

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0167
Location: 11 Trent Avenue, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3EX
Proposal: Single storey side and rear extensions, new side dormer extension, roof light to side elevation of roof, and alterations to fenestration including new front door and window, following demolition of existing dormer – Resubmission of PL/2025/1190
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Majid Mir

Location

The application relates to no. 11 Trent Avenue; a detached bungalow located in a residential suburb in Milnrow. No. 11 is located at the end, and by the turning circle, of the cul-de-sac. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 26 Trent Avenue to the west and no. 9 Trent Avenue to the east. No. 26 is located to the side, and like no. 11, it is located close to the shared boundary. No. 9 is located in advance of the front elevation of no. 11 and is set at a 90-degree angle to no. 11.

The rear curtilage boundary backs onto open land.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of one flat roof dormer to the eastern side roof slope, following the removal of the existing flat roof dormer. The existing and proposed dormer face towards the side boundary of no. 9. The dormer would be constructed in grey vertical cladding. A roof light is proposed on the western facing roof slope.

The application also proposes to construct a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed extension would wrap around the side and rear of the host property. The application proposes to render the proposed extension in a white colour.

The application proposes to replace an existing window on the front elevation with a new front door and glazing. Render will be added to where the opening will be infilled. The existing dormer to the side will be demolished.

Relevant History

PL/2025/1190 - Single storey side and rear extension including raised platform and glass balustrade to the rear, dormer to both sides, application of render and alteration to fenestration following demolition of existing dormer to side and detached garage. Decision: Refuse. Reasons for refusal:

1. By virtue of its size, height, design and materials, the proposed dormer extensions and single storey front and side extension constitutes a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the host dwelling which would represent poor design and appears out of keeping to the appearance of the host dwelling. The proposed development represents an unsatisfactory standard of design and constitutes undue visual harm to the character and visual appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed raised platform would offer unrestricted views into the rear garden areas of adjacent number 26 Trent Avenue and would result in an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property through an unacceptable loss of privacy. Furthermore, by virtue of their proximity, the side facing bedroom windows within the proposed dormer would face towards no.26 at such proximity that their amenity would be unduly harmed, should they undertake works under extant permitted development rights. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed dormer facing west and towards number 26 Trent Avenue would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of outlook to the proposed upper floor bedroom through insufficient space between the bedroom window and number 26 Trent Avenue. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No representations have been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

Design and Appearance

The proposal seeks to replace the existing dormer with one larger dormer on the side of the 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 a number of principles.

The existing dormer has a flat roof; however, it is set approximately 2m up the roof plane and is considered to be proportionate. The proposed dormer would cover the vast majority of the roof plane and would be set up from the roof plane by approximately 0.4m. In comparison to the existing dormer, that would be an increased projection of 1.6m.

The proposed dormer would meet a number of the principles set out in section 5.17 of the SPD, however, paragraph 5.17 states that flat roof dormers should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area. Noting the existing street scene, there are substantial full-width flat roof dormers that are prevalent additions to bungalows in the area. Flat roof dormers have become ubiquitous in the immediate area; however, it appears many of these were consented prior to the adoption of the SPD, and others appear to have been constructed under permitted development rights. When compared to the previous application, the mass, scale and prominence of flat roof dormers have been substantially reduced by proposing one enlarged dormer. Furthermore, it is noted that the application site is located at the end of cul-de-sac. The proposed dormer would have limited visual prominence within the street scene.

In regard to the proposed use of vertical grey cladding, it would fail to be constructed out of matching materials. It is however noted that numerous dormers within the immediate vicinity of the site that have been constructed with various different materials, including white cladding and to a lesser extent, grey cladding. The inconsistency in materiality has resulted in a discordant character within the wider street scene. Whilst the use of a matching material of a better quality would be preferred, the use of grey cladding would not appear wholly out of keeping with the existing material palette. Furthermore, it is noted that the application now only proposes one dormer and therefore limits the amount of cladding. Given this specific site context, on balance, it is considered a relaxation of the guidelines would be justified and the proposed dormer would be acceptable.

The application also proposes a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed extension would have a flat roof that would wrap around the side and rear of the host property. The addition of the flat roof extension would appear at odds with the character of the host property and would not be in keeping. The use of render exacerbates the poor design of the extension and would make it more prominent. The use of brick that matches the host property would be preferable and would reduce the prominence of the proposed extension.

Further to the above, the poor design is further characterised by the eaves height of the proposed extension sitting above the eaves height of the host property. It is however noted that this element of the proposal would be visible fleetingly from the highway. Furthermore, there are numerous flat roofed structures within the immediate vicinity of the application site with flat roof structures becoming ubiquitous in the surrounding area. When viewed from the highway, the proposed extension would appear as a relatively subservient addition to the host property.

When taken as a whole, the amendments to the proposal have seen a reduction of the amount of flat roof structures proposed, and thereby the overall prominence of the flat roof structures. The overall design and form of the proposal would not be out of character for the surrounding area.

The proposed alterations to the fenestration are considered to be acceptable.

On balance, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this location, and therefore it is considered that it accords with policies, P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, PfE, SPD and NPPF.

Amenity

The proposed dormer would have three windows on the side elevation facing towards no. 9. Two windows would be for bedrooms and one window for an ensuite. The bedroom windows would be sited approximately between 5m and 9m from the shared side boundary with no. 9. It is noted that there is already a dormer with two bedrooms facing towards no. 9. The proposed dormer would reduce the distance by approximately 1.6m. The proposed windows would not directly face any windows and would have obscured views of the windows on dormer of no.9. Furthermore, the main garden area is located to the rear of no. 9 and the distance exceeds 10.5m. Considering the existing arrangement, it is considered the proposed extension would not substantially alter existing arrangement to warrant a refusal.

The rear element of the proposed single storey extension would project out by 4m when measured from the shared boundary from the rear elevation of no. 26. As such it would adhere to standards set out in paragraph 5.6 of the SPD.

Along with not unduly impacting on the amenity of neighbour properties, developments are required to provide a high standard of amenity for the occupiers of the application property. All habitable rooms would receive an adequate amount of light and outlook. It is noted that the room identified as a gym on the proposed plans will have access to roof lantern and an elevated window that is set approximately 1.6m off the ground floor level. It is noted that the room would not be used as a habitable room but as a functional room. Functional rooms do not receive the same level of protection as habitable rooms. In this instance, is considered likely that the room would be used as a functional room and as such is considered acceptable.

A sufficient amount out of outdoor amenity space would be retained for the size of the dwelling following the proposed alterations.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and accords with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, PfE, SPD and NPPF.

Highways

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 proposal would not see an increase in the number of bedrooms, and therefore in accordance with the Core Strategy, the property would require a maximum of two parking spaces. The addition of the proposed single storey extension would see the existing drive to the side reduced. The proposed extension would see the length of the existing drive reduced to approximately 8.2m. The SPD requires a minimum of 4.8m per parking space. It is however noted that there is sufficient space for additional parking to the front, if required.

Furthermore, it is noted that the planning officer for the previous application considered that the proposal was acceptable in regard to parking and road safety.

On balance, the proposal is considered acceptable and accords with policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 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 development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Planning: Proposed and Existing Plans. Drawing number: PL01 rev D.
Received by email on 17/04/2026

- Planning: Proposed and Existing Plans. Drawing number: PL02 rev D.
Received by email on 17/04/2026

- Planning: Existing Site Plan. Drawing number: PL03

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, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 No above ground works shall take place until such time as a detailed specification and/or samples of materials to be used externally in the construction of the development have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development

shall be carried out in accordance with the duly approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.