

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01246/HOUS

Application Number:	23/01246/HOUS
Location:	35 Milnrow Road, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 0BS
Proposal:	Increase roof height of existing dwelling by 1m including rear dormer and 1 no. roof light to front and two-storey side extension following demolition of existing side extension, including application of render and alterations to fenestration to all elevations, boundary walls to a maximum height of 1.83m, gates and timber fencing
Applicant:	Mr & Ms Paul & Deborah
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 12.02.2024	EXT OF TIME
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 no. 35 Milnrow Road, a redbrick bungalow located on the outskirts of Smithy Bridge, a suburb south-west of Littleborough. The property is sited on a prominent corner plot at the junction with a private access road and public right of way. The dwelling is connected via an attached garage with no. 44 Milbury Drive to the south-east and faces the highway and nos. 5 and 7 Knowl View to the west. The northern boundary of the curtilage borders the side curtilage of no. 42 Milbury Drive. To the south of the property lies open Green Belt land.

The dwelling is served by Milnrow Road/B6225, a highly-trafficked classified road connecting Smithy Bridge and Milnrow.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of works to the dwelling, including the following:

- ☐ The raising of the ridge height of the dwelling by 1m;
- ☐ Two-storey side extension which projects 4.65m from the north-facing elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing conservatory. It comprises a matching dual-pitched roof form and a ridge and eaves height matching the enlarged dwelling;
- ☐ The addition of a dormer with a lean-to roof form on the east-facing roof slope which measures 13.89m in width, 1.99m in height, and 2.86m in depth. It would be constructed from grey roof tiles;
- ☐ The addition of a roof light which protrudes 0.37m from the west-facing roof slope;
- ☐ The application of off-white render to all elevations; and
- ☐ The addition and alteration of dark-coloured fenestration to all elevations.

The proposed roof would be constructed from grey roof tiles, fascia and rainwater pipes.

Additionally, the proposal seeks to construct boundary treatments which comprise the following:

- ☐ 2m-high rendered wall along the north-west, north and south-east boundary;
- ☐ 1m-high rendered wall with 1.05m-high piers along the south-west corner boundary;
- ☐ 1.05m-high aluminium sliding vehicle and pedestrian gate; and
- ☐ 1.6m-high aluminium fencing along the south-east boundary.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main concern regarding this application is the height of the proposed wall along Milnrow.

Milnrow Road is a busy classified road (B625) and a motorway diversion route for the M62 so Highways must consider any impact on its junctions. The application site is directly on the junction of a private vehicular access which also carries public highway rights and is busy with pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders taking a short

cut to Hollingworth Lake. Along the site boundary to Milnrow Road is a narrow footway alongside the carriageway.

Highways' concerns relate to the visibility at this junction and the detrimental impact a permanent structure would have in this location. A reduced visibility at this junction would have an impact on road safety and Highways therefore cannot support this element of the application.

The proposed extensions would not appear to have an impact on the current parking arrangements.

The servicing arrangements for the extended dwelling would seem to remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on highways capacity.

Rights Of Way Officer

No comments received at the time of writing.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received with the following concerns:

- ☐ The removal of existing greenery and the addition of white rendered wall would not be in keeping with the surrounding area;
- ☐ The proposed increase in height may obstruct view from windows of adjacent property.

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ Concerns relating to the impact on the appearance of the street scene are addressed under the 'Design' heading of the report;
- ☐ Concerns relating to amenity impacts are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report. Loss of view resulting from a proposal does not constitute material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

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

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.*” However, significant weight would be given to “*innovative designs which... help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.*”
- ❑ 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 surrounding building line along Milnrow Road is mainly characterised by detached gable-fronted bungalows with consistent built forms and a mix of brickwork and render finish. A few individual dwellings feature flat-roof dormers, namely no. 19, 23, 27 and no. 1 Leighton Avenue. To the west of the host dwelling lies the rear elevation of a row of semi-detached dwellings of redbrick construction.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, the dwelling is read together with no. 44 Milbury Drive, connected by their respective garages. No. 44 features a flat-roof dormer to

the south-east roof slope and comprises a higher ridge height to the host dwelling. It was previously constructed from redbrick and gable cladding but was recently subject to substantial remodelling, particularly in the full application of off-white render and replacement of dark grey fenestration, roof tiles and dormer hanging tiles. By virtue of its siting and orientation, the pair of dwellings are best understood with the agrarian and verdant character of the adjacent open farm land. This is evident by the complimentary hedging and soft landscaping which currently bounds the host dwelling.

- 2 The proposal seeks to drastically overhaul the appearance of the host dwelling through a number of enlargements and alterations, including the construction of a dormer extension on the south-east facing roof slope. 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.”*

- 2 The proposed dormer would be of a lean-to/flat roof form which would occupy a large portion of the roof slope. By virtue of its siting, scale, and roof form, the proposed dormer would fail to comply with points (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of Section 5.17. However, regards have been had to the existing flat-roof dormers along the street scene, particularly the one of adjoined no. 44. Considering the siting of the proposed dormer on the south-east facing roof slope away from the highway, the dormer would not appear readily visible on approach into Smithy Bridge from the B6225 and as such, in isolation, would justify a relaxation of the principles of Section 5.17 and be acceptable on balance.

- 2 However, significant concerns are had with a number of proposed works, which when viewed together with the proposed dormer, constitute undue

visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and immediate street scene.

- ② This includes the construction of a 2m-high, 19.4m-wide rendered boundary wall directly adjoining the highway, the height, scale and materiality of which creates an imposing and oppressive feature which would dominate the street scene. The subsequent partial removal of existing hedging would also be detrimental to the verdant character of the area.
- ② The submitted plans have also not sufficiently demonstrated the practicality of the proposed sliding vehicle gate which would obstruct the pedestrian gate and ultimately constitute a poorly thought-out feature.
- ② The proposed plans indicate substantial alterations of fenestration, particularly to the south-west elevation which features gable-end windows and the relocation of the front entrance. The resulting arrangement appears awkward and unresolved on a prominent elevation and would therefore inflict visual harm to the appearance of the dwelling. Elsewhere, the 0.37m protrusion of the proposed roof light is a conspicuous feature on an otherwise unbroken roof slope.
- ② Whilst the proposed application of render to all elevations would not appear wholly complementary to the existing use of brickwork within the immediate street scene, it is acknowledged that the use of render is prevalent across dwellings further along Milnrow Road. Regards have also been had to adjoined no. 44 which was recently refurbished with off-white render, though it is noted such works do not benefit from planning permission. Notwithstanding, given this existing site context, it is considered the use of render on the host dwelling would not significantly detract from established appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable on balance. In the event the application was approved, clarifications would have been sought to address the discrepancies between the proposed off-white render and the white render shown on the 3D visualisations (drawing no. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0004 Rev. P05). In any case, suitable materials can be achieved via condition in the interest of visual amenity.
- ② As part of the proposed enlargement, the ridge height would be increased by 1m. It is noted that as it stands, adjoined no. 44 comprises a greater ridge height to the host dwelling, however, in the absence of any submitted drawings indicating the proposal alongside the neighbouring properties, it has not been possible to adequately assess the suitability of this element of the proposal. Should the application be acceptable, additional information by way of street scene drawings would be requested from the applicant.
- ② Notwithstanding, taken as a whole, the cumulative impacts of the proposed dormer, fenestration and boundary treatments would result in an unsatisfactory standard of design which would inflict undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② 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.”

- ② 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.*”
- ② Whilst no concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the proposed raising of ridge height and two-storey rear extension, given the siting of the host dwelling at an angle away from adjoining no. 44 and the 26m separation distance maintained from nos. 5 and 7 Knowl View, the proposed north-east dormer window of Bedroom 2 would be sited 5m from the side curtilage boundary of no. 44 and would directly overlook onto the adjacent garden space, to the detriment of the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers. Whilst it is accepted no. 44 already suffers from existing overlooking impacts from the side dormer windows of no. 42 Milbury Drive, the overall greater separation distance of the proposed dormer would afford a more direct line of sight into the rear amenity space of no. 44 and would not be acceptable.
- ② The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient albeit restricted 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.
- ② Notwithstanding, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would fail to accord with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ② 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.*”
- ② The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from one to two and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy. The submitted plans indicate sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces to be retained in the existing driveway which would be acceptable.
- ② The proposed boundary treatments comprise a 2m-high, 19.4m-wide boundary wall along the north-west curtilage boundary adjoining Milnrow Road/B625, a highly-trafficked classified road which also serves as a motorway diversion route for the M62. The adjoining private access road is a public right of way and is used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to access nearby Hollingworth Lake. By virtue of its excessive height and siting 2.68m from the vehicle access, it is considered the proposed boundary wall would restrict the visibility for vehicles entering into and emerging from this junction, to the detriment of highway safety for road users. Whilst it is acknowledged the existing boundary hedging may already present some visibility issues, the proposed boundary wall is a solid structure and would only serve to exacerbate any existing harm.

- ❑ For this reason, the proposed development would adversely impact on highway safety and would fail to accord with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale, design and materiality, the cumulative impacts of the proposed dormer, fenestration and boundary treatments constitute unsympathetic and obtrusive forms of development which would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and immediate street scene. The development proposals would not be well-designed and represent an unsatisfactory standard of design and appearance, thereby failing to accord with 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 siting, the proposed north-east dormer window would give rise to undue overlooking into the rear amenity space of no. 44 Milbury Drive and would result in detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. By virtue of its excessive height and siting, the proposed 2m boundary wall would significantly reduce visibility for users of the highway and the footway, resulting in an unacceptable risk to pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore considered to pose an unacceptable threat to highway safety, and would be contrary to Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD 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, Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0000 Rev. P03 received 18/12/2023
- ❑ Existing Ground Floor Plan and Elevations – Drawing No. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0001 Rev. P01 received 30/11/2023
- ❑ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0002 Rev. P06 received 30/11/2023

- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0003 Rev. P04 received 30/11/2023
- ☐ Proposed Boundary Treatments – Drawing No. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0005 Rev. P00 received 30/11/2023
- ☐ Proposed 3D Visualisation – Drawing No. MNR-RALA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-(PL)-0004 Rev. P05 received 30/11/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	09/02/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	12/02/2024	Signed: RK

Procedural Note

The applicant confirmed during the determination process that the proposed vehicle access sliding gate to the south-east corner would partially sit within the ownership boundary of adjoined no. 44 Milbury Drive and as such a Certificate B would have been required to be submitted. It is noted however, the owners of no. 44 would not have been prejudiced in the absence of a Certificate B as a neighbour notification letter was sent to the occupiers of no. 44. In any event, future applications which include this element will require the applicant to serve the appropriate certificate.

Report Author Sam Yuen