

Application Number:	23/01303/HOUS
Location:	87 Kingsway, Rochdale, OL16 5HR
Proposal:	Front and rear dormer extensions
Applicant:	Shahid Mahmood
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 21.02.2024	EXT OF TIME 05.04.2024
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. 87 Kingsway, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 85 Kingsway to the west, adjacent to no. 89 Kingsway to the east, and faces the highway to the south. The rear curtilage of the boundary borders the rear curtilages of nos. 16 and 18 Lonsdale Avenue. The property is served by Kingsway/A664, a classified road and primary route which surrounds Rochdale town centre.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of two flat roof dormers to the front and rear roof slope of the dwelling to accommodate two bedrooms. The front dormer measures 4.18m in length, 1.31m in height, and 1.72m in depth, whilst the rear dormer measures 5.9m in length, 1.79m in height, and 2.31m in depth.

Relevant History

23/00161/CPL - Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed rear dormer extension – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ The proposal does not constitute permitted development by virtue of non-compliance with the requirements of Class B, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) as the plans indicate that the materials used in the construction of the proposed rear dormer walls would not be of a similar appearance to the existing roof. In addition, the plans indicate the proposed rear dormer to extend beyond the external rear wall of the original dwelling.

23/01063/CPL - Rear dormer extension - Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

This proposal will not impact upon the highway.

Highways have no objections to these proposals.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

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 135 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 139 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 JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ❑ 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 proposal seeks to construct two flat roof dormers on the front and rear roof slope of the dwelling respectively. 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 surrounding street scene is characterised by semi-detached dwellings with unbroken roof slopes. There is an exception in adjacent no. 89, which comprises two flat roof dormers occupying the entirety of its roof. Based on available evidence, these additions appear to have been constructed in excess of 15 years ago but do not have any associated planning history and thus did not benefit from planning permission. These additions are very poorly designed and are unsympathetic and harmful additions to the street scene and do not constitute established features within the locality. These additions are a clear example of works that should be avoided.

- ☐ The proposed dormers would fail to comply with points (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) of Section 5.17 by virtue of its siting, scale, flat roof form and window proportions. The proposed rear dormer is excessive in scale and fails to be set back from the eaves and set in from the side walls of the dwelling. Whilst it is noted the front dormer is smaller in scale relative to its rear counterpart, owing to its siting and flat roof form, the dormer would constitute an obtrusive and out of keeping feature to the host dwelling. Moreover, the proposed windows do not appear proportionate and aligned with the existing fenestration, particularly to the front elevation, worsening the visual impact of the proposal.

- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development constitutes a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design and would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene, which is further exacerbated by its readily visible location along a prominent classified road.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”*
- ❑ 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 dormers do not project beyond the front and rear elevation of the host dwelling and would retain a minimum 36m separation distance with the habitable room windows of front-facing no. 86 Kingsway. As such, the proposal would not result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers in this regard.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample 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.
- ❑ 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

- ❑ 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 three 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 in the front driveway.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, excessive scale, flat roof form, window proportions and design, the proposed front and rear dormers constitutes incongruous and obtrusive additions to the host dwelling roof slope which would be wholly out of keeping with the appearance of the dwelling. Owing to its siting in a prominent location, the proposal would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene. 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 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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 30/11/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 2078/1 received 30/11/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. 2078/2 received 30/11/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 2079/3 received 30/11/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. 2079/4 received 30/11/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	05/04/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	05/04/2024	Signed: RG