

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00586/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00586/HOUS
Location:	9 Thames Street, Rochdale, OL16 5NY
Proposal:	First floor rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Abdul Haq
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 21.08.2025	EXT OF TIME
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 9 Thames Street, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 11 Thames Street to the east, adjacent to no. 7 Thames Street to the west, and faces the highway to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilages of nos. 37 and 39 Channing Street to the north. The rear curtilage comprises an attached shared outbuilding with no. 7.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension which projects 2.4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a hipped roof form and is set down 0.74m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves.

The submitted plans also indicate the alteration of the ground floor side fenestration of the existing rear extension and the addition of a first-floor side window to serve the existing bathroom.

The proposal would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

24/00123/HH42 – Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 6m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.7m and height to eaves to 2.7m) – Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received with the following comments:

- ☐ The extension would result in significant loss of privacy and access to natural light to the adjacent window.
- ☐ Concerns about poor workmanship of the development.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Matters relating to residential amenity are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of this report.
- ☐ The quality of the construction is not a material planning consideration. Notwithstanding, any development must comply with the relevant parts of Building Regulations, which forms a separate process to planning.

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:

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ 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 also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor rear extension would be set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would be subservient. The use of a hipped roof form would appear in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ It is noted the cumulative impacts of the proposed first-floor rear extension with the existing single-storey rear extension would add substantial massing to the rear elevation of the dwelling which would be visible from the rear curtilages of neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding, the extension would be sited in substantial distances from the rear-facing properties and views of the extension from the street scene would be limited due to its rear siting. As such, it is considered the proposal would not result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.

- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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.
- ☐ The host dwelling is set back circa 2m from the main front wall of adjacent no. 7 and comprises a separation distance of circa 3.24m. As such, there is already a sense of enclosure and oppressiveness from the rear patio area of no. 7 due to its proximity to the two-storey side elevation brick wall.
- ☐ Taking into account of the building setback, the proposed extension would project an additional 2.4m and would exceed the 30-degree line drawn 2.4m from the rear elevation of no. 7 as per Section 5.9 of the SPD. The resultant development and the shared outbuilding would completely enclose the amenity space immediate to the rear of no. 7 and would be appear unduly overbearing, to the detriment of the amenity of the neighbouring occupants.
- ☐ With regard to no. 11, the adjoining dwelling comprises a 4.83m single-storey rear extension set 1.57m away from the common boundary of the host dwelling. Notwithstanding the additional allowance afforded by this extension as per Section 5.10, the proposal projects 2.4m which would meet the requirements of Section 5.9 and would not give rise to undue overbearing and overshadowing.
- ☐ It is noted a window serving what is understood to be the kitchen of no. 11 is sited on the ground floor rear elevation close to the common boundary. However, the existing boundary treatment arrangement together with the rear extension of no. 11 has already created a substantial tunnelling impact on this fenestration arrangement and therefore the additional impact of the proposed development would not be so great as to warrant refusal. In any case, as defined in Appendix 2 of the SPD, kitchens do not constitute habitable rooms and as such would not be subject to the assessment of amenity impacts.
- ☐ Notwithstanding, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of no. 7 and would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property, which would be retained to the front hardstanding.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposed first-floor rear extension would result in undue loss in residential amenity of the occupiers of no. 7 Thames Street by way of adverse overbearing and overshadowing to the rear amenity space. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 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.

Article 35 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	18/08/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/08/2025	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan – received 26/06/2025
- Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 2102A/1 received 09/06/2025
- Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 2102A/2 received 09/06/2025

Report Author Sam Yuen