

Application Number:	23/00848/HOUS
Location:	52 Newhouse Road, Heywood, OL10 2NU
Proposal:	Front dormer extension and alterations to existing roof (part retrospective)
Applicant:	Mr Stephen Lavelly
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
Recommendation:	Refuse

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

This application relates to no. 52 Newhouse Road, a detached dormer bungalow located on an architecturally similar street in Heywood. The dwelling faces the highway to the southwest, adjacent to no. 50 Newhouse Road to the southeast and to no. 54 Newhouse Road to northwest. It is faced to the front by the rear elevation no. 9 Mossland Close and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear garden of no. 34 Sunningdale Drive. The host dwelling benefits from front and rear box-style dormers and is constructed in beige brick, brown roof tiles and white uPVC.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a front dormer extension with a dual-pitched roof. It would be constructed in materials to match the host dwelling. The submitted plans also indicate the alteration of the existing eaves line to the front roof slope, which would be extended above the existing front porch and garage door.

A site visit was conducted on 17th October 2023, where it was noted that development had commenced on site. As a result, the description of development was amended to include the words 'part retrospective'.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The proposed dormer extension would seem to have no impact on current parking provision for this site, which is in line with Council parking standards.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed dormer extension.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

In conclusion, Highways would raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires *“development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.”* Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all new development must *“enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.”*
- ② The application site is a detached bungalow situated in a residential area in Heywood. The subject property is sited within a row of four detached bungalows; all of which share a strong building style. As a result, there is a symmetry and cohesive character of development in this location. Each bungalow benefits from a modest, box-style dormer to the front elevation and there is a strong building line.
- ② Paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the SPD states that *“the materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof.”* The proposed dormer would be constructed in white uPVC shiplap cladding and brown roof tiles to match the materiality of the current front dormer and main roof. Generally dormers are of a higher quality design if the materials match those seen on the existing roof, i.e. faced in hung tiles. However, in this instance, given the materials used on the existing dormer and neighbouring It is therefore considered that the proposed material palette and the use of would be sympathetic to the character of the application dwelling and the wider street scene.
- ② 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. In addition, it states that front dormers will not normally be permitted. Although the proposal to some extent would adhere to the SPD requirements, for example it is set back from the eaves and ridge, it is considered that the front dormer would harmfully alter the appearance of the street. The street scene includes modest, box-style front dormers that occupy only a small portion of the overall roof slope. There is a consistency to the existing dormer extensions, giving a neat and relatively uniform appearance to the street scene. The proposed front dormer extension would have a disproportionate and harmful scale, projecting much further forward than the existing front dormer. This would unbalance the existing pattern of development along the street scene and would appear particularly prominent from public vantage points. It is therefore considered that the front dormer would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the host dwelling and wider street.
- ② In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not “adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.” Paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the SPD states that “dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in section 4.”
- ❑ Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD documents the minimum spatial standards all new developments must comply with to ensure they avoid a significant loss of privacy or light to any neighbouring amenity. The proposed front dormer extension would measure approx. 26.5m to the directly facing rear elevation of no. 9 Mossland Close and would comply with the 21m requirement. In addition, the dormer would also measure approx. 18.5m to the directly facing neighbour’s boundary and would accord with the 10.5m standard. It is therefore considered that the relationship with the neighbouring properties to the front is acceptable.
- ❑ An additional assessment has been undertaken to assess the harm to the adjacent neighbours. The adjacent property at no. 54 Newhouse Road contains a front-facing dormer window. However, whilst the dormer proposed under this application would project beyond this window, there is a sufficient separation distance between the properties to ensure that there would be no undue loss of light or outlook.
- ❑ The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ❑ In view of the above assessment, 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 proposed development would not impact the existing provision of off road parking currently available at the host property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design and size, the proposed front dormer extension would be unduly prominent and would be an incongruous addition to the application property and wider street scene. It would unbalance the existing pattern of development to the street and would significantly alter the visual amenity of

the immediate locality. The proposed dormer have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the host property and street scene and fail to comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	24/10/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	25/10/2023	Signed: RC

INFORMATIVE:

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

- Location Plan – received 21/09/2023
- Site Plans – received 21/09/2023
- Existing Site Plans – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed Site Plans – received 21/09/2023
- Existing Front Elevation S/W – received 21/09/2023
- Existing S/E Elevation – received 21/09/2023
- Existing N/E Elevation – received 21/09/2023
- Existing N/W Elevation – received 21/09/2023
- Existing Ground Floor Plan – received 21/09/2023
- Existing First Floor – received 21/09/2023
- Existing Roof Plan – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed Front Elevation – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed First Floor – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed N/W Elevation – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed S/E Elevation – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed First Floor – received 21/09/2023
- Proposed Roof Plan – received 21/09/2023

Report Author Bob Melling