

Application Number:	23/00582/HOUS
Location:	48 Rose Avenue, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 8QJ
Proposal:	First Floor extension with the addition of front and rear dormers
Applicant:	KARL & CAROL WHITTAKER & MCCARTHY
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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. 48 Rose Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dormer bungalow located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge in Littleborough. The dwelling is sited in a corner plot at the junction with Johnston Avenue and is adjoined by no. 46 Rose Avenue to the south-west, adjacent to no. 50 Rose Avenue to the north-east, and faces the highway to the north-west. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the side curtilage boundary of no. 2 Johnston Avenue to the south-east. The dwelling comprises a single-storey side garage extension to the north-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor extension above the existing attached garage which projects approx. 3.68m from the side elevation of the host dwelling, including the extension of the existing front and rear dormers. The proposal retains the dual-pitched roof form of the existing dwelling with matching ridge and eaves height.

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

Relevant History

81/D12023 - Private Garage - Grant subject to conditions

99/D36414 - Single Storey Side Extension To Dwelling - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The parking arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged as part of the development proposals.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

Highways do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

Highways raise no objection to this application and ask for any specific planning conditions.

Representations

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

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – September 2023
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

- 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 application seeks to extend the existing front and rear dormers. Section 5.16 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 coherent built forms and massing; flat roof front and rear dormers which occupy the width of the roof slope are established design features. On this basis, the site context justifies a relaxation of the above guidelines and the proposed dormers would comply with all points of Section 5.17.
- ☐ Additionally, no concerns are had with the roof forms and materiality of the proposed extension, which would be in keeping with the existing dwelling.
- ☐ The host dwelling is located on a corner plot between Rose Avenue and Johnston Avenue. Despite the small number of properties on Johnston Avenue, there is a presence of a building line as defined by the front elevations of nos. 2 and 4 Johnston Avenue.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor extension projects approx. 4.17m forward of the front elevations of nos. 2 and 4 and constitutes a prominent addition to the host dwelling which would significantly erode the sense of space between the adjacent dwellings and present a hard edge to the highway.
- ☐ It is acknowledged the host property comprises a single-storey side extension, which has already restricted the space between the original dwelling and the side curtilage boundary. It is also noted that to the rear of the extension lies a large tree which somewhat screens the existing side extension from Johnston Avenue. Notwithstanding, an additional storey to the side extension would substantially enlarge the bulk of the dwelling jutting out from the existing side elevation and would further accentuate the obtrusiveness of the side projection from the highway, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the immediate street scene.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord 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.”*
- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD 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.”*

- ☐ No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the proposed first-floor extension, given it does not project beyond the existing front and rear elevation of the host dwelling.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate 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, the front driveway of which would be retained.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its size and prominent siting on a corner plot, the proposed first-floor extension would result a hard edge forming on the building line of Johnston Avenue and would inflict undue harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 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. 22.3023.2 dated 05/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. 22.3023.1B dated 02/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.3023.SC3.1B dated 05/2023

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11/09/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	13/09/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen