

Application Number:	22/01558/HOUS
Location:	61 Rouse Street Rochdale OL11 4PG
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension, front and rear dormer extensions, insertion of windows to side elevation following demolition of existing porch at the rear
Applicant:	Mr Asif Nadeem
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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 61 Rouse Street, a semi-detached bungalow located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale and in a defined urban area. The rear curtilage boundary sits adjacent to 7-14 Thomas Henshaw Court, a row of terrace flats and sits adjacent to 68 and 70 Rouse Street to the front. The rear garden hosts large trees to the rear, a small outhouse and a small rear porch. The main entrance to the dwelling is on the west elevation and to where the dwelling also hosts on-site parking. The overall street scene is comprised of semi-detached bungalows and rows or terraces.

Description of Proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for a front and rear dormer both of which are set down from the existing ridge height. The application is also seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension with a projection of 3.7m to which the rear eastern elevation would feature a chamfered edge.

All external materials are sought to match those on the host dwelling of brick and blockwork and interlocking roof tiles.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties regarding development. No letters of notification 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

Amendments were sought from the agent to reduce the depth of the rear dormer given the originally submitted plans indicated for the roof pitch of the single storey rear extension to attach onto the rear dormer. It was considered a reduction of depth would constitute a better design for a dwelling of this size.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, in addition to being sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and maintaining a strong sense of place. Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape

Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that 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.

Paragraph 5.17 sets out design principles for 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) 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;
- (vi) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof;

It should be noted dormers are not common amongst dwellings along Rouse Street with the exception of three dwellings, one of which is the adjoining dwelling of the application property. The front dormer is proposed to a similar scale of that on the adjoining dwelling with a 0.5m set down from the existing ridge height. It would be 5.2m in length, 1.7m in height and project 2.7m from the existing roof. The windows would be positioned vertically upwards to line up with those on the existing dwelling. Although the SPD states that dormers to the front elevation are not usually permitted, there is thought to be a justification of this principle given the adjoining dwelling, no.59, hosts a dormer to the front elevation. Furthermore, there are currently only eight bungalows along Rouse Street, three of which currently host front dormers, given the application property is also a bungalow, the addition to the of a front dormer would not present an addition which would be out-of-keeping with the surrounding street scene.

The rear dormer would constitute a slightly larger scale than the one proposed to the front elevation projecting 3m from the rear elevation. It is proposed to occupy a large portion of the roof however, would be set down from the ridge and back from the eaves lines and be 2m in height. It is acknowledged the rear dormer, although would occupy significant roof space to the rear elevation cannot be seen from public vantage points and is shielded to the rear by a line of trees taller than the existing dwelling. Although constructed with flat roofs, it would appear to respect the visual built form of the dwelling and surrounding street scene existing dormers are also constructed with flat roofs therefore deemed acceptable by SPD standards.

The single storey extension would project 3.7m from the host dwelling following demolition of the existing rear porch to which sufficient rear garden space would be retained. It would extend to the full width of the rear elevation of the host dwelling and be constructed up to the site boundary collective with no.59 Rouse Street. The extension is proposed with a shallow pitch roof to match that of the host dwelling.

The materials for both the external walls and roofs of the dormers and single storey rear extension are sought to match that on the original comprised of red brick and interlocking roof slates in order to be in keeping with the visual appearance of the host dwelling.

The proposed insertion of 1no window to the west elevation would form a suitable addition to the dwelling with material and colour to match the UPVC on the existing build.

It is not considered bin storage arrangements, currently sited to the side of the dwelling, are to be impacted as a result of development.

It is therefore considered the front and rear dormers, the single storey rear extension and the insertion of 1no window to the west elevation would constitute a satisfactory standard of design and be deemed acceptable and in accordance with policy DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Section 4 of the SPD sets out space standards for new developments to which it requires "21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level". Plans indicate a 4.5m distance between the proposed window on the west elevation and blank east elevation of 63 Rouse Street. Given the window is proposed to host a bathroom, therefore not a habitable room, it is considered the space standards for this window would not apply. The plans indicate a 25m space between the rear dormer windows and those adjacent on the front elevation of Thomas Henshaw Court therefore acceptable by 4.1(i) space standards which only requires a 21m gap.

Paragraph 5.7 of the SPD outlines the point 3 metres measured from rear elevation of the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling, it must be ensured the new extension does not extend beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary. Proposed plans indicate an approx. 1m chamfered edge to the rear of the extension in order to comply with the 45 degree rule. Based on this there would be no unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the rear windows of the attached property, no.59.

The current siting of the dwelling sited to the west, 63 Rouse Street, is set approx. 0.4m away from the common boundary to which fences and shrubs run along. It is not thought the proposed works would have any negative impact regarding loss of light given both gardens face south at the rear. Additionally, the SPD does not permit development which would extend beyond 45 degrees of the neighbouring rear elevation when drawn from a 4m point along the common boundary in order to prevent a reduced loss of outlook for neighbouring occupiers. Proposed plans do not propose the single storey extension to project beyond the 45 degree line when drawn 4m from the rear elevation of no.63 therefore compliant with paragraph 5.6 of the SPD.

Occupier amenity is not thought to be negatively impacted post development given all four rooms within the dormers would host large windows to which sufficient light will be received. The south-facing positioning of the dwelling also means the single storey rear extension would receive maximum light throughout the day.

In view of the above assessment, the single storey rear extension, the front and rear dormers and insertion of 1no window to the west elevation would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and host occupiers in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

As a result of development, the dwelling will increase from a 2-bed to a 4-bed dwelling. Appendix 5 parking standards requires a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed houses outside of the town center. Given the dwelling hosts a driveway to the side providing off-street parking, the proposal would therefore comply with the Council's Appendix 5 scheduled parking standards and would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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. This permission relates to the following plans;
 - Location Plan
 - 1972/1 Existing Floor Plans, Elevations And Site Plan
 - 1972/2 Proposed Elevations, Floor Plans And Site Plans received on 16th February 2023and the development must be carried out in accordance with the 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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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 Policy DM1 and Policy P3 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	16.02.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	23.02.2023	Signed: AT

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo

