



## Officers Report

**Case Reference:** PL/2025/1344  
**Location:** 8 Talbot Street, ROCHDALE, OL11 3SY  
**Proposal:** Proposed single storey extension at the rear including front and rear dormers.  
**Recommendation:** Approve with Conditions  
**Officer:** Bob Melling

### LOCATION

The application relates to no. 8 Talbot Street, a two-storey terraced dwelling located in Milkstone. The dwelling is sited near the end of a cul-de-sac and is adjoined by no. 6 Talbot Street to the north, no. 10 Talbot Street to the south, and faces the highway to the northeast. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto private yards which adjoin Mere Street to the southwest.

### PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension and dormers to the front and rear roof slopes. The single-storey extension would have a depth of 3m and comprise a dual-pitched roof with a ridge height of 3.6m and a height to eaves of 2.7m. The front and rear flat roof dormers would measure approximately 3.6m in length, 1.7m in height and 3.1m in depth. The proposed extensions would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

### HISTORY

25/00793/HOUS: Proposed single storey extension at the rear including front and rear dormer to create habitable rooms. Refused for the following reasons:

*By virtue of its excessive scale and the failure of setback from the eaves, the proposed rear dormer constitutes an incongruous and prominent addition to the host dwelling and would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*The proposed extensions would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of internal space to the proposed rear-facing bedroom and the loss of the existing rear amenity space. The proposed development would fail to ensure an adequate standard of amenity for the host occupants and therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and*

*Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

### **National Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### **Sub-Regional Guidance**

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1: Sustainable Places

### **Local Guidance**

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

Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

## **PUBLICITY**

**Site Notice:** N/A

**Press Notice:** N/A

**Neighbour notification letters:** 11/02/2026

**Weekly List:** 19/02/2026

## **ASSESSMENT**

### **Design**

The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to

local character. This is reflected in PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. In addition, SPD Section 5.1 states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The proposal seeks to, amongst other things, construct flat roof dormers on the front and rear roof slope of the dwelling. SPD Section 5.16 notes:

*'Dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.'*

Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:

- i. They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of 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 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 surrounding street scene is characterised by dense terraced properties where front and rear flat roof dormers are present features (as seen on nos. 2, 5, 9, 13 and 14 Talbot Street). Given this site context, it is considered the proposed dormers would not detract from this established character and would be acceptable in principle.

Following the submission of amended plans, it is now considered that the front and rear dormers would be appropriately sized and sited. The dormers would broadly comply with the SPD design principles, except for the use of flat roofs. Notwithstanding, it is noted that all of the dormers within the immediate setting have

flat roofs. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed dormers would have a detrimental impact on the character of the street scene.

No concerns are had regarding the design of the single-storey rear extension, which would constitute a subservient addition to the host dwelling.

As such it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would be acceptable, in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

## **Amenity**

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which 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.

*SPD Section 5.17 states 'dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.'*

The proposed dormers do not project beyond the front and rear elevations of the host dwelling and would retain the existing separation distance from the front and rear-facing properties. With regard to the overlooking impact of the adjacent rear gardens, it is not considered that the views from the rear dormer window would be materially more harmful than the views from the existing first floor bedroom window. While the dormer window would be elevated above the first floor windows, it would also be set back from the eaves line.

The depth of the proposed single storey rear extension has been reduced to 3m and this would comply with the projection limit for single storey extensions outlined in SPD Section 5.6. Therefore, it is not considered that the single storey rear extension would unduly harm the living conditions of the adjoining residents.

In terms of the living conditions within the application property, it is noted that under the previous application concerns were raised about the floor area of the rear-facing bedroom and the failure to comply with the space standards for a single bedroom as set out in the Nationally described space standards (NDSS). However, it is noted that the layout has been amended and this bedroom would now have a floor area of 7.6m<sup>2</sup>, which complies with the NDSS floor area requirement for a single bedroom.

It is noted that the extension would occupy much of the existing rear yard, leaving a 4m by 1.4m gap between the extension and the rear boundary wall. While not ideal, it is not considered that the resultant outdoor amenity space would be uncharacteristic when compared with extended properties in the immediate area. Moreover, it is noted that there is a recreational open space and children's play area less than a 1-minute walk from the application property. On this basis, it is not considered that the resultant private outdoor amenity space would be unduly detrimental to the living conditions of the application property.

As such, it is considered proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of both the occupiers of the application property and the neighbouring properties, in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the NPPF

## Highways

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

The host dwelling relies on on-street parking on Talbot Street; this arrangement would remain under the proposed plans. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with CS Policies T2 and DM1.

## Conclusion

Subject to the conditions set out below and taking into account the provisions of the development plan and all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

## SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Three objection letters were received with the following representations:

- The proposed rear extension would restrict access for the maintenance of the adjacent party walls. Little and small pets may become trapped in the intervening space.
- The extension would significantly reduce natural light to adjacent kitchen windows and rear yards.
- The proximity of the extension would create a sense of enclosure and reduce the open character between the properties.
- No guttering is shown on the plans.
- The proposed dormer would be overbearing and directly overlook into the yards of neighbouring properties.
- The proposal may impact on the structure of the adjacent properties.
- The proposed works will create noise pollution.
- The loft space is not big enough to accommodate the size of the extension and may not support the load bearing.
- It would not be possible to repair the proposed SVP without accessing it from the neighbour's side.

### Officer's Comments:

- Concerns over access to and/or damages to the neighbouring property relate to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

- Concerns relating to overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts are assessed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- Concerns over damage and access to shared drains are not material planning considerations.
- Construction works are expected to result in a level of noise and disturbance and should not be a reason to prevent development. Noise and disturbance generated in excess of what is 'acceptable' would be controlled via separate legislation through the Council's Public Protection Service.
- Concerns relating to structural integrity of development relates to Building Control and are not material planning considerations.

## **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

N/A

## **AMENDMENTS**

Amendments have been sought to reduce the depth of the single-storey extension from 3.4m to 3m and to reduce the scale of the rear dormer.

## **PROCEDURAL STATEMENT**

### Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application, and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

### Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

**Recommendation:** Approve with Conditions

**Condition(s) (3)**

- 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Location Plan
- Existing Site Layout Plan – drawing no. 01
- Existing Ground Floor Plan – drawing no. 02
- Existing Elevations – drawing no. 03B
- Proposed Floor Plans – drawing no. 04E received 21/01/2026
- Proposed Elevations – drawing no. 05E received 21/01/2026
- Proposed Site Layout Plan – drawing no. 06C received 20/01/2026

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained 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 The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture. This includes a requirement for the external walls of the approved dormer extensions to

be clad using hung tiles to match the colour and texture of the existing roof tiles.

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.