

Application Number:	25/00746/HOUS
Location:	17 Brook Terrace, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3QA
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear dormer extension
Applicant:	Mrs Karen Bladen
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 12.09.2025	EXT OF TIME 19.09.2025
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

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 no. 17 Brook Terrace, a two-storey end terrace property located in Newhey. The dwelling is adjoined to no. 15 Brook Terrace to the south-west and is adjacent to no. 200 Huddersfield Road to the north-east. The dwelling is primarily accessible via an unadopted access road from Huddersfield Road and has an appearance akin to back-to-back houses, where both the front and rear elevation comprise entrance doors. The property is sited some 6m away from Piethorne Brook to the south-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey side extension which projects 3.38m from the side elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a flat roof with a roof lantern and has a ridge height of 2.98m.

The submitted plans also indicate the addition of a gable-fronted dormer to the south-east facing roof slope. It measures 2.2m in length, 2.02m in height and 3.54m in depth. Lastly, one roof light would be installed on each roof slope respectively.

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

Relevant History

24/01226/HOUS - 2 storey pitched roof side extension with new rear facing pitched roof dormers. – Grant subject to conditions

93/D29215 - Erection Of 6FT High Boundary Fence To Enclose Existing Garden And Car Parking Area. - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

Whilst this proposal does represent an apparent loss of parking, Highways do not believe there will be any detrimental impact upon the highway and as such no objection are had to this proposal.

Environment Agency

EA has no objection in principle to the proposed development and has provided standard advice regarding permits which has been attached to the decision notice.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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 side extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a flat roof form, though not in line with existing roof forms in the area, would not appear overly obtrusive due to its considerable 26m setback from the adopted highway and the screening offered by the existing boundary fencing.
- ☐ 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 proposal also comprises the addition of one dormer to the south-east facing roof slope. Section 5.16 of the SPD 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 proposed dormer would face the south-west and would not be readily visible from Huddersfield Road. It is also appropriately positioned above the lower floors windows and is modestly sized, setting away from the ridge, eaves and the side walls. The use of gable-fronted roof form would constitute satisfactory design, as would the dark grey vertically hung tiles which would match the existing roof.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed dormer would comply with all points of Section 5.17 and would be acceptable in this regard.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ In addition, Section 5.17 of the SPD 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 dormer does not face any properties to the south-east. The proposed single-storey side extension would be sited in excess of 40m from the front elevation windows of no. 189 Huddersfield Road. As such, no concerns are had with residential amenity impacts arising from the proposal.
- ☐ By virtue of its siting, the dwelling benefits from additional curtilage space to the side which would be severed under the proposed plans. However, the limited residual space would be consistent with the garden space of adjacent

properties and would comprise sufficient space for functional use which would be acceptable.

- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms which would ensure a satisfactory standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1, 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.
- ☐ As it stands, the dwelling does not appear to have any formal provisions for parking, though the side curtilage space has been used to store vehicles. The absence of private parking space is prevalent amongst the surrounding terraced properties, and is mostly accommodated through on-street parking on Huddersfield Road. Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed side extension would remove the existing parking space, given the restricted parking arrangements, it is considered a refusal on highway grounds cannot be reasonably substantiated in this instance.
- ☐ It is also noted the Council's Highways Officer has raised no objections to the proposal.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

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 permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing no. 908-101 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. 908-107 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan – Drawing no. 908-102 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Existing First Floor Plan – Drawing no. 908-103 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Existing Loft Plan – Drawing no. 908-104 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Existing Roof Plan – Drawing no. 908-105 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing no. 908-106 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing no. 908-108A received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing no. 908-109A received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Proposed Loft Plan – Drawing no. 908-110 received 18/07/2025

- ☐ Proposed Roof Plan – Drawing no. 908-111 received 18/07/2025
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing no. 908-112A received 18/07/2025

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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 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.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity 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	19/09/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	19/09/2025	Signed: TH

INFORMATIVES:

1. The applicant is reminded that under The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, a permit must be obtained for any activities which will take place:
 - ☐ on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
 - ☐ on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)
 - ☐ on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
 - ☐ involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
 - ☐ in the floodplain of a main river if the activity could affect flood flow or storage and potential impacts are not controlled by a planning permission

Please note the granting of this planning permission does not assume a permit will be automatically forthcoming. The applicant is advised to consult the Environmental Agency at the earliest opportunity.

Report Author Sam Yuen