

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Date of Meeting | 24 June 2021 |
| Portfolio | Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for a Thriving Economy |
| Report Author | Majid Mir |
| Public/Private Document | Public |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Application: 21/00433/HOUS | Township: Rochdale South | Ward: Kingsway |
| Applicant: Mr Mohammed Qurban | | Agent: Mr M Farooq |
| Site Address: 43 Berwick Street, Rochdale, OL16 5DT | | |
| Proposal: Enlargement of roof from hip to gable to incorporate new dormer extension to rear, single storey rear extension, installation of rooflight on front elevation and new window opening on existing rear extension at ground floor - resubmission of 20/00962/HOUS | | |

SITE LOCATION



DELEGATION

- 1.1 Councillor Daalat Ali has called-in the application for consideration by the Planning and Licensing Committee.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

- 2.1 Enlargement of roof from hip to gable to incorporate new dormer extension to rear, single storey rear extension, installation of rooflight on front elevation, and new window openings on the ground floor rear elevation and the second floor side elevation - resubmission of 20/00962/HOUS.

RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Planning and Licensing Committee resolves to **REFUSE planning permission.**

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The property occupies a prominent location at the end of a row of terraced properties, centrally placed with a number of terraces on either side when viewed from Bilberry Street. Each of the end properties that run along Bilberry Street have a hipped roof design, creating a uniform appearance when viewed from Bilberry Street. The proposed hip to gable extension would erode this uniformity and detract from the distinctive character and appearance of the terraces. Additionally, the proposed rear dormer would result in the roof of the existing two storey rear extension intersecting the rear elevation of the proposed dormer, creating a cluttered roof design. The proposal would therefore have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

BACKGROUND

This application is a resubmission of planning application 20/00962/HOUS, which was refused by officers in November 2020. No appeal was lodged. The proposed rear dormer has been reduced in size compared with the previous application, by setting it further up the roof plane (by 0.7m compared to 0.2m originally). Other than that, the proposal remains as previously refused.

SITE

The application relates to a traditional red brick end of terrace property located on the junction with Bilberry Street. Along Bilberry Street, there are a number terraced streets that run parallel to Berwick Street and are similar to Berwick Street. The terraced property features a hipped roof like many of the properties that sit along Bilberry Street. The properties on the opposite side of Bilberry Street, facing away from the street.

The property has a two storey extension to the rear which is set flush with the side elevation of the host property. To the rear, a convenience store with flat above occupies the end terrace of Stamford Street, but fronts onto Bilberry Street.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to enlarge the existing hipped roof of the original house to a gable roof, creating a gable end facing Bilberry Street. The proposal also includes the construction of a dormer extension to the rear, and the installation of a rooflight the front elevation of the roof. Additionally, the proposal includes a single storey rear extension, a new ground floor window opening on the existing rear extension and a new second floor window on the side elevation.

The application proposes to use materials that match the existing, with brick proposed for the elevations and slate for the roof and the proposed dormer.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

DM1 General Development Requirements
P3 Improving Design of New Development

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (June 2016)

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – February 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

RELEVANT HISTORY

20/00962/HOUS - Enlargement of roof from hip to gable to incorporate new dormer extension to rear, single storey rear extension, installation of rooflight on front elevation and new window opening on existing rear extension at ground floor.

Decision: Refused 23.11.2020. Reason for refusal:

The proposed hip to gable end roof extension would constitute an incongruous addition to the property that would be out of keeping with the uniform hipped roof design of the terrace and those adjacent terraces. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer would occupy a disproportionate amount of roof space that would lead to a cluttered roof design. The proposal would therefore have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

88/D22749 - Change Of Use Of Dwellinghouse Use To C.B.A.A Area Offices
Decision: Grant Permission subject to condition - 02 February 1989.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None.

TOWNSHIP PLANNING PANEL

None.

MEMBER REPRESENTATIONS

None.

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Objection Reps | 0 | Support Reps | 0 | Neutral Reps | 0 |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|

Letters of notification were sent by the LPA to surrounding neighbours. No representations have been received.

ANALYSIS

Design & Appearance

1. Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.
2. Additionally, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities

available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.'

3. The application property and the neighbouring traditional end of terrace properties that run along Bilberry Street hold a prominent position within the street scene. The end of terrace properties that run along Bilberry Street have a high degree of uniformity of form and design that has been created by the hipped roof design and use of traditional brick and slate.
4. The proposed hip to gable extension would erode the uniformity between the end-of-terrace properties and detract from the distinctive character and appearance that can be viewed on Bilberry Street. This would be magnified by the fact that no. 43 sits centrally between the terraces. To the west there are 3 rows of terraced properties with a similar roof design and two rows to the east. It is therefore considered that the proposed hip to gable extension would not be an appropriate form of development in this particular location. The proposed hip to gable end roof extension would constitute an incongruous addition to the property that would be out of keeping with the uniform hipped roof design of the terraced property and those adjacent terraced properties, to the detriment of the character of the street scene. In addition, although matching brickwork is proposed, it is likely that the proposal would result in an unsightly visible join between the brickwork of the existing elevation and that of the triangular addition above creating the gable end.
5. 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. The SPD adds that 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.*
6. It is noted that a number of properties on Berwick Street and Stamford Street have flat-roof rear dormer extensions that are of a similar size and design to the one proposed. In particular, no. 39 Berwick Street and no. 42 Stamford Street have similarly designed rear dormer extensions that are clearly visible from Bilberry Street. The proposed rear dormer has been reduced in size and, on balance, would not now occupy a disproportionate amount of roof space. However, the base of the proposed dormer would still be set below the ridge of

the existing two storey rear extension and therefore it would intersect the gable roof of the existing two storey extension. This would lead to a cluttered design to the rear of the property, in a prominent location visually.

7. The proposed single storey rear extension would be screened from view by the two storey extension. The proposed extension would have a monopitch roof and be constructed out of matching materials. The design of the proposed ground floor extension is considered to be acceptable. The proposed windows and rooflight are also considered acceptable in design terms.
8. In light of the above, the design of the proposal as a whole constitutes poor design and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity

9. The proposed dormer extension would face the rear elevation of the convenience store at 149 Bilberry Street and the flat on the first floor (149A). The proposed dormer would directly face the window of a habitable room on the first floor. The windows would be approximately 12.5m apart and would not therefore fall short of the minimum distance of 21m set out in the SPD. However, the proposed dormer extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of the host property, and the loss of amenity would not be substantially greater than at the present. It is therefore considered that the proposed dormer would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 149A Bilberry Street.
10. The window for the ground floor rear elevation of the existing two storey extension would serve a kitchen and would not directly face a window. The window on the second floor side elevation would directly face the side elevation of 17 and 18 Morningside Close which is 22.5 away. Additionally the window would service a landing. The proposed windows would not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties
11. The proposed single storey extension projects out the same distance as the existing two storey extension. The proposed single storey rear extension would project out by 3.15m, therefore it would exceed the limits set out in the guidance by 0.15m. However, it is considered that the additional 0.15m would not unacceptably increase the loss of light and outlook to the neighbouring property of no. 41 Berwick Street.
12. In regards to the residential amenity of the occupants of the applicant property, the addition of the proposed single storey extension would reduce the size of an already small garden to approximately 2.5m by 4.5m. However, it is noted that many of the properties along the street have similarly small gardens. The remaining space would be sufficient to dry washing and for a child to play out.
13. The window on the rear elevation of the kitchen room would be approximately 4.6m from the rear elevation of the single storey extension directly opposite. This would lead to very limited light and outlook entering the kitchen. However it is noted that the window is for a kitchen and therefore not a habitable room.

Furthermore, it is noted the existing window is on the side elevation and faces north, and therefore already receives very limited amount of light and outlook.

14. The room labelled as dining room would lose the external window due to the addition of the proposed single storey rear extension. It is however noted that there is no partition between the dining room and the room labelled living room. Therefore the room labelled as dining room would receive limited but sufficient light and outlook. Furthermore, it is noted that the rear window already receives very limited light due to the existing two store rear extension which is to the south of the window.
15. On balance, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or the application property, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning and Licensing Committee resolves to **REFUSE planning permission** for the following reason:

The proposed hip to gable end roof extension would constitute an incongruous addition to the host property that would be out of keeping with the uniform hipped roof design of the terrace and those adjacent terraces. Furthermore, the introduction of the proposed rear dormer above the existing two-storey extension would lead to a cluttered roof design. The proposal therefore constitutes poor design and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.