

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00629/HOUS

| | |
|---|--|
| Application Number: | 25/00629/HOUS |
| Location: | 98 Springfield Road, Middleton, M24 5DD |
| Proposal: | First floor rear extension including Juliet balcony, single storey side and rear extensions, alterations to fenestration and application of render |
| Applicant: | Ms J Hicklin |
| Case Officer: | Bob Melling |
| DETERMINATION DATE 08.09.2025 | EXT OF TIME N/A |
| RECOMMENDATION: | Grant subject to conditions |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| DELEGATION | Applicant a Council Member or officer? | N |
| | Contrary to previous decision? | N |
| | Called in by Ward Member? | N |

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national, sub-regional and local policies and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the Planning Officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

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
JP-P2 Heritage

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area
BE/17 New Development Affecting Conservation Areas

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

| | |
|------------|--|
| P2 | Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage |
| 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

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

N/A

Assessment

Background

The development proposed under the current application is similar to the development approved under application reference 24/00611/HOUS. The main differences are as follows:

- Use of flat roofs instead of pitched roofs for the single storey extensions;
- Application of cream render to the walls of the single storey extensions;
- Reduction in scale of the single storey side extension; and
- Increase in depth of the single storey rear extension.

Impact on Designated Heritage Asset

Section 72 of the Planning and Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 (as amended) states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states: 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

PfE Policy JP-P2 requires development proposals to ensure the heritage significance of a site or area is considered in accordance with national planning policy.

CS Policy P2 sets out the aim of protecting the borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, such as Conservation Areas.

The Towncroft Cricket Ground to the rear of the application property falls within the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area. Therefore, it is important to consider the impact of the proposals on the setting of the nearby Conservation Area.

The application property sits amid a row of traditional postwar semi-detached dwellings that have been variously extended over the years.

The proposed first floor extension would be a modest addition to the host dwelling characterised by an appropriate hipped roof form. It would also be built using brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing property.

While the use of flat roofs for the single storey extensions would conflict with the design of the original building, it is acknowledged that the existing extensions to the rear of the property have flat roofs and therefore it is not considered that there would be a material difference in terms of the roof design.

Additionally, while the proposed use of render would conflict with the prevailing use of red brick, it is noted that the render would be used exclusively at ground floor level, which would reduce its impact.

Overall, it is considered that the extensions would not have a harmful impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. The extensions would reflect the design of the existing extensions and would have an appropriate scale in the context of the neighbouring properties. Moreover, the use of render would be balanced against the existing brickwork, limiting the visual impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.

Therefore, the proposal would accord with CS Policy P2, PfE Policy JP-P2 and the relevant policies contained within the NPPF.

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

| | |
|---|---|
| Impact on street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line | ✓ |
| Height and massing | ✓ |
| Facing materials and detailing | ✓ |
| Roof style | ✓ |
| Window proportions | ✓ |
| Bin storage | ✓ |
| Impact on trees | ✓ |

While the use of render would be at odds with the material palette of the application property, it is noted that the render would be applied exclusively to walls of the single storey extensions. The side extension would be set well back from the principal elevation, meaning the render would not be a prominent feature within the street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

| | |
|---|---|
| Impact on privacy, light & outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front) | ✓ |
| Light and outlook of application property | ✓ |
| Remaining garden space of application property | ✓ |

Although the proposals would result in a raised patio to the rear, it is noted that this is to provide level amenity access into the rear garden and would match the height of the existing raised patio. On this basis, no concerns are had regarding the raised patio.

Furthermore, the first floor extension, with a rear projection of 1.7m, would comply with the requirements set out in the Council's SPD (Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development), ensuring no adverse levels of overshadowing or overlooking for neighbouring residents.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Impact on highway safety | ✓ |
| Parking provision | ✓ |

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

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 hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- Existing & Proposed Plans. Dwg no. JH-01_01 rev G
- Existing & Proposed Elevations & Site Plans, & block location plan. Dwg no. JH-01_02 rev H

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory development in accordance with the policies 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 development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with drawing JH-01_02 rev H unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

| | Date | Officer |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Report Completed | 03/09/2025 | Signed: BM |
| Authorisation | 09/09/2025 | Signed: AC |

Report Author Bob Melling