

Application Number:	25/00579/HOUS
Location:	3 Durham Walk, Heywood, OL10 3HS
Proposal:	Single storey rear extensions, front dormer and a front porch extension
Applicant:	Mr Ben Cartwright
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 26.08.2025	EXT OF TIME 08.09.2025
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 a mid-terrace, two-storey dwellinghouse positioned to the northern end of Durham Walk, Heywood. The property has a split-level character – appearing as a bungalow to its front (west facing) elevation and a two-storey house to the rear (east facing elevation). From the footpath of Durham Walk, the ground level falls steeply in an easterly direction across the site. The front garden contains a large outbuilding and is enclosed by a 1.8m high timber fence. A narrow area of hardstanding provides a single off-road car parking space to the rear.

Durham Walk is part of a wider, mid-20th century, Radburn-type housing estate, whereby the houses open onto a pedestrian footpath to the front with vehicle access and car parking to the rear. Houses typically benefit from large front gardens with paths leading to a pedestrian footway. There are two-storey houses occupying an elevated position across Durham Walk to the west and there is a terraced block of split-level properties to the east on Kent Walk. Properties in these terraces benefit from a combination of outbuildings and extensions within their rear yards and a number of split-level properties benefit from front dormers. The construction of various extensions to properties along the terraced blocks across the estate has resulted in some of the original front elevations reading as rear elevations and vice versa.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a front porch, a front dormer and a single-storey rear extension. The dormer would have a mono-pitched roof and its face and sides would be finished in grey rosemary tiles and the extensions would be constructed using a brick to match the colour of the existing brickwork.

It was noted during a site visit by the Case Officer that an outbuilding has been constructed within the front garden of the application property. This does not form part of the current application; however, a planning application should be submitted for the outbuilding as it would not benefit from permitted development rights given it is situated on land forward of the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse. This Council's Planning Enforcement service reserves the right to take enforcement action against this development.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and 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:

JP-P1 Sustainable Development

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

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

Amendments were sought to reduce the scale and change the window detailing of the front dormer. The plans were also amended to remove the use of a blue engineering brick and change the dormer cladding to match the existing roof tiles.

Assessment

Character and Appearance

- ❑ Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *'of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area'* and to *'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.'*
- ❑ The scale of the proposed single-storey rear extension would be proportionate when viewed in the context of similarly sized rear extensions and outbuildings along the street. Moreover, it would have an appropriate roof design and window detailing.
- ❑ The proposed front porch would have a relatively small scale with a ground area of approximately 2.52m and a dual-pitched roof design. Therefore, it would appear proportionate and is not considered to detract from the character of the terraced block.
- ❑ The applicant has suggested using an engineering brick in a colour to match the existing brickwork, rather than a matching facing brick. Therefore, a condition is recommended requiring the submission of a detailed material specification and/or samples prior to above ground constructions works commencing on site. This is to ensure that the brickwork results in an acceptable match with the existing brickwork.
- ❑ Section 5.16 of the SPD advises that front dormers will not normally be permitted. However, as per section 5.18, it is considered that there are circumstances that justify a relaxation of this guidance.

- ② Although there are no dormer windows along the terraced block, it is noted that the application property is sited towards the end of the block on much lower ground than the public footpath. Furthermore, the application property is set back approximately 20m from the footpath, with a circa 1.8m timber fence enclosing the front garden.
- ② Given the Radburn layout of the estate, vehicular traffic would not pass the front of the site, with vehicle access and car parking provided to the rear. Therefore, residents travelling by car would typically park and access properties via the rear elevation. This means that the footpath to the front is not heavily trafficked, with its use generally limited to residents of Durham Walk and Kent Walk travelling on foot to and from public transport links and amenities on Bury Old Road and the A58.
- ② Lastly, it is noted that front dormers are a relatively common feature to the front elevations of the split-level properties across the estate. Therefore, the presence of a dormer to the front elevation of the application property would not appear at odds with the character of the wider estate.
- ② To ensure that the dormer does not appear unduly harmful with regards to its design, the dormer has been set back 0.8m behind the eaves line and is set in from the side walls of the property. The windows would line up with the ground floor windows below and the sloping roof would reduce the massing of the dormer face. Moreover, the dormer face and sides would be finished using grey rosemary tiles to match the existing roof tiles.
- ② Overall, it is not considered that the proposed dormer would result in undue harm to the character of the host property or the street scene.
- ② The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

- ② Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.'*
- ② Section 5.5 of the SPD states *'it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.'*
- ② The proposed rear extension would comply with the projection limit for single-storey extensions outlined in section 5.6 of the SPD given the shape of the extension and the presence of an existing car port which projects approximately 6m from the rear elevation of no. 1 Durham Walk. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the adjoining occupiers.
- ② Although the proposed extension would include patio doors that would face the rear yard of no. 5 Durham Walk at close quarters, it is noted that there is an existing solid boundary screen that would prevent any undue overlooking.
- ② The proposed dormer windows would face into the front garden of the application property, measuring approximately 21 metres to the front boundary. This is comfortably in accordance with the minimum separation distances outlined under section 4.1 of the SPD. Therefore, it is not

considered that the dormer would result in an undue loss of privacy for any neighbouring properties.

- ☐ All habitable rooms within the application property would receive sufficient natural light and a 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 occupiers.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or the application property in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

- ☐ The proposed rear extension would result in the loss of the existing off-street parking space to the rear (east) of the dwellinghouse.
- ☐ While this would not accord with the Council's maximum standards, it is considered that there are mitigating circumstances that justify the loss of off-street parking in this case.
- ☐ The site is located within comfortable walking distance (some 0.65 Kilometres) of Heywood Town Centre and some 200 metres from the A58 – a route which is well served by public transport. Therefore, the site is readily accessible by modes of transport other than private car.
- ☐ Properties on Durham Walk and Kent Walk are accessed via Livsey Lane and benefit from a combination of on and off-street parking within communal forecourts or in-curtilage driveway areas. Owing to the presence of numerous outbuildings and/or extensions to the rear of houses on Durham Walk and Kent Walk (and the lack of any parking provision within their front gardens), a number of surrounding houses benefit from only one (and in some cases no) off-street parking space.
- ☐ When assessed in this context, it is considered that the loss of one off-street parking space would not have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the surrounding highway network.
- ☐ Given the site's accessibility by public transport, its proximity to the town centre and the availability of other safe and convenient on-street parking in the area (having regard to existing on-street parking patterns), it is not considered that the development would result in undue obstruction or congestion of the surrounding highway network due to a lack of parking provision. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy T2 and appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations. Drawing no: 200. Rev: A
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations. Drawing no: 201. Rev: C
- Location Plan, Existing Site Plan and Proposed Block Plan. Drawing no: 202. Rev: B

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory development in accordance with the policies within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 No above ground works shall take place until such time as a detailed specification and/or samples of materials to be used externally in the construction of the development have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the duly approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and 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 Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	02/09/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	08/09/2025	Signed: TH

INFORMATIVE:

1. This decision does not imply consent for the existing outbuilding within the front garden of the application property. The outbuilding is situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would therefore require planning permission. You are advised to contact the Council's Planning Enforcement Team at dme@rochdale.gov.uk to discuss.

Report Author Bob Melling