

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2024

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2024

Appeal ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3336326

No. 52 Newhouse Road, Heywood, Lancashire OL10 2NU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stephen Lavelly against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. 23/00848/HOUS, dated 5 September 2023, was refused by a notice dated 25 October 2023.
 - The development is: Front dormer extension and alterations to existing roof (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the effect of the nearly completed front dormer roof extension at No. 52 Newhouse Road on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Appeal dwelling and proposed works

3. The appeal property, No. 52 Newhouse Road, Heywood, is in a row of mostly similar dwellings with open front gardens and driveways. Originally, No. 52 had a flat roofed dormer occupying just over a half the width of the road facing roof slope, incorporating 2 windows serving a bedroom and a landing. At ground floor level, the incorporated single garage door and surround, together with the front face of the porch alongside, is set forward of the façade of the house by approximately 0.8m.
4. The Appellant, Mr Lavelly, wished to increase the size of his home by adding a pitched roof dormer to the remaining section of the original roof slope, enlarging the bedroom in the western corner of the house. At the time of my site visit, the external appearance showed the appeal project to have been almost finished, small details only remaining.

Considerations

5. I agree with the Council that the front dormer extension is unacceptably dominant in relation to the roof and the house at No. 52. Although the front face of the new dormer may meet local policy guidance that it be set back from the eaves of the roof immediately below, it is forward of the main front wall of

the house fronting the entrance hallway and dining room. Particularly seen from the south-east, it appears unhappily incongruous, an excessive extension in relation to the roof and the remainder of the house.

6. As was pointed out, there are several roof extensions seen nearby along Newhouse Road, some of which bear slight comparison with what Mr Lavelly seeks to achieve. However, I consider the new roof extension at No. 52 to be incompatible with neighbouring houses, unacceptably harmful to the visual amenity of its immediate surroundings. The excessive size and undue prominence of the new dormer in the street scene militates against approving the scheme. The dormer 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. Planning permission is not granted for its retention.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons and taking account of other matters raised, I conclude that the large new dormer on the front of the house at No. 52 Newhouse Road is contrary to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR