

Application Number:	24/00768/HOUS
Location:	9 Biggin Gardens, Heywood, OL10 2WF
Proposal:	Proposed front and rear dormer and single storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Tomlinson
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 03.10.2024	EXT OF TIME
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. 9 Biggin Gardens, a two-storey detached dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac on a modern housing estate in Heywood. It is adjacent to no. 11 Biggin Gardens to the southwest, no. 7 Biggin Gardens to the northeast and faces no. 13 Biggin Gardens to the northwest. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto the rear gardens of nos. 11 and 13 Worthington Avenue. The property benefits from two off-street parking spaces to the front and a detached garage along the side elevation.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for three front-facing cuckoo dormers with pitched roof forms, a rear-facing dormer with a flat roof form and a single-storey rear extension with a flat roof form. The single-storey rear extension would have a depth of 4m and a length of 3.8m with a canopy roof extending across the remaining rear elevation. The three front-facing dormers would be equal in size with a height of approx. 2m, length of approx. 1.7m and depth of approx. 3m. The rear dormer would have a height of approx. 2.2m, length of approx. 8.5m and depth of approx. 3.2m with an overall volume of approx. 30m³. The single-storey rear extension would be constructed in

brickwork to match the existing, the rear dormer would be clad in hung tiles to match the existing roof and the front dormers would be finished in cream render to the faces and cheeks, with matching tiles to the roofs.

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)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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 sought to reduce the scale of the proposed front dormers.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- The NPPF establishes that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PpE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.
- 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 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 host dwelling sits within a mixed street scene and numerous surrounding dwellings comprise front dormers, namely nos. 7, 11 and 15 Biggin Gardens. Given this context, it is considered the proposed front dormers would not detract from the established appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable in principle.
- The proposed front dormers would comply with the guidance outlined in Section 5.17 of the SPD and would be sufficiently sited away from the ridge, eaves and side walls. As such, the front dormers would constitute a modest and non-intrusive addition on the roof slope.
- The proposed front dormers would be similar in design to those approved at no. 15 Biggin Gardens (application ref: 07/D49176) albeit they would be larger in scale. However, the application property is set back from the building line with less exposure to the public realm. Moreover, the varied character of the street scene and the orientation of properties would lessen the impact of the proposal on the character of the street scene.
- The proposed rear dormer would occupy the majority of the rear roof slope and would fail to comply with several points within Section 5.17 of the SPD. However, the LPA must be mindful of what can be constructed under Permitted Development (PD). The proposed dormer has a volume of approximately 30m³, which is comfortably below the 50m³ allowed under Class B of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO). On this basis, it is not considered that the scale of the dormer would warrant the refusal of the application.
- To soften the visual impact of the dormer, it would be clad in hung tiles to match the main roof. This is in compliance with Section 5.17 of the SPD with a condition recommended to ensure the use of this material.
- The rear dormer would also not be readily visible from the highway given the setback of the host property from the building line. Taking the above into account, it is considered the visual impact of the rear dormer would not be unduly harmful and would be acceptable on balance.
- No concerns are had with the single-storey rear extension and canopy roof, which could be an appropriate scale and screened from public view.
- Taken as a whole, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with CS Policies DM1 PpE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which 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.”*
- The proposed front dormers would not unduly obscure the line of sight from the front dormers of no. 11 Biggin Gardens and they would not project beyond the front elevation of no. 7 Biggin Gardens. While the dormers would directly

face no. 13 Biggin Gardens at a minimum distance of some 13m, the front elevation of no. 13 is skewed away from the application property and the facing side elevation of no. 13 is blank. Given that any views shared between the properties would be oblique, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an undue loss of privacy for the occupiers of no. 13.

- Taking into account Section 5.6 of the SPD, the proposed single-storey rear extension would comply with the projection requirements outlined. As such, the proposed single-storey rear extension would not result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- The proposed rear dormer would measure a minimum of 23.8m to the nearest first floor windows of the directly facing properties to the rear, which would accord with the 21m standard contained within Section 4.1 of the SPD. However, the dormer windows would fall approx. 0.75m short of the 10.5m standard to the rear boundary of the curtilage. Whilst less than ideal, it should be noted that the facing properties to the rear (nos. 11 and 13 Worthington Avenue) are sited on a higher ground level, which would minimise the overlooking impact. Moreover, there are large outbuildings within the rear gardens of nos. 11 and 13 which would provide some mitigation. Given the existing context and on the basis that the rear dormer could likely be constructed without planning permission, it is not considered that the approx. 0.75m shortfall of the 10.5m standard would warrant the refusal of the application.
- The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample 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 CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- CS Policy DM1 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 increase the number of bedrooms from two to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in CS Appendix 5.
- The proposals would not affect the existing parking arrangements, which remain acceptable and in accordance with CS 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:

- Block Plan & Site Plan - dated 22nd July 2024
- Existing Plans, Elevations & External Views. Dwg no. 2024 01 02
- Proposed Plans, Elevations & External Views. Dwg no. 2024 01 02. Rev A

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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 adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with drawing number 2024 01 02 (Rev A) unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	30/09/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	24/10/2024	Signed: RC