

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00269/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00269/HOUS
Location:	34 Roundthorn Road, Middleton, Rochdale, M24 1FU
Proposal:	Two front dormer extensions
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs M. Smith
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 19.06.2025	EXT OF TIME
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 34 Roundthorn Road, a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential context in Middleton. It is adjoined by no. 36 Roundthorn Road to the south-east, no. 32 Roundthorn Road to the north-west, and faces the highway and no. 61 Roundthorn Road to the north-east.

The established street scene is characterised by uniform building lines of semi-detached bungalows and two-storey semi-detached dwellings with unbroken roof lines.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of two gable-fronted dormers to the front roof slope of the dwelling. The dormers each measure 2.1m in length, 1.75m in height and 1.88m in depth and would be constructed in dark grey uPVC cladding to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

24/01191/HOUS - Front dormer extension including alterations to front elevation – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

1. The totality of the proposed development represents poor design as it does not reflect the existing street scene and will harm the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached bungalows. The proposed development does not follow the form of existing dwellings and is not in keeping with the character of the area, the two front dormers will be highly visible from the street scene and this is not considered acceptable. As such the proposal would not comply with policies DM1, P1, P2, P3 and C3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016) SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policies in Places for Everyone.

24/01190/CPL - Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed single storey rear and single storey side extension, rear dormer, insertion of roof light to front roof slope, alterations to fenestration on front elevation including relocation of front entrance and front porch - Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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-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)

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- 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 Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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 two dormers to the front roof slope of the dwelling. 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. 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.”*

- ② The dwelling sits within a street scene characterised by defined lines of redbrick semi-detached bungalows and two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Of note is the absence of alterations and additions to the front roof slopes of the dwellings in the immediate vicinity which contributes towards the sense of uniformity.
- ② The proposal would introduce dormer additions to an otherwise unbroken roof line and would appear somewhat prominent in this regard. Notwithstanding, the vernacular of the surrounding area is typical of late 20th century housing development and thus, its architectural merit is not considered to be so significant as to warrant its preservation from any roof alterations.
- ② Moreover, the proposed dormers are modestly sized; adequately set away from the ridge, eaves and side walls of the dwelling; aligned with the newly altered ground-floor windows; and constructed from matching materials. The proposal would therefore accord with all points of Section 5.17 of the SPD.
- ② With the above in mind, it is considered the design of the proposed front dormers would not result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable, in accordance with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted CS, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② 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.
- ② Taking into account of Section 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed dormers would be set back 0.42m from the front elevation of the dwelling and would be sited in excess of 23m and 15m from the front-facing habitable room windows of no. 61 and its front curtilage boundary respectively. As such, no concerns are

had regarding any adverse overlooking impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.

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

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ The proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property and is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted CS.

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:

- ☐ Location Plan – drawing no. 3 Rev. A received 18/03/2025
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Rev. A received 18/03/2025
- ☐ Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Section Plan – drawing no. 1 Rev. A received 18/03/2025
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – drawing no. 2 Rev. A received 18/03/2025
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Rev. A received 18/03/2025
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – drawing no. 4 Rev. A received 18/03/2025

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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.

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	03/06/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	10/06/2025	Signed:RK

Report Author Sam Yuen