

Officers Report

Case Reference: 25/01132/HOUS
Location: 181 Bolton Road
Rochdale
OL11 3LR
Proposal: Refurbishment of Existing dormer, Proposed Rear Dormer with an increase to the Ridge height of the Main Dwelling by 225mm, Replacement of all existing Windows plus the construction of a Portico at the front of the property
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Sam Yuen

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to no. 181 Bolton Road, a large two-storey detached dwelling in Castleton. The property is sited prominently on a corner plot at the junction with Matthew Moss Lane. It is adjacent to no. 183 Bolton Road to the west, adjacent to a public house 'Success to the Plough' to the east, and faces the highway and Springfield Park to the north. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the grounds of Matthew Moss High School to the south. The property is set Bolton Road/A58 is a high-trafficked classified road which connects Rochdale Town Centre and Heywood.

PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements and alterations to the dwelling, including the following:

- Raising of the ridge height of the main dwelling by 0.2m, and of the attached garage by 0.13m.
- Replacement of all existing dark grey concrete roof tiles with red clay roof tiles.
- Erection of a flat roof dormer of black uPVC cladding to the rear roof slope which measures 14.24m in length, 2.6m in height and 3.15m in depth.
- Erection of a front porch extension above a 0.3m-high raised platform, extending 1.9m from the existing front projection. It is characterised by a portico-like design with a dual-pitched roof and supporting columns and has a ridge height of 3.17m and height to eaves of 2.51m. The north and east-facing elevation of the porch would be bounded by balustrades of maximum 1.2m height.
- Refurbishment of existing rear flat roof dormer with black uPVC cladding.
- Insertion of 2no. roof lights to the front roof slope.

- Replacement of all windows and fascia with black uPVC.

PLANNING HISTORY

80/D10440 - Two Storey Side Extension And Dormer Bedroom Over Garage – Grant subject to conditions

79/D08299 - Two Storey Side Extension To Dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

78/D06379 - Attached Double-Garage - Grant subject to conditions

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

N/A

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:

Policy JP-G7 Trees and Woodland

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:

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)

DESIGN

The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PfE 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.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states “development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”

The host dwelling is a large detached redbrick dwelling sited on a generous plot bounded by mature trees and hedging. More widely, the property forms part of a street lined with similarly large dwellings, each with its own individual style. The street scene is lined with trees and grass verges and has an attractive and leafy character.

The proposal seeks to remodel the host dwelling through a number of enlargements and alterations. The majority of the proposed works have been completed, with the exception of the front porch extension. At the time of the Officer's visit, an unconnected uPVC pipe has been installed to the east-facing side elevation wall. It was also noted most of the existing front garden landscaping, including a mature tree to the corner of the road junction, have been recently removed.

The proposed increase in ridge height is marginal and the scale of the enlarged dwelling is not considered to have a material visual impact to the street scene. However, it was noted that as a result of the raised height there is a prominent gap between the brick corbels and the eaves which falls short of an acceptable construction standard and quality.

Significant concerns are had regarding the external material finish used in the alterations. The use of the red Roman roof tiles is a stark contrast to the previous dark grey tiles and appears conspicuous and incongruous in the context of the immediate street scene. This harm is further exacerbated by the use of mismatched black uPVC in the fascia and dormer cladding which also constitutes a poor quality and obtrusive material.

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. 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 proposed enlargement comprises a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope of the dwelling, in an area which is currently absent of dormer extensions. Notwithstanding its rear siting, the structure remains readily visible from the public vantage points from Bolton Road and Matthew Moss Lane due to its proximity to the highway.

The flat roof dormer extends the full width of the dwelling and is flush with the side walls of the dwelling and has resulted in the loss of the rear cross-gabled section of the original dwelling. At its most prominent position from Matthew Moss Lane, the dormer has fully obscured the roof line and appears to have altered the built form of the dwelling into a three-storey building. The use of black uPVC cladding constitutes a poor-quality material finish which is at odds with the material palette of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

By virtue of its excessive scale, siting, flat roof form, material and design, the proposed rear dormer fails to comply with points (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vii) of Section 5.17 and would not be acceptable.

The proposed front porch extension comprises a large roof canopy also of uPVC and red roman roof tile construction. The resultant development is an obtrusive structure which appears out of scale and dominant against the front façade. As it stands, the canopy is supported by slender wooden columns which would be covered with decorative Doric-style columns under the proposed plans. Notwithstanding its material finish, the columns would appear derivative and out of keeping with the simple and regular forms of the surrounding building line.

It is regrettable the existing mature tree and soft landscaping to the front curtilage have been removed, which together with retrospective works have been detrimental to the verdant character of the area.

Taken as a whole, the proposed enlargements and alterations constitute a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design, significantly undermining and inflicting undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore wholly unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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 rear dormer is sited 6m from the common boundary with no. 183 and angled towards Matthew Moss Lane. It is also sited in excess of 30m and heavily screened by a line of mature trees from the rear-facing high school building. As such, no adverse harm has been identified in relation to loss of privacy.

The increase in ridge height of both the dwelling and garage is marginal and is not considered to have a material impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

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.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

The proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Refusal(s) (2)

- 1 The totality of the proposed development constitutes a substandard level of design quality and appearance which undermine the verdant character of the immediate street scene. In particular, the flat roof dormer and front

porch extension are wholly dominant and disproportionate additions which disrupts the built form of the host dwelling. The use of red Roman roof tiles and black uPVC cladding represents poor quality and unsympathetic material finish and is not acceptable. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 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

1

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan and Existing and Proposed Site Plan – drawing no. P07 received 07/11/2025
- Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan – drawing no. P01 received 07/11/2025
- Existing and Proposed First Floor Plan – P02A received 25/11/2025
- Proposed Dormer Floor Plan – drawing no. P03 received 07/11/2025
- Existing and Proposed Roof Plan – drawing no. P04 received 07/11/2025
- Existing and Proposed Front and Side Elevation – drawing no. P05 received 07/11/2025
- Existing and Proposed Rear and Side Elevation – drawing no. P06 received 07/11/2025