APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00340/HOUS

Application Number:	21/00340/HOUS
Location:	7 Retford Avenue Rochdale OL16 4AD
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension, installation of rooflights to front, alteration to fenestration on the ground floor rear elevation and dormer to rear following raising of roof ridge height
Applicant:	Mr Andrew Harrison
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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?	**Y**

CONDITIONS	**Pre-commencement conditions proposed?**	**N**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**N/A**

Location

The application relates to 7 Retford Avenue, a two storey detached property located in a residential area of Rochdale.

Description of Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for the following:

- a two storey rear extension,
- increase in ridge height of roof,
- dormer to rear,
- installation of roof lights to front, and
- alteration to fenestration on the ground floor rear elevation.

Relevant History

Not applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties. One objection was received. The objection is summarised below:

- Property already overlooks and will encroach on privacy of garden and bedroom.
- Appears too close.
  Officer comment: Discussed in the amenity section of the report.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

The height and pitch of the proposed two storey rear extension has been reduced and the proposed rear dormer has been reduced in size.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

The application seeks to increase the ridge height by approximately 0.8m and install roof lights to the front roof plane. It is noted that due to the topography of land in the area, there is already a variation in the height of properties. Additionally, the property is a detached property with an open aspect to the north and is set close the neighbouring property of no.9 Retford Avenue to the south. It is noted that the ridge height of no. 9 is already set lower than that of no. 7, and therefore there already is a

variation in height. It is considered that the additional 0.8m would not substantially alter the character of the host dwelling or the street scene, with the overall increase in height considered to still be in keeping with the local properties. It is therefore considered that the proposed changes are acceptable,.

Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that they are carefully designed and sited. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof. Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD states the principles that will apply to dormer extension:

(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 overall size of the proposed rear dormer is considered to be larger than would normally be considered acceptable due to it covering a large proportion of the roof plane. The addition of a dormer of such a size would only be possible with the increase in the ridge height. However, the proposed dormer would be set below the ridge and set up from the eaves. It would also be set in from the sides. On balance, it is considered that the overall size of the proposed dormer is acceptable.

The proposed dormer extension would have a flat roof. It is noted that there are no properties within close vicinity that have flat roof dormers. However, it is noted that there are properties in close vicinity to the property that do have dormers, but these are well-proportioned gable roof design dormers. The design and size of the proposed dormer has been reduced, with the element of the proposed dormer on the northern side being set further back up from the eaves and the side elevation of the proposed dormer being set in further from the side elevation of the host property. Due to the open aspect to the north, the rear dormer would be visible from the street scene, but due to the reduction in size of the northern element of the proposed dormer, it substantially reduces the amount of the proposed dormer that would be visible. A small element of the proposed extension would be visible from the street scene, with the majority of it being screened from view and therefore limiting the visual amenity impact on the street scene. On the southern and eastern sides, the proposed dormer would be screened by the neighbouring properties from being visible from the street scene. Overall, it is considered that the addition of the

proposed dormer extension would not adversely impact on the character of the surrounding street scene to an unacceptable degree.

The proposed two storey rear extension would have a dual pitch gable roof design. The height of the ridge has been reduced to a pitch that is more in keeping with the host property. The proposed two storey rear extension would mimic the design of the two storey front projection. With the amendments made to the roof of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposed extension would be a subservient addition that would be in keeping with the host property.

The addition of the proposed dormer and the proposed two storey rear extension would see a somewhat cluttered roof design, where the roof of the proposed two storey extension would intersect the elevation of the proposed dormer. However, it is noted that it would be wholly to the rear of the host property and would not be prominent from the highway along Retford Avenue and therefore would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene.

The alterations to the fenestration proposed on the rear elevation of the host dwelling, the addition of the roof windows on the front roof elevation, and fenestration on the proposed two storey rear extension and dormer is considered to be acceptable.

On balance, the design of the proposal is acceptable and therefore in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposal would face towards a row of terrace properties on Weston Avenue. It is noted that the properties enjoy a long rear garden and the properties do not directly face towards no. 7. The proposed two storey rear extension would be between 11.7m and 10.6m from the rear boundary and 36.6m and 30.3m from the rear elevation of the properties on Weston Avenue. The proposed extension therefore would meet the minimum standards set out in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD, and as such, it is considered the proposed two storey rear extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of the properties on Weston Avenue.

In relation to the proposed dormer, paragraph 4.2 of the SPD states that ‘where buildings of three or more storeys are proposed, or there is a marked difference in levels, it may be necessary for the minimum distances set out in (ii) and (iii) above to be increased.’ The proposed dormer would be a minimum of 13.4m to the rear boundary and a minimum of 32.8m from the rear elevation of the properties on Weston Avenue. It is noted that the distance to the properties on Weston Avenue would be greater than the proposed two storey rear extension and greater than the existing. It is considered, even with the addition of the windows on the second floor, the distance between the proposed dormer and the properties to the rear are sufficiently big enough to not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of the properties opposite the proposed dormer. It is therefore considered that the proposed dormer extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of the properties on Weston Avenue.

The proposed two storey rear extension would be set close to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property of no.9. The proposed extension would be 1.1m from the shared boundary and would not project beyond the rear elevation of the no. 9. It would therefore meet the maximum standards set out paragraphs 5.8 – 5.10 of the SPD.

The submitted floor plans indicate the provision of adequate natural light to all habitable rooms in addition to the retention of a suitably sized rear garden with a functional layout.

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.

The property would retain off-street parking spaces for at least two vehicles and as such would accord with the parking standard contained within Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

   Location plan. Drawing no: AS3
   Existing Site Plan. Drawing no: AS4
   Proposed Elevations (Proposed site plan). Drawing no: AL2
   Proposed Elevations. Drawing no: AV1 Rev B. Received 22/06/2021
   Existing Plans. Drawing no: AS1
   Existing Elevations. Drawing no: AS2
   Proposed Plans. Drawing no: AL1 rev B. Received 22/06/2021
   Proposed Section. Drawing no: AX1 Rev A

   and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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	28/07/2021	Signed: MM
Authorisation	28/07/2021	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir