

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00533/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00533/HOUS
Location:	63 South Street, Rochdale, OL16 2ER
Proposal:	Single storey ground floor extension and first floor rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Haider Ali Khan
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?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N/A
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 63 South Street, a two-storey terraced house on the edge of Rochdale town centre. South Street, and much of the surrounding area, comprises linear terraced houses fronting the pavement. The character of the area is typically urban, consisting of a dense built environment, limited greenery and various amenities and small businesses.

The application property faces south, fronting the pavement and overlooking the adopted public highway. It adjoins no. 65 to the east and no. 61 to the west. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces north, bordering an alleyway running between the rear yards of Fitton Street and South Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension and two separate single-storey rear extensions.

The first-floor rear extension would comprise a dual-pitched gable roof with a single window. It would project 2.4m from the original dwelling, measuring 3.5m (width) by 6m (eaves height) and 7.5m (maximum height). Proposed materials include red brick, grey slates or tiles and white uPVC windows.

One of the single-storey rear extensions would be a 1.4m projection increase to the existing single-storey rear extension. It would match the existing slide roof form and

would extend to the rear boundary of the curtilage. Proposed materials include red brick and grey slates or tiles.

The other single-storey rear extension would run adjacent to the common boundary with no. 65, comprising a flat roof, a rear door and window, and a roof light. It would project 4m from the host dwelling, measuring 2.5m (width) by 2.75m (height). Proposed materials include red brick, a rubber membrane roof, and white uPVC windows and doors.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties. No objections were raised.

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):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

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

Residential Amenity

CS policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the NPPF advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Single-storey rear extension:

The proposal includes a single-storey rear extension, adjacent to the common boundary with no. 65 South Street. The SPD aims to ensure that single-storey rear extensions are not overbearing and do not result in an undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers. As such, paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets a maximum standard for single-storey rear extensions to attached properties of a 3m projection along the common boundary, measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling. The proposed single-storey rear extension projects 4m along the common boundary with no. 65 and therefore exceeds the limits of paragraph 5.6 by 1m. By virtue of its non-compliance with the SPD, the proposed single-storey rear extension would be considered to have an unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing impact on occupants of no. 65 South Street.

Two-storey rear extension:

Similarly, paragraph 5.9 of the SPD sets a maximum standard for two-storey rear extensions to attached properties of a 2.4m projection along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling. The proposed first floor extension would project 2.4m along the common boundaries with nos. 61 and 65 and would therefore be considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the adjoining neighbouring occupants.

Separation distances:

Notwithstanding the above, paragraph 4.1 of the SPD establishes minimum separation distances between new and existing residential development, to prevent an undue loss of privacy and/or light. The following space standards are relevant to this application:

- (i) *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 the curtilage.*

The proposed first-floor rear extension would accommodate a bedroom with a window on the rear elevation. The SPD defines a habitable room as one in which occupants would spend prolonged periods of time, such as a bedroom.

The proposed first-floor rear bedroom window would sit 12.4m from the rear windows of no. 19 Fitton Street and 6.7m from the boundary of the curtilage. As such, the proposed first-floor rear extension would fail to comply with the separation distances

established under paragraph 4.1. For the avoidance of doubt, a site visit confirmed that first-floor rear windows to no.19 Fitton Street likely served at least one habitable room, such as a bedroom.

It is recognised, under paragraph 4.3, that exceptions to the separation distances may be acceptable, for example where new development would not detract from the general levels of privacy and amenity typical in the area. Indeed, the distances between the rear elevations on Fitton Street and South Street currently fall short of the distances under paragraph 4.1, measuring just 15m. However, to further reduce the distances would be considered to excessively undermine the privacy of occupants of no. 19 Fitton Street and go towards establishing a culture of overlooking.

Similarly, it is acknowledged that there are other two-storey rear extensions on South Street which have reduced the separation distances towards the rear elevations on Fitton Street. However, all of these extensions were approved prior to the adoption of the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD in June 2016. Since the adoption of the SPD, the Council has placed a higher importance on the protection of residential amenity and is focused on offering a consistent approach across all new developments. Furthermore, in some cases, the first-floor windows of the two-storey rear extensions serve bathrooms, which are not considered to be habitable rooms and therefore would not compromise the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

On balance, it is considered that the proposed two-storey rear extension, which includes a bedroom window, would cause an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of no. 19 Fitton Street.

Living conditions for the application property:

Collectively, the NPPF, PfE and CS look to ensure that all new developments offer an acceptable level of amenity for all future occupants, including through the provision of sufficient outlook and natural light to all habitable rooms. The SPD includes 'living rooms' as an example of a habitable room.

The proposed internal layout includes a central 'lounge' area on the ground floor with no windows. Given that the proposed ground floor would not be open plan, light from the proposed kitchen windows and rooflight would not sufficiently infiltrate to the lounge. Furthermore, the proposed kitchen window is a single window which would be located 4m from the lounge and would therefore provide limited natural light for the lounge. The proposed ground floor layout would therefore provide inadequate levels of natural light and no outlook for the lounge and does not provide the required levels of amenity for future occupants.

Regarding outdoor amenity space, paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that an extension that does not leave sufficient garden space is unlikely to be acceptable. The proposed rear extensions would occupy almost the entire outdoor area, leaving just 3.5sqm of available outdoor space. Without the provision of adequate outdoor space, the dwelling does not provide the required levels of amenity for future occupants.

Conclusion:

The proposal would be considered to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupants at no. 65 South Street, through unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing impact, and at no. 19 Fitton Street through an unacceptable loss of privacy. In addition, the proposal would not provide an adequate level of amenity for

future occupants of the application property, due to a lack of functional garden space and poor provision of outlook and natural light to the lounge. The development is therefore unacceptable and fails to comply with PfE policy JP-P1, CS policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Character and Appearance

When read collectively, the NPPF, CS policies P3 and DM1, and PfE policy JP-P1 seek to achieve development of high-quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Development to the rear of a dwelling tends to pose fewer design concerns, as it generally has limited impact on the visual amenity of the street scene. However, due to the back-to-back arrangement of the terraced houses on South Street and Fitton Street, the proposed development would be visually prominent from surrounding windows and gardens. As such, there is moderate concern that the scale of the proposed development would be seen as incongruous in such a dense built environment.

However, whilst the additions would significantly increase the footprint of the dwelling, they would be considered in keeping with the broader patterns of development seen to the rear of South Street. The proposed roof forms and scale correspond with similar rear extensions along the terrace and would generally be seen as subservient to the host dwelling.

In addition, the proposed materials and fenestration would integrate with the appearance of the host dwelling and are therefore considered acceptable.

Overall, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with PfE policy JP=P1, CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

The proposed development would have no bearing on the existing parking and servicing arrangements and therefore accords with CS policies T2 and DM1.

Other Matters

In determining this application, due regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who do and do not share a protected characteristic. From the limited available evidence and the personal circumstances identified, this decision has the potential to affect persons with a protected characteristic for the purposes of the PSED.

Additionally, section 5.22 of the SPD states:

Personal circumstances, such as a disability, may make it difficult to provide necessary facilities within the standards set out in this document. The Council may interpret these standards flexibly in such circumstances, but proposals that significantly exceed the standards set out in this document are unlikely to be

appropriate. The more general planning considerations, such as the impact of a development on the character of an area and its impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, are still the principal considerations by which the planning application will be judged; the needs of a person may exist for only a few years whereas built development is likely to last for decades.

Careful consideration has been given to the reasons why the applicant has applied for planning permission to extend the property. The application is supported by evidence of Personal Independence Payments received by a relative of the applicant and refers to 'disabled applicants' on the proposed first-floor plan. Moreover, at the request of the Council, the applicant provided further information, noting that the additional space is necessary to accommodate specialist equipment and ensure adequate movement space in the bedroom to meet the applicant's needs. No information was provided regarding the type of equipment required or the accessibility requirements of the applicant.

However, only limited evidence is available to demonstrate how the proposed development would improve accessibility, is specific to the needs of the family member or could not be met by a less harmful scheme for the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Therefore, having regard to this matter, limited weight in favour of the application proposal is given to the identified personal circumstances. Furthermore, the unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and future occupiers of the application property is such that the refusal of the application is a necessary and proportionate response.

Recommendation:

Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed development is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupants of the application property and neighbouring occupants. The proposed single-storey rear extension exceeds the limits of paragraph 5.6 of the SPD and would therefore have an unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing impact on the occupants of no. 65 South Street. The proposed two-storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupants of no. 19 Fitton Street by further reducing the separation distances between directly facing habitable room windows. In addition, the development does not provide an adequate amount of useable garden space to serve the necessary requirements of a family dwelling, and the ground floor layout would provide very restricted outlook and natural light to the lounge. The development therefore fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policy DM1 of the Rochdale Council Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

Procedure 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 development. 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.

Notes for Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- Location plan: PP-14050371v1
- Proposed site plan, floor plans and elevations: SOUTH-02-20

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11/12/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	12/12/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling