

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00194/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00194/HOUS
Location:	15 Piethorne Close, Newhey, Rochdale, OL16 3RH
Proposal:	Front and rear dormer extensions together with alterations to front entrance doorway
Applicant:	Mr Brett Mills
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 05.05.2025	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. 15 Piethorne Close, a semi-detached bungalow located in Newhey. The dwelling is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac and is adjoined by no. 16 Piethorne Close to the north-west, adjacent to no. 14 Piethorne Close to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north-east. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto open recreational space to the south-west.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements to the dwelling, including the following:

- ☐ A flat roof front dormer which measures 4.41m in width, 1.5m in height and 2.74m in depth ; and
- ☐ A flat roof rear dormer which measures 6m in width, 1.96m in height and 4.4m in depth. The dormers would be constructed in uPVC or Cedar weatherboard cladding.

The proposed plans also indicate the addition of one roof light to the front roof slope and the relocation of the front entrance door opening, both of which would be in materials matching the existing fenestration.

Relevant History

19/01273/HOUS - Front dormer extension – Grant subject to conditions

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

- ② 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.
- ② The proposal seeks to construct two flat roof dormers on the front and rear roof slope of the dwelling respectively. 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.”*

- ☐ The surrounding street scene is characterised by semi-detached bungalows of redbrick construction. A number of dwellings comprises front and rear flat roof dormer extensions, in particular nos. 7, 13 and 17, which feature flat roof dormers to the front roof slope. The remaining dormer extensions do not have any associated planning history but appear to have been extant in excess of 18 years. Given this site context, it is considered the proposed front dormer would not detract from the established character and appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable in principle in this location.
- ☐ The proposed front dormer is modestly-sized, set down from the ridge line, and sufficiently set away from the side walls and eaves. The use of a flat roof form would be consistent with the established appearance of flat roof dormers in the vicinity. The submitted plans indicate the dormer to be constructed in uPVC cladding or Cedral weatherboard cladding but has not provided specific details. It is noted the extant dormers on the street scene all comprise of contrasting materials and as such, it is considered the overall architectural merits have been compromised. Notwithstanding, a standard condition for matching materials has been recommended in the interest of visual amenity.
- ☐ The proposed rear dormer extension would project beyond the rear elevation wall of the original dwelling but would be consistent with the roof form and built form of existing surrounding rear dormers. The rear dormer would also not be materially larger than the full-width rear flat roof dormers of nos. 13, 14 and 17.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed dormer extensions would comply with all points of Section 5.17 and would be acceptable.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted CS, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ 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.*”
- ☐ The proposed front dormer does not project beyond the front elevation wall of the host dwelling and is not considered to result in considerable amenity impacts in this regard. The proposed rear dormer does not face any properties to the rear.
- ☐ The proposed rear-facing single bedroom comprises an internal area of 7.44m² which falls short of the minimum area of 7.5m² as set out in the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS). However, this difference is marginal and given the bedroom would not be the principal room, it is considered adequate levels of occupier amenity would be retained.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be

retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted CS, 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 would be 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. LP001 received 27/02/2025
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing no. BP001 received 27/02/2025
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. BP002 received 10/03/2025
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan and Roof Plan – Drawing no. E001 received 27/02/2025
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing no. E002 received 27/02/2025
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Roof Plan – Drawing no. P001 received 27/02/2025
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing no. P002 received 27/02/2025

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	01/05/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	02/05/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen