

Application Number:	23/00207/HOUS
Location:	105 Mount Road, Middleton, M24 1EZ
Proposal:	Front dormer and alteration to front fenestration
Applicant:	Mrs Debra Plunkett
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
Recommendation:	Refuse

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

The application refers to no. 105 Mount Road, a two storey, semi-detached bungalow located on an architecturally similar street in East Middleton. The dwelling faces west on to the highway, adjoining to no. 107 to the south and adjacent to no.103 to the north. The rear boundary of curtilage backs on to nos. 18 and 20 Frampton Close and the front of the dwelling is situated opposite nos. 156 and 158 Mount Road. The existing dwelling benefits from a two storey side extension, rear dormer and rear conservatory with off-road parking to the front of the dwelling and a sufficiently sized rear garden.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a front dormer extension that would have a depth of approximately 3.76m with a width across of 6.18m and a height of 2.04m. It would be constructed using vertically hung tiles to match the rear dormer and brown UPVC to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

04/D42825 Front Dormer Extension To Dwelling.
Withdrawn

05/D45310 Two Storey Side Extension To Dwelling.
Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The application would not seem to have any impact on the surrounding highway network..

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and one letter was received in support and one in objection to the proposed development.

The objection raised the following concerns:

- Impact of additional rain water run-off into the overflowing downpipe.

Officer's response: It is not considered that the proposed dormer would result in additional rain water run-off into the down pipe.

- Is the maximum for extensions 15% of the total original volume?

Officer's response: There is no limit on what can be applied for under planning permission. Assessment on the acceptability of the proposal is provided below.

There were no comments made on the representation in support.

Policy

National

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

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that proposals should 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 whilst also ensuring that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned.

Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD states that dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway. Therefore it is important that they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted.

Section 5.17 of the SPD offers the following principles that should apply in the determination of applications that include 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 proposed front dormer would be set down from the ridge line, back from the eaves line and in from the side walls of the existing dwelling. Further, whilst it would have a flat roof, this is considered acceptable given that the proposed dormer has been designed to match the exiting rear dormer. The proposed materials would match the existing rear dormer and this is considered to accord with the design language of the host dwelling. Additionally, the proposed fenestration would both match and align with the existing ground floor fenestration.

Notwithstanding the above, the SPD makes it clear that front dormers will not normally be permitted unless circumstances exist that justify a relaxation of the guidelines. The application property is mostly seen in conjunction with those properties situated along the section of Mount Road which is intersected by Naunton Road. Along this section of Mount Road the street scene is generally devoid of front

dormer extensions. This results in a sense of rhythm to the pattern of development in this location.

The most prominent examples of front dormers along this section of Mount Road are to nos. 138 and 150. In respect of no. 150, the front dormer predates current national and local planning policies and guidance. Further, it is considered to constitute poor design and, therefore, it is important that the Council does not encourage development that does not comply with current policies and guidance.

In respect of no. 156, permission was granted for a front dormer extension in October 2020 (ref: 20/01326/HOUS). Whilst it was considered against the same local guidance as this application, it should be acknowledged that the front dormer to no. 156 was granted on the basis that it replaced an existing dormer, was modest in size and kept the balance with the adjoining property. The dormer proposed under this application would be larger in scale than the one granted under 20/01326/HOUS, would not be replacing an existing front dormer and would upset the balance shared with the attached property.

Therefore, the provision of a dormer to the front of the application property would significantly detract from the existing appearance of the property and the character and appearance of the neighbouring properties and adversely impact on the appearance of the existing street scene.

The design is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

DM1 (c) of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy outlines that development should not “adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.” Paragraph 5.17 (vii) of the SPD states that “dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in section 4.”

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires “21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of curtilage.” The plans confirm that the proposed front dormer extension would measure approximately 25m to the opposing dwellings on Mount Road. It is therefore considered that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring amenity through an unacceptable loss of privacy or increased overlooking.

The plans confirm the provision of 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.

In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would accord with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development would not impact the current provision of parking available at the property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason:

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed front dormer extension would harmfully impact the character and uniformity of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and 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 developments. 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	29/03/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	20/04/2023	Signed: RC

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Site Block And Location Plan. Drg no. 694-01
- Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 694-02
- Existing First Floor Plan. Drg no. 694-03
- Existing Roof Plan. Drg no. 694-04
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 694-05
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 694-06
- Proposed First Floor Plan. Drg no. 694-07
- Proposed Roof Plan. Drg no. 694-08
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 694-09

Report Author Bob Melling