

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00573/HOUS**

<b>Application Number:</b>	25/00573/HOUS
<b>Location:</b>	22 Grandidge Street Rochdale OL11 3SA
<b>Proposal:</b>	Front and rear dormer extensions to facilitate loft conversion.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Naeem Ashraf
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Rosalind Gralton
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	<b>Refuse</b>

<b>DELEGATION</b>	<b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b>	<b>N</b>
	<b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>	<b>N</b>
	<b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b>	<b>N</b>

<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>Planning Panel comments received?</b>	<b>N</b>
	<b>Neighbour comments received?</b>	<b>N</b>

<b>CONDITIONS</b>	<b>Pre-commencement conditions proposed?</b>	<b>n/a</b>
	<b>Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?</b>	<b>n/a</b>

**Location**

The application relates to 22 Grandidge Street, a two storey terrace property located in Rochdale. The property benefits from an existing single storey front extension, single storey rear extensions, and appears to be externally rendered with a painted finish.

The property has a small external courtyard area and bins are stored at the rear of the property.

The site is located within the defined urban area and is not within the setting of a listed building or conservation area.

**Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for a front and rear box style dormer.

To the front dormer this would measure 1.8m high, 4.2m length and 3.8m depth, with a volume of 14.36m<sup>3</sup>.

To the rear dormer this would measure 1.8m high, 4.2m length and 3.8m depth with a volume of 14.36m<sup>3</sup>.

## **Relevant History**

24 Grandidge Street:

93/D29596 - Front And Rear Dormer Extensions To Dwelling Grant subject to conditions 1993-08-05

## **Township/Member comments**

None

## **Consultee responses**

Not applicable

## **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties 05/06/2025; no objections were raised.

## **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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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**

None.

The case officer contacted the agent advising them of the refusal with an opportunity to amend the scheme to remove the front dormer and redesign the rear dormer; this was declined.

## **Assessment**

### **Design: DM1 and P3**

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that 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.

### *Dormers:*

The Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD recognises that dormer extensions can appear incongruous if not designed and sited carefully. As such, paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 of the SPD establish design principles for dormer extensions, the following of which, the dormer extensions fail to comply with:

- Front dormer extensions will not normally be permitted;
- dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof;
- they should be set back from the eaves line;
- they should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;
- 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;
- the materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof.

It should be noted that paragraph 5.18 concedes that it may be acceptable to relax the guidelines on dormer extensions in some instances. The adjoining neighbour at 24 Grandidge Street benefits from an existing front and rear dormer extension, granted under reference 93/D29596, in a very similar design as to the proposed dormers. However, no other front dormers are located along the southern side of

Grandidge Street, and the existing front dormers along the terrace row on the northern side of Grandidge Street are much more modest in design and smaller than the existing dormers at no 24 Grandidge Street.

The proposed front and rear dormer extension would result in a bulky, visually egregious and incongruous feature in the streetscene. The erection of the proposed front and rear dormer would contribute to the further erosion of the roofscape on Grandidge Street.

While the neighbouring dormer at 24 benefitted from planning permission, the erected dormer, clad in white UPVC, dominates the roofscape, does not represent a high standard of design, nor is reflective of the rigorous design policies reflected in planning policy in present day, which present a policy context which is clearly materially different to that when permission was granted for the adjacent property. Notwithstanding, the proposed dormer would comprise a visually stark and harmful addition that would only exacerbate the incongruity of dormers within the streetscape given its proximity to, and cumulative bulk of no.24's dormer. It would clearly highlight that such features do not sit comfortably within the established character and would be harmful as a result.

The siting, materiality and scale of the dormer would not mitigate the harm identified and only serve to exacerbate the harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Based on these issues the design of the dormers are wholly unacceptable. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

As such, the design of the development is deemed to be especially harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding built environment, and fails to accord with the NPPF, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

#### **Amenity: DM1 and SPD**

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Section 4 of the Council's SPD states the following in relation to spade standards:

*'4.1 Although it is expected that most new development will have some impact on neighbours, it is important to ensure that the impact is not so significant that it results in unacceptable harm. All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings.'*

*The following minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties:*

- (i) 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an*

- upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage (Figure 2);*
- (ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 3);*
  - (iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 4). 4.2 Where buildings of three or more storeys are proposed, or there is a marked difference in levels, it may be necessary for the minimum distances set out in (ii) and (iii) above to be increased.'*

To the rear 10 and 12 Elm Grove are located; which are the end properties at row of single storey terraced bungalows. The proposed front and rear dormer windows would retain a 14.4m distance to No 10 and 12; and therefore comply with the above guidance. To the north of the application site, no properties face directly south onto the property, and no unacceptable rise in overlooking would be caused. As such, the guidance above is satisfied.

Regarding internal amenity, all new habitable rooms are served with an adequate level of natural light which is considered sufficient. The proposed dormers would not seek to cause loss of light of any adjacent property.

Overall, the proposed dormer would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupants, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

**Recommendation: Refuse**

1. By virtue of its poor design, the proposed dormers as carried out, is considered to be excessive, domineering, and incongruous relative to the host dwelling and surrounding context. As such, the design is especially harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding built environment and fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Council Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

**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.

**Notes for Applicant:**

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

Proposed Site Plan Dwg No -25-05 05. Rev A – received 02/07/2025

Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Dwg No -25-05 02 Rev. – received 06/06/2025

Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Dwg No -25-05 01 Rev. – received 06/06/2025

Dormer Section Details – Dwg No -25-05 03 Rev. – received 06/06/2025

Existing Block Plan – Dwg No -25-05 05 Rev. – received 25/06/2025

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Officer</b>
<b>Report Completed</b>	20/08/2025	Signed: RGR
<b>Authorisation</b>	27/08/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Rosalind Galton