

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00879/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00879/HOUS
Location:	7 Bowland Grove, Milnrow, OL16 4EX
Proposal:	Front dormer and single storey side and rear extensions following demolition of existing rear extension and detached garage.
Applicant:	Mr Michael Shaw
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 21.10.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

This application relates to no. 7 Bowland Grove, a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential area of Milnrow. The application property adjoins no. 5 Bowland Grove to the northwest and is adjacent to no. 9 Bowland Grove to the southeast. The rear boundary of the curtilage backs onto the rear gardens of nos. 33 and 35 Beechfield Road.

The established street scene is characterised by semi-detached bungalows with several having constructed front dormer extensions.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a flat roofed dormer to the front roof slope of the dwelling and a flat roofed single storey side and rear extension. The dormer would measure approximately 7.67m in length, 1.74m in height and 2.64m in depth and would be constructed in materials to match the host dwelling. The single storey extension would project approximately 1.55m from the existing side elevation and 4m from the existing rear elevation. The northwest corner of the extension would be cut out with

the depth reducing to 3.05m along the common boundary with the adjoining property. The extension would be set away from the common boundary with no. 5 Bowland Grove by between 0.45m and 0.15m and a gap of between 0.78m and 1.11m would be retained between the extension and the common boundary with no. 9 Bowland Grove. The extension would be constructed brickwork to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

25/00880/CPL – Certificate of lawfulness for rear dormer – Pending determination.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. 32 letters of support and 6 objections were received.

The objections raised the following concerns:

- Loss of light and overshadowing impacts.
- Excessive scale and visually overbearing.
- The rear extension is disproportionate and non-subservient.
- Principle of front dormer is unacceptable.
- Front dormer is too large and out of character with street.
- Impact on parking capacity with limited on-street parking.
- Increased surface and foul water discharge and associated flood risk.
- A similar application for a front dormer was refused on the street.
- Impact of noise during construction.

While the above concerns have been duly considered in the following report, it should be noted that the rear dormer is subject to a Certificate of Lawful Development (CLD) and cannot be considered under the current application.

Also, comments have made reference to a similar application for a front dormer that was refused by the Council. While an address or application reference has not been provided, it is noted that an application for front and rear dormers at 8 Bowland Grove was withdrawn in June 2019 (application reference 19/00501/HOUS). It is unclear why this application was withdrawn; however, each application should be determined on its individual merits.

Lastly, the impact of noise during construction is not a material planning consideration.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

The rear extension was set in further from the common boundary with no. 5 Bowland Grove to account for a drawing inaccuracy with the site boundary.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ The NPPF establishes that 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.
- ☐ The proposal seeks to construct a front dormer. 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.' 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 dwelling sits within a street scene characterised by semi-detached bungalows. While dormer extensions are not an original feature of dwellings, it is noted that several properties along the street have constructed front dormers, including no. 12 Bowland Grove which is directly opposite the application property.
- ☐ In this context and given that the scale and design of the dormer would be dissimilar to the front dormers at nos. 12 and 16 Bowland Grove, it is not considered that the front dormer proposed under the current application would appear out of character when viewed from the public highway.
- ☐ Moreover, the proposed dormer would be modestly sized; adequately set away from the eaves and side walls of the dwelling; aligned with the ground-floor windows; and constructed from matching materials. While flat roofs are generally discouraged by the SPD, it is noted that the nearby front dormers have flat roofs.
- ☐ With the above in mind, it is considered the design of the proposed front dormer would not result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ☐ Although the proposed single storey extension would have a relatively large scale, it is not considered to be disproportionate. The extension would be set well back from the front elevation and would not be widely visible from the public highway.
- ☐ Overall, it is considered that the proposed extensions would be acceptable, in accordance with CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 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.

- ☐ Taking into account section 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed dormer would be set back 0.93m from the front elevation of the dwelling and would be sited in excess of 21m and 15m from the front-facing first floor windows of no. 12 Bowland Grove and its front curtilage boundary respectively. As such, no concerns are had regarding any adverse overlooking impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states '*it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.*'
- ☐ The proposed single storey extension would comply with the projection limit for single storey extensions outlined in section 5.6 of the SPD given the corner cut out and separation from the common boundary with the adjoining property.
- ☐ While it is noted that it would result in a degree of overshadowing towards the neighbouring windows and rear patio of no. 5 Bowland Grove, it is noted that some of this harm is a result of the existing extension to the rear of no. 5.
- ☐ No. 9 Bowland Grove is set back approximately 4.5m from the application property, meaning the proposed extension would not project further rearward than the rear elevation of no. 9. Moreover, it was noted on a site visit that the side elevation of no. 9 does not contain any principal windows to habitable rooms.
- ☐ As such, it is considered that the single storey extension would comply with the SPD guidance and would have an acceptable impact on the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ For a dwelling of the proposed size, the Council's maximum parking standards require two off-street parking spaces, excluding garages.
- ☐ While the proposed side extension would result in the loss of some driveway space, the driveway would still have a length of approximately 11.6m, which is sufficient length for two cars.
- ☐ Therefore, the proposed development would not conflict with the Council's parking standards and the provision of parking spaces would be acceptable 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:

- ☐ Site Location Plan
- ☐ Scheme 3 – Existing Details. Dwg no. 25.3646.SC3.1
- ☐ Scheme 3 – Proposed Scheme Details. Dwg no. 25.3646.SC3.2A
- ☐ Scheme 3 – Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Dwg no. 25.3646.SC3.3B

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 match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture. This includes a requirement for hung tiles to match the main roof for the front dormer extension hereby permitted.

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, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	06/10/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	14/10/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Bob Melling