

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

25/00286/HOUS

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 15.05.2025 **EXT OF TIME** 03.06.25

Address: 16 Hardfield Road Middleton Rochdale M24 1PD

Proposal: Front and rear dormers and alteration to front fenestration

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/A

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to conditions

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: TH

DATE: 29.05.2025

SITE

The site is located at 16 Hardfield Road, this is a semi detached bungalow within the Defined Urban Area. The dwelling fronts Hardfield Road and benefits from off street parking, a front and rear garden.

The dwelling is made up of red brick and the front elevation is render. The surrounding street scene is made up of similar dwellings.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a front and rear dormer, and alterations to the front fenestration. The proposed development will provide an additional bedroom and extend an existing bedroom at loft level. At ground floor changes to the existing porch are proposed, the existing window is being replaced with a smaller window.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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:

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

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

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

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The proposed application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The

site is located with a predominately residential area and the principle of development is considered acceptable.

Design

Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, which is largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

The front dormer will have a pitched roof and is proposed to be finished in materials to match the host dwelling. The form of the front dormer is considered to be somewhat at odds with that of the existing building, by including a dual-pitched roof oriented perpendicular to the main roof volume and with a slightly lower roof pitch.

However it is noted that similarly designed bungalows on the street and in the immediate surroundings have been modified with the addition of front dormers of a wide range of forms and scales, including some with the same overall form as that proposed.

In this context it is not considered that the proposed front dormer would be a particular incongruous addition to the street scene, and therefore that refusal on design grounds could not be sustained.

The rear dormer will have a flat roof and finished in materials to match the host dwelling. The rear dormer is considered acceptable as it is in keeping with the host dwelling.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Impact on Surrounding Occupiers.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

The proposed front dormer will not reduce the separation distance of the windows and are not considered to have a negative impact on neighbour privacy. The proposed rear dormer will introduce new windows on the first floor of the dwelling which will create some views towards neighbouring rear gardens, but it is not considered that this will result in a harmful level of overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants. In any case, a similar dormer window could be undertaken under permitted development rights, and as such resisting the proposal on the basis of any such concerns could not be sustained.

Both dormers are considered to be of an appropriate scale and will not have an overbearing impact on neighbours.

The proposed bedrooms will have sufficient light and outlook and are considered acceptable.

In light of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers and would provide a satisfactory standard of occupier amenity for all future occupiers in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy DM1 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. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The proposed development will not have an impact on the existing parking and is considered acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to 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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Proposed Site, Block and Location Plan 920-06
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan 920-07
- Proposed Loft Plan 920-08B
- Proposed Roof Plan 920-09A
- Proposed Elevations 920-10
- Cross Sections 920-11A

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with those indicated on the approved plans.

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 and the National Planning Policy Framework

Procedure 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.

Report Author Aimee Bovaird