

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01191/HOUS

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/01191/HOUS

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 27.01.2025 EXT OF TIME 11.02.2025

Address: 34 Round Thorn Road Middleton M24 1FU

Proposal: Front dormer extension including alterations to front elevation

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA

DATE: 11.02.25

SITE

The site is located at 34 Round Thorn Road Middleton. The dwelling is a semi – detached bungalow with off street parking, garage, front and rear garden.

The dwelling fronts Round Thorn Road, dwellings on the same side of the street are bungalows however the dwellings opposite the site are two storey semidetached dwellings.

The site is in a residential area and within the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for two front dormers and front alterations consisting of moving the front door to the middle of the front elevation, removing all front elevation windows and moving their position. The alterations will also consist of removing the built in garage and changing it to a room.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024
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:

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).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications 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 site is within a residential area and the application is seeking to add two front dormers with front alterations consisting of altering the position of the front door and removing the built in garage. The principle of alterations to a dwelling in the urban area is acceptable.

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 128 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.

Of most relevance is the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD which sets out dormers can be visually prominent where they can be seen from the public highway and 'Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted'.

The proposed front dormers to the front elevation are highly visible from both directions on Round Thorn Road. No bungalows in the immediate street scene have front dormers, the proposed development does not fit in with the character of the area and is not considered acceptable.

The proposed development also seeks to alter the front elevation by relocating the front door to the center of the front elevation, removing and relocating existing windows and changing the built-in garage to a lounge. A skylight is also proposed on the roof.

The existing bungalows on the street follow the same form and maintain the same characteristics, no front dormers or skylights and all the doors are on the outside of the front elevation. The proposed development deviates from this and therefore is considered poor design. The proposed door in the middle of the elevation with windows either side is not in keeping with the street scene.

Overall, the proposed development does not consist of a high standard of design and does not comply with Policies DM1, P1, P3 and DM1 in Rochdale's Core Strategy, the SPD and relevant paragraphs in the NPPF.

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 SPD sets out space standards residential development should adhere to, the proposed development complies with these standards in paragraph 4.1 and will not have a negative impact on neighbour privacy.

The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

The proposed development will remove the garage and will create two new bedrooms at first floor, this is an increase in of one bedroom in total. Rochdale's Unitary Development Plan sets out in 'Schedule Of Parking Standards' Appendix C there should be two spaces per dwelling, the proposed development complies and is considered acceptable.

The development is considered acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

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.

Procedure 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.

Informative

This decision relates to the front dormers and front alterations only. The proposed rear dormer and side extension shown on the plans do not make up part of this application and have not been assessed.

Report Author Aimee Bovaird