

Application Number:	23/00154/HOUS
Location:	68 Springfield Road, Middleton, M24 5DL
Proposal:	Front and rear dormer extension - retrospective
Applicant:	Ms Liz Evans
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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. 68 Springfield Road, a two storey, semi-detached property in Middleton. The application property faces west onto the highway and is adjoined to no. 70 to the north and no. 66 to the south. It benefits from an attached link garage formed with a party wall and an L-shaped single storey rear extension. The dwelling is set back from the highway 6.4m with an area of hard standing which provides two off-street parking spaces. To the rear, the original build measures some 14m to the rear boundary of curtilage, beyond which lies the rear garden of no. 36 Cleworth Road.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for front and rear dormer extensions which would extend 1.94m from the existing roof plane as measured along the ridge with a width across of 5.55m and a height of 1.32m. The dormers would provide space for a dual-aspect en-suite bedroom, with two windows in the rear-facing dormer and one window in the front-facing dormer. The dormer walls are to be finished in oak colour UPVC cladding and the windows in UPVC to match existing.

It is noted that dormers have recently been built at this property without the benefit of planning permission. However, the plans submitted with this application slightly differ from the dormers which have been constructed, which are flush to the sides of the property.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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
G/D/2 Green Belt

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

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.

Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway. 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.

Section 5.17 of the SPD offers the following principles that should apply in the determination of applications that include 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

The front and rear dormer extensions would be set back from the eaves line and set in from the side walls of the existing dwelling. However, the dormer extensions would incorporate flat roofs which would correspond poorly with the gable roof of the original build and extend up to the height of the existing ridgeline. This is considered to be of poor design. Further to this, the dormer windows would not align with that beneath resulting in an incongruous visual effect.

Further, the use of oak coloured UPVC cladding and window frames would not match the existing roof materiality and would further contribute to the incongruous appearance of the dormers. It is accepted that the existing fenestration and cladding at the dwelling is a similar oak coloured UPVC, additionally, this colour scheme is used variously along Springfield Road. Nonetheless, the introduction of this material to the tiled roof would not sit uncomfortably against the existing roof scape and contribute to the negative appearance of the dormers.

The SPD is clear that front dormers would not normally be supported and in the case of this site the street scene is generally devoid of dormer extensions. The provision of a dormer to the front of this property would significantly detract from the existing appearance of the property and be in stark contrast to the character and appearance of the neighbouring properties, resulting in undue harm to the street scene.

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

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not “adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.” Paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the

SPD states that “dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in section 4.”

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires “21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of curtilage.” The plans confirm that the proposed front dormer extension would measure approx. 27m to the opposing dwellings on Springfield Road. By virtue of the siting of the plot the rear dormer would not directly face neighbouring dwellings on Cleworth Road, which stand at a 90 degree angle to the application property. The rear dormer would measure approximately 15m to the opposing boundary of curtilage and would comply with the 10.5m SPD requirement. It is therefore considered that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring amenity through an unacceptable loss of privacy or increased overlooking.

The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient 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.

In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development would not impact the current provision of parking available at the property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

1. By virtue of their design, scale, siting and materials the proposed front and rear dormer extensions would have an incongruous design which would harmfully impact the character and uniformity of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the 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 developments. 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	24/03/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	29/03/2023	Signed: RC

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Location Plan, Site Plan and Floor Plans. Drg no. 001. Rev A

- Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations. Drg no. 002. Rev A
- Existing and Proposed Side Elevations. Drg no. 003. Rev A

Report Author Bob Melling