

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
25/00935/HOUS

CASE OFFICER
Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 05.11.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: 1 Brandlehow Drive Middleton M24 4QY

Proposal: Two storey and single storey side extension

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY:

DATE:

SITE

The site relates to 1 Brandlehow Drive, a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling benefits from off street parking, front and rear amenity space. The dwelling fronts Brandlehow Drive. The attached neighbour is no.380 Windermere Road and this dwelling fronts Windermere Road

The site is located on a corner plot, it is therefore exposed and has an open feel. The site is visible from Brandlehow Drive and Windermere Road.

The site is located in the Defined Urban Area, the area is highly residential and the dwellings made up of similar characteristics.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a two storey and single storey side extension.

The proposed development will provide an additional reception room on the ground floor and an additional bedroom on the first floor.

The dwelling is on a corner plot, having regard to this in relation to the attached house the side extension is also assessed as a rear extension. This proposed side extension will project from the rear boundary of no.380 Windermere Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

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

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

7. Places for Homes

JP-H 3 Type, Size and Design of New Housing

9. Places for People

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1	Delivering a more prosperous economy
SO2	Creating successful and healthy communities
C1	Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C3	Delivering the right type of housing
SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P3	Improving design of new development

SO5 **Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport**
T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements
SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Not applicable.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding properties and two objections have been received. The objections have raised the following,

- Concerns over loss of privacy
- Not in keeping with the area
- Increase in vehicles
- Overbearing impact and overshadowing

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development.

The proposed application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The site is located with a predominately residential area and the principle of development is considered acceptable.

Design

Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, which is largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

The application proposes a part two storey, part single storey side extension. Due to the dwelling being located on a corner plot and the front elevation fronting Brandlehow

Drive and the side elevation (south facing) facing Windermere Road, the proposed development will be highly visible. There is currently a sense of openness giving a visual break in the street scene. The proposed development is considered large in scale. As a result of this, the proposed development is considered to have a negative impact on the street scene through eroding the open character.

Furthermore, given the visibility of the extension, the assemblage of roof forms across both levels would appear unresolved and incongruous, comprising a visually harmful feature.

The proposed materials are to match the host dwelling and this is considered acceptable.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is unacceptable and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Impact on Surrounding Occupiers.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

The SPD sets out guidance for single storey rear extensions in paragraph 5.6, *'For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling.'* The proposed development will project 4.5m from the rear elevation of the adjoining property and be set along the common boundary, this would far exceed the limits of the SPD. The single storey rear extension is therefore considered to have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the rear facing habitable room windows and rear garden area of no.380 Windermere Drive.

The application also proposes a part two storey rear extension, this element will comply with the SPD however does not influence the overall view that the extension is unacceptable.

PfE Policy JP-H3 establishes the requirement for new dwellings to be compliant with the [Nationally Described Space Standards](#). Whilst not a new dwelling, the intentions of the policy in respect of delivering adequate standards of amenity through the provision of suitably sized rooms still applies. As a result of the proposed extension, an existing bedroom will be reduced in size, resulting in a floor area of 6.8sqm, 0.7sqm below the 7.5sqm requirement for a single bedroom. This falls below the requirements of the NDDS however on balance, given that there are 3 other suitably sized rooms, can be accepted.

The proposed bedrooms will have sufficient light and outlook. The proposed development will leave a sufficient amount of garden space.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact on the rear facing windows and rear amenity space of no.380 Windermere Rd and therefore fails to accord with the requirements of Policies

DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways

Policy DM1 states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The proposed development will not have an impact on the existing parking arrangement of highway.

The proposal accords with the requirements of Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposed development would result in an adverse overbearing impact to the neighbouring dwelling no.380 Windermere Road as it fails to comply with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document. As such the proposal would not comply with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016) SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
2. By reason of its scale, siting and form, the proposed side extension would compromise a visually distracting feature comprise of an unresolved and incongruous assemblage of roof forms at a prominent location and would be subsequently harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development fails to be suitably well-designed and is therefore contrary to Policies P3 and DM1 of the 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.

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.

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

- Location Plan
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations BRAND – 02-20

