extensions:

> (i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the 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 ridges 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.

5.18 It is accepted that there may be circumstances that justify a relaxation of these guidelines. Each application will be determined on its merits."

Whilst the proposed works would involve a first floor extension of sorts, the installation of a cross gable pitched roof at first floor level would exhibit a form that slopes away from the front elevation. This would remove any terracing issues as the existing front gable end would remain the prominent front of the house and would therefore accord with paragraphs 5.11 and 5.12 of the SPD. Furthermore, as a result of this relationship between the existing front gable end and the proposed first floor cross gable extension aspect, the alterations would remain subservient to the existing dwelling in line with paragraph 5.1 of the SPD.

It is noted that the SPD discourages the introduction of dormers to the front of houses, however it is recognised that the proposed dormer feature accords with the guidelines set out in paragraph 5.17 of the SPD and furthermore this cross gable-dormer addition would remove a flat roof feature replacing it with an addition that is already prevalent in the street scene. With paragraph 5.18 allowing for the relaxation of guidelines regarding the addition of dormer extensions the proposal is considered to be acceptable on balance.

The rear extension aspect would be subservient to the original building in height, style, and footprint. As a result it would be in accordance with paragraph 5.1 of the SPD.

On balance, it is concluded that 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, SPD

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all developments should demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7 of the SPD set out guidance for single storey rear extensions and is set out below.

"5.6 The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions:

- For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);
- For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

5.7 The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any

extension if one exists close to the common boundary. If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary."

With regard to the relationship between the application dwelling and the south eastern neighbour (no.58), it is noted that both dwellings exhibit a uniform original rear elevation, and with the neighbour having an existing two-storey rear extension, which results in the main rear elevation being projected a further 3 metres beyond the original, the introduction of the proposed works is recognised to have no impact upon the residential amenity of no.58.

With regard to the relationship between the application dwelling and its north western neighbour (No.62) it is noted that this arrangement is unorthodox due to the properties being located along a slight bend in the highway. As a result the two dwellings exhibit rear elevations that are angled slightly toward each other. However, when a 45 degree angle is drawn from the point located 4 metres along the shared boundary from where the rear elevation of no.62 corresponds with that boundary, the angle remains unobstructed by the proposed rear extension. As a result the proposed works are in accordance with the guidance set out in the SPD.

The first floor side extension would not impact upon the residential; amenity of the neighbouring properties in any way.

The proposed works would allow for all habitable rooms within the application dwelling to be subject to sufficient natural light and outlook.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the application property or that of neighbouring properties and is therefore in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways: DM1, SPD

Appendix 5 (Parking Standards) of the Core Strategy states that there should be 2no parking spaces for dwellings with 2no bedrooms located outside the city centre. The application dwelling only exhibits 1no parking space. However, it is noted that the dwelling in its existing arrangement features more than two bedrooms. As a result the proposed works are not considered to impact upon the highway network to any greater degree than the current situation does with regard to the guidance provided.

The proposal would retain sufficient space for bin storage.

It is therefore considered that the proposed works are acceptable in terms of their impact upon the surrounding highway network, in accordance with relevant policy.

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 Site Plan, Elevations and Floor Plans – Drawing No. 1688/1
- Proposed Site Plan and Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1688/2

- Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1688/3
- Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 1688/4

And the development shall be carried out in complete 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.

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	22.03.2021	Signed: RW
Authorisation	22.03.2021	Signed: KN

Report Author Richard Whittaker