APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00407/FUL

Application Number:	21/00407/FUL
Location:	16 Huddersfield Road Milnrow OL16 3QF
Proposal:	First floor rear extension and front and rear dormer extension
Applicant:	MR PRAKASH GORSIA
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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 16 Huddersfield Road, a two-storey mid terraced property located in a predominantly residential area of Rochdale. No. 16 is a mixed use property, with the ground floor being predominantly being used for retail purposes. The first floor contains the living accommodation.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a first floor rear extension over the existing ground floor extension and front and rear dormer extensions.

Relevant History

97/D34160 New Shop Front
Decision: Approved.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties, and one objection letter was received. The objection is summarised below:

- No properties on Huddersfield Rd currently have front dormers. A front dormer would introduce an incongruous unsightly feature into the street scene and would not be in keeping with the current flow of traditional slate roofs within Newhey village
  Officer comments: Discussed in design section of the report.
- Structural and party wall concerns.
  Officer comments: Concerns raised are not material planning considerations.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and

are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Additionally, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states:

> *"Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents."*

In addition, Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that 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. Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD states the principles that will apply to dormer extension:

(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.

There are a number of terraces in the vicinity of the application property which contribute positively towards the overall character of the area. Looking at the proposed dormer to the front, it is noted that there are no properties in close vicinity that have front dormers. There is a dormer extension on the rear of 24 Gordon Street, however there is no information available on the dormer extension. There is a property with a flat roof dormer to the rear on Shaw Road, and two bungalows on Cedar Lane with gable and shed design dormers.

Given that the terrace properties in close vicinity remain free from front dormers, the break in the roof plane caused by the insertion of a fairly large flat roofed dormer would appear incongruous, prominent and visually intrusive.

In regards to the proposed rear dormer. The overall size of the dormer is considered acceptable as it is set back from the eaves and boundaries to the adjoining properties, and is set below the ridge height. It has been noted that there are properties in close vicinity with flat roof dormers, however, on the row of terrace properties of Huddersfield Road, there are no dormers. Therefore it is considered that whilst dormer extensions exist in the area, in this particular location it is

considered that the presence of other, unsympathetic dormers does not justify allowing another one. Furthermore, the dormers would also have front and rear facing elevations with a large amount of slate due to the lack of openings. This would appear at odds and incongruous in appearance within the street, and would only add to the negative impact on the street scene caused by the dormer extensions.

Moving to the proposed first floor rear extension. The proposed first storey extension would have a flat roof, which is considered to be of poor design. It is noted that both the adjoining properties have similar two storey extensions; one with a flat roof (no. 18) and the other with a shallow pitched mono roof that connects to roof of the host property (no. 14). Furthermore, details of planning applications for the two storey extensions could not be found. It is noted that the proposed extension would be set close to the shared boundary with no.14, and therefore shares a closer relationship with that property than no. 18. The addition of the flat roof would exacerbate the already existing negative visual amenity impact that has been created by the two poorly designed two storey extensions. A gable roof, similar to the one found on neighbouring properties would be a preferable design for a roof in such a location. A mono pitch roof similar to the adjoining would help to soften visually amenity impact of the proposed first floor extension, but would also be of poor design quality.

The design of the proposal is therefore does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposed front dormer would face the front of a residential property on the opposite side of Huddersfield Road. The Bedroom window would directly face a small window. It is unclear what room this services, but it appears to be for a bedroom. It is however noted that the proposed dormer would be set further back than the front elevation of the host property and the amenity impact would be no greater than the existing.

The proposed rear dormer would accord with the requirements set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD and would not unduly encroach the habitable room windows of surrounding occupiers.

The proposed first floor extension would project out by 3.1m, but it would meet the requirements set out in paragraphs 5.9-5.10 of the SPD due the neighbouring properties two storey extensions.

The neighbouring property of no. 18 has a two storey extension that has windows on the side elevation facing towards no. 16. These windows have led to a poor level of privacy for the occupants of no.16. Furthermore, the two storey extension of no.18 also has windows on the rear elevation and therefore the windows on the side elevation are not principal windows. It is therefore considered that the addition of the proposed first floor extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of no. 18.

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, Appendix 5

The property would retain the existing one off-street parking space available.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposed dormer extensions would introduce intrusive additions into the roof planes and would spoil the relatively uniform roofscape of the surrounding area owing to a general absence of dormer extensions to surrounding properties. The front dormer extension would be inappropriate in its context and, by virtue of its scale, massing and prominent position when viewed from public vantage points, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposed rear dormer would have an inappropriate design. The proposed development fails to improve the character and quality of the area and is therefore contrary to 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 flat roof design, the proposed first floor rear extension would appear as an incongruous addition of poor design and due to its scale would significantly impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The addition of the proposed flat roofed first floor rear extension would only exacerbate the negative impact on the street scene caused by the two storey extensions of the neighbouring properties. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to 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.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt this decision relates to the following plans:

Location plan
Existing and proposed block plans. Drawing no: 20.2409.SC1.1C
Existing details. Drawing no: 20.2409.1B
Proposed scheme 1 - Floor plans. Drawing no: 20.2409.SC1.1C
Proposed scheme 1 - Section X – X. Drawing no: 20.2409.SC1.2C

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	10/05/2021	Signed: MM
Authorisation	12/05/2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir