

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00490/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00490/HOUS
Location:	15 Woodfield Road, Middleton, M24 1NF
Proposal:	Alterations to existing roof including Increase in height, two storey front extensions, front dormer extensions, single storey side extension, alterations to existing rear extension, alterations to existing fenestration and application of render to all elevations
Applicant:	Miss Sarah Shannon
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 08.08.2025	EXT OF TIME 15.08.2025
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
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to 15 Woodfield Road, a large, two storey, detached dwellinghouse located towards the head of a cul-de-sac in Alkrington. The application property faces the highway to the northwest, is adjacent to 17 Woodfield Road to the southwest and 13 Woodfield Road to the northeast. 18 Woodfield Road is located across the highway to the northwest and the rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear garden of 21 Meadow Road. The application property has a long and secluded rear garden, bounded by fencing and shrubbery.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for an approximate 1.31m increase in the ridge height of the dwelling along with front dormer windows and two storey front extensions. The proposals would remodel the façade of the building through a classical design approach. Other aspects of the design include a single storey side extension, the replacement of the conservatory roof with a flat roof, various alterations to the existing fenestration and the application of render to all elevations.

Relevant History

- 06/D47029 Two Storey Front Extension And New Roof Including Increase In Ridge Height - Resubmission D46736
Decision: Approved (May 2006)
- 06/D46736 Front Porch, Two Storey Front Extension And Second Floor Extension Including Front Dormers To Form 3 Storey Dwelling
Decision: Approved (March 2006)
- 81/D13157 Part Single Part Two Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling
Decision: Approved (November 1981)

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Urban Design (Summary) - Despite some diverse architectural styles on the street, this weak architectural response makes the house appear disruptive and incompatible for its location. A significant overhaul in the design is required.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no responses were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) 2024:

JP-P1 Sustainable places

Local

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
Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Character and Appearance

When read collectively, the NPPF, CS policies P3 and DM1, and PfE policy JP-P1 seek to ensure that new development respects local character. Development must achieve 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. 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 states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents.

Woodfield Road is comprised of traditional mid-century suburban houses. While the street is not characterised by a single architectural style, houses generally share similar period revival features, such as an asymmetrical design with one projecting gable that is offset, tall, elaborate chimney stacks, natural materials (i.e. rustic red brick and clay roof tiles), mullioned windows, bay or oriel windows, deep, sheltered porches, and integration with soft landscaping.

Although the existing property lacks architectural merit, it is modest and does not jar with the surrounding properties, particularly in terms of its scale and massing. The proposed re-design would result in an incongruous design that would not reflect the overriding postwar suburban traditional style of the street scene. It would be reliant on classical architectural references that would be in stark contrast with surrounding properties (Figure 1).





Figure 1 - Street Scene Images (Source: Author)

The use of three projecting bays coupled with the increase in height and introduction of dormer windows would result in an overbearing built form with a top-heavy and disproportionate appearance. This would be exacerbated by the vertical emphasis of the windows. Furthermore, the single-story side wing appears to be an afterthought, disrupting an already disjointed front elevation (Figure 2).



Figure 2 - Existing Property and Proposed Property (Sources: Author and Space Architectural Ltd)

The glazing-to-masonry ratio has significantly contributed to a loss of the dwelling's identity, resulting in a confused attempt to be simultaneously contemporary, grand, and historic. The street generally maintains a consistent colour palette and the use of render should be limited and combined with high-quality, textured brickwork that is fitting for the context. The use of grey brick and the extensive use of white render would not be in keeping with the street and would have a harmful impact on the character of the locality.

Overall, the proposed development is considered to cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. Consequently, it would conflict with CS policies DM1 and P3 and PfE policy JP-P1 which together require all development, including extensions and alterations, to be of

high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area by respecting context and having regard to scale, density and layout. It would further conflict with the guidance at paragraph 135 of the NPPF that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Residential Amenity

CS policy DM1 states that all development proposals must not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Privacy

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD provides guidance on minimum distances that apply to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties. The purpose of the guidance is to avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The proposed windows to the front elevation would measure approximately 30m to the directly facing property, in accordance with the 21m minimum separation distance set out under paragraph 4.1 of the SPD.

It is noted that a bedroom window would be installed within the northeastern side elevation, facing the side elevation of 13 Woodfield Road at a distance of approximately 5.26m.

It is noted that the side elevation of no. 13 does contain two first floor windows, however these windows are secondary windows, and not the principal sources of light and outlook for the rooms they serve. This has been ascertained from the floor plans submitted with planning application reference 97/D33943.

On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed bedroom window would result in an undue loss of privacy for the occupiers of 13 Woodfield Road.

Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact

As noted above, the windows within the side elevation of 13 Woodfield Road are secondary windows. 17 Woodfield Road also has windows within the side elevation facing the application property, however the ground floor windows are secondary windows serving the living room while the first-floor window serves a bathroom. Therefore, neither property has principal habitable room windows which directly face the application property.

On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed additions to the application property, namely the front extensions and the roof enlargement, would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties. While the application property is set forward of no. 17, there would still remain a comfortable degree of separation between the properties.

Moreover, although the roof of the existing conservatory (which runs along the common boundary with 13 Woodfield Road) would be changed to a flat roof with a greater overall height, it is not considered that this alteration would have a material impact on the living conditions currently enjoyed by the occupiers of no. 13.

Occupier Amenity

All habitable rooms within the application would be supplied with an adequate amount of light and outlook.

Summary

In light of the above, the proposals would not unduly harm the residential amenity of the present and future occupiers of the neighbouring properties or the application property, in accordance with CS policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

The proposals do not reduce the existing provision of off-street parking which is considered appropriate for a dwelling of this size. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with CS policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason

1. By reason of its design, size, siting and massing, the proposals would constitute an incongruous, disproportionate and poorly designed development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document 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.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Location Plan dated 13/05/2025
- Existing Plans. Dwg no. A100. Rev B
- Existing Elevations. Dwg no. A101. Rev B
- Proposed Plans. Dwg no. A102. Rev B
- Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. A103. Rev B
- Proposed Loft Plans. Dwg no. A104
- Proposed External 3Ds. Dwg no. A106
- Existing & Proposed Site Plans. Dwg no. A108. Rev B

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	13/08/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	13/08/2025	Signed: LA

Report Author Bob Melling