

Application Number:	25/00071/HOUS
Location:	26 Morley Street Rochdale OL16 2LG
Proposal:	Proposed front and rear dormer extension
Applicant:	Afia Begum
Case Officer:	Aimee Bovaird
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

Site

The site is located at 26 Morley Street, a terraced dwelling. The dwelling does not benefit from off street parking and has a small outdoor space to the rear.

The site is located within the Defined Urban Area.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for a front a rear dormer. The dwelling consist of two floors with two bedrooms, one bathroom, kitchen and living room. The proposed development will accommodate two more bedrooms on the second floor.

The proposed front dormer would not benefit from permitted development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Policy

Places For Everyone (PfE)

JP-S1 Sustainable Development

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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

N/A

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding properties and no comments have been received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The proposed development is within the Defined Urban Area, as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

The principle of development is considered acceptable within the Defined Urban Area and further matters will be considered below.

Design

Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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. In addition, paragraphs 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The proposed development consists of a front dormer and rear dormer. The proposed front dormer window will be 3.2m wide and 1.4m in height and have a flat roof. The proposed front dormer will have a window in the front elevation.

The Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD sets out guidance for dormers. The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.16 that dormers should be well designed and dormers to the front elevation are not normally permitted. Paragraph 5.17 sets out the following for dormer extensions,

- i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the 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 ridges 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 dwellings on either side of the house do not have front dormers therefore there is an uninterrupted, uniform roofscape. In the wider street scene there are existing front dormers. The proposed front dormer will have a flat roof, this is not considered to better respect the design of the host building. It will be set in from the sides however jar with the angled ridgeline of the main dwelling of the house, this means the dormer will be visually dominant due to the scale and bulk.

Similar to the other front dormers in the wider street scene, the proposed front dormer will not be subservient to the host dwelling. The existing front dormers appear to be situated from 2005 or before, the NPPF and local policies have since been revised.

The Council have been resisting front dormers more recently, a number of recent appeals against the Council's decision to refuse consent for front dormers have been dismissed, with Appeal Inspectors concluding that front dormers are visually dominate to roofscapes, do not appear visually subservient to the host building and are severely disruptive to the roofline of terraces to the detriment of their character and appearance.

Of particular relevance is the Planning Inspectorates decision letter (26/07/13) for the appeal against refusal of planning permission for front and rear dormer extensions at 46 Sussex Street (ref APP/P4225/D/13/2200315) the Inspector stated that:

"The proposed front dormer would be flat roofed and whilst it is set down from the ridge of the roof and away from the eaves and set in from the sides, it would occupy a substantial portion of the front roof slope and be an uncomfortable addition to the building. I acknowledge that the appeal site is a detached building, however, it is in close proximity to the surrounding terraced houses and seen in this context along Sussex Street, Mere Street and Suffolk Street. The front dormer would be highly prominent in the street scene and be a visually strident feature that breaks the otherwise generally clear roofscape. Even if the front dormer was constructed in appropriate materials and to a high standard as the appellant suggests, it would not in my view make it visually acceptable."

The inspector acknowledged the presence of other front dormer extensions in the area surrounding the site but advised the following:

"I observed a number of other dormer extensions, some of which have been referred to by the appellant. These dormer are visually intrusive and are out of keeping with the character and appearance of the local area which still largely comprises of unbroken roof slopes. They would be a most unsatisfactory precedent to follow and their impact reinforces my view that the appeal proposal too, would be unsatisfactory. In any case, I have not been made aware of the considerations that were taken into account when (and if) they were permitted."

The inspector concluded with the following comments on the appeal at this site:

"The dormer proposed on the front of the appeal site would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. It thus

conflicts with policies H/11 and BE/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan which require development proposals to demonstrate good design and amongst other criteria, be compatible with the property being extended and with the character of the street scene. The proposal also conflicts with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that permission should be refused for poor design.”

The existing dormers within the street scene should not be a precedent to follow as they are considered prominent within the street scene and poor design. Therefore the proposed front dormer is considered poor design and if allowed may encourage similar proposals which would be progressively more difficult to refuse and result in cumulative harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.

The rear dormer complies with the standards set out in the SPD and is considered acceptable. The materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

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.

The proposed front dormer will not extend past the front elevation of the dwelling and therefore will not result in a reduction of separation distances the dwelling opposite.

The rear dormer does not comply fully with the standards set out in the SPD. It does not comply with the space standards set out in paragraph 4.1. The nature and layout of these terraced properties means a degree of overlooking is inevitable as the rear of properties are close together often only separated by narrow alleyways and the fronts of properties are also in close proximity to each other built up to the footways of narrow streets. On balance this contributes to the proposed development being overbearing and dominant within the street scene.

The proposed development will not have a negative impact on neighboring properties and will provide enough light and outlook for the occupiers of the existing property.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation:

Refuse for the following reason -

1. The proposed development would add an intrusive feature that would become a dominant feature within the street scene. The proposed

development is considered poor design as it will not be subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed development fails to improve the character and quality of the area and is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the requirements of 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	31/03/2025	Signed: AB
Authorisation	07/04/2025	Signed: RK

For avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans

- Location Plan
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan A 2195/2
- Proposed Elevations A 2195/3

Report Author Aimee Bovaird