

Application Number:	22/01424/HOUS
Location:	44 Heald Close Littleborough Rochdale OL15 0DL
Proposal:	Front dormer extension, single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and extension to existing rear dormer.
Applicant:	Mr Steve Kelly
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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 no. 44 Heald Close, a semi-detached bungalow located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 42 Heald Close to the south-east, adjacent to no. 46 Heald Close to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders Green Belt land to the north-east. The host property is located towards the end of the cul-de-sac and comprises of a single garage to the rear and a driveway which has shared access with adjacent no. 46.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a flat roof dormer to the front roof slope of the host dwelling, measuring approx. 6m in length, approx. 1.94m in height and approx. 3.9m in depth. The proposed front dormer would be constructed in dark grey PVC cladding.

The application also proposes a rear extension which projects approx. 3.6m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The proposed rear extension roof would join the host dwelling roof to form a catslide roof with an eaves height of approx. 2.51m.

The existing rear flat roof dormer would also be extended by approx. 1.22m along the rear roof slope, measuring approx. 6.79m in length, approx. 1.77m in height and approx. 4.92m in depth.

Lastly, the application proposes alterations of the side elevation fenestration to accommodate changes in internal layout.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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)

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 made to the proposed plans to reduce the length of the proposed front dormer by approx. 0.3m away from the common boundary of adjoining no. 42.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② 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.”*
- ② The application proposes a front dormer and an extension of an existing rear dormer. 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.”*
- ② Section 5.17 of the SPD 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.”*

- ☐ As it stands, numerous properties along Heald Close comprise of similarly designed flat roof dormers to the front elevation, including adjacent no. 25, 28, 30 and 32. It is noted, however, only no. 28 has associated planning history, having been granted planning permission in 1998, prior to the adoption of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the SPD. It is also noted that planning permission was granted for a front dormer to no. 15 Heald Close in 2020. Given the context of the existing surrounding street scene, on balance, it is considered the principle of a front dormer would be acceptable in this particular location.
- ☐ The proposed front dormer would be set down below the ridge line and would be set back from the eaves. Amendment was also made to set the dormer further in from the party wall with adjoined no. 42 to mitigate its visual prominence on the street scene.
- ☐ The proposed rear dormer constitutes an approx. 1.22m extension of the existing rear dormer and would retain the roof form, siting and length of the existing.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would be in accordance with all points of section 5.17 of the SPD.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is of a single storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed extension roof is of a lower roof pitch to the host dwelling and would join the host dwelling roof to form a catslide roof which, on balance given its location at the rear, is considered acceptable.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”*
- ☐ In particular, section 4.1 states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - ☐ *“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 the curtilage.”*
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ Given the minimum approx. 28.28m distance between the principal window of the proposed front dormer and the front curtilage boundary of directly facing

no. 29 Heald Close, and no. 29 comprising of a single-storey form, it is considered the proposed development would not cause undue harm to the amenity of no. 29.

- ☐ The host dwelling does not face any properties to the rear and would not result in any harm in this regard.
- ☐ Additionally, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ☐ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ☐ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposed extension does not project beyond the existing 3.65m rear projection of adjoining no. 42 and would accord with the maximum standard for attached properties.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 3.6m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 46, in accordance with the maximum standard for detached properties.
- ☐ The plans confirm the provision of natural 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.
- ☐ 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 proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property. Therefore, the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – Drawing No. 01
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 05

- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 06
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 07A
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 08C

And the development shall be carried out in accordance with these 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 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 policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	17/01/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	08/02/2023	Signed:LA

Report Author Sam Yuen