

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00151/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00151/HOUS
Location:	350 Albert Royds Street, Rochdale, OL16 5AD
Proposal:	Single storey front porch extension, part single storey/part two storey rear extension and the erection of new outbuilding following demolition of existing
Applicant:	Mrs Fatima Faiz
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 23.04.2025	EXT OF TIME 30.04.2025
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 no. 350 Albert Royds Street, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a housing estate in Firgrove. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 348 Albert Royds Street to the north, adjacent to no. 352 Albert Royds Street to the south, and faces the highway to the east. The rear curtilage boundary adjoins the rear curtilages of nos. 38, 40, 42, 44 and 46 St Anns Road to the west. Albert Royds Street/A664 is a high-trafficked classified road which forms part of the ring road for Rochdale town centre.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements to the host dwelling, including:

- ☐ A single-storey rear extension which projects 1.4m and 0.6m from the existing rear extension along the common boundary of no. 352 and no. 348 respectively. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of up to 3.15m and a height to eaves of 3.03m;
- ☐ A two-storey rear extension which projects 4.2m and 2.4m from the rear elevation along the no. 352 and no. 348 respectively. It features two separate hipped roofs and is set down up to 0.61m from the ridge line of the host dwelling with matching height to eaves; and
- ☐ A single-storey front porch extension which projects 1.2m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a hipped roof form and has a ridge height of 3.46m and a height to eaves of 2.6m.

The proposed extensions would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling.

In addition, the proposal seeks to construct a replacement outbuilding in the rear curtilage to accommodate a gym and games room. It occupies an L-shape form and comprises a dual-pitched roof form. It measures up to 10.82m in width and up to 3m in depth and has a ridge height of 3.07m and a height to eaves of 2.65m. It would be constructed in KRender coloured render.

The proposed plans also indicate the alteration and addition of windows to the front and side elevation.

Relevant History

15/00226/HOUS - Erection of conservatory to the rear of dwelling – Refuse

Officer's Comments:

1. The proposed extension, when taken with the existing extension at the rear of this property, would lead to a total projection at ground floor level of 6.3m beyond the original rear elevation of the property, along the common boundary with No. 348 Albert Royds Street. This would lead to an overbearing impact and unacceptable overshadowing of this property to the detriment of their residential amenity. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies H/11 and BE/2 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Guidelines and Standards for New Residential Development'.

05/D45120 - Single Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling (Resubmission - D43539) - Grant subject to conditions

04/D43539 - Single Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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.
- ❑ Of note, Paragraph 139 of the Framework states *“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 such as design guides and codes.”*
- ❑ The host dwelling sits in a well-established residential estate with a cohesive appearance and a defined, uninterrupted building line. Where alterations to the front elevation are present, these are limited to minor works such as porch canopies that do not detract from the overall character of the dwellings.
- ❑ The proposal seeks to, amongst other things, construct a front porch extension with a 1.2m projection and a width of 6.4m. The resultant extension would occupy almost the full width of the dwelling and would effectively obscure and distort the facade of the building. By virtue of its excessive scale and built form, the proposed porch would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous addition to the dwelling, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene.
- ❑ The proposal also seeks to extend the property by way of a part-single, part-two storey rear extension with a maximum projection of 5m from the rear elevation. By virtue of its excessive scale and massing, the extension would result in a dominant and bulky addition which fails to be subservient to the host dwelling. The staggered projection would also result in two separate hipped roofs and constitutes an irregular and poorly thought-out feature. Whilst the rear extension would not be readily visible from the highway, it would remain prominent from the rear windows and curtilages of the surrounding dwellings due to its enclosed layout and would constitute undue harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- ❑ The proposed outbuilding would represent an enlargement to the one it replaces. However, owing to its single-storey form and the marginal difference in overall height, it is considered the visual impact of the outbuilding to the surrounding area would be limited and would not amount to unacceptable harm.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of design and appearance. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted CS, the SPD, 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.”*
- ☐ Taking into account of the maximum standard of Section 5.6 and 5.7 of the SPD, the proposed single-storey rear extension would not exceed the 45 degree line drawn 4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of no. 352. However, the extension would project 3.6m along the common boundary of adjoined no. 348, exceeding the requirements of Section 5.6. Considering the siting of no. 348 to the north of the extension, and the restricted size of its rear curtilage, the proposed extension would result in undue loss of natural light to the rear habitable room windows and the rear curtilage space, to the detriment of the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The maximum standard for single-storey rear extensions has also been applied to the proposed front porch extension and is not considered to result in adverse amenity impacts in this regard.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension would comply with the requirements of Section 5.8 of the SPD. It would also be sited in excess of 30m from the directly-facing habitable room windows of no. 38 St Anns Road, in accordance with the Section 4.1 (i). Whilst it is noted the first-floor windows would be sited circa 8m from the curtilage boundary of no. 46, which falls short of the requirements of (ii), the area of the curtilage overlooked would be at the rearmost, and the least actively used part of the garden. Given this, and the generally compact arrangements of the surrounding dwellings, it is considered the amenity impacts of this component would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The proposed outbuilding is marginally taller than the one it replaces and is not considered to result in material additional amenity impacts to the adjoining curtilages.
- ☐ With regard to occupier amenity, the proposed extensions would result in substantial depths of up to 10m to the lounge/dining area. As such, the proposals would fail to provide sufficient access natural light and outlook to the ground-floor habitable rooms. The addition of obscurely glazed side elevation windows would not satisfactorily ameliorate the harm identified.
- ☐ The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the host occupants and occupants of neighbouring properties and would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted CS, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ 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 CS.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, built form and design, the proposed front extension constitutes an obtrusive and incongruous addition to the dwelling

which results in undue harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposed two-storey rear extension also represents a non-subservient and irregular addition due to its excessive scale, massing and roof form design. The proposed development would not be well-designed and 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.

2. The proposed single-storey rear extension would result in undue loss in residential amenity of the occupiers of no. 348 Albert Royds Street by way of adverse overshadowing to the ground-floor rear facing windows. 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.
3. The proposed extensions would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of natural light to the proposed ground-floor lounge area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 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.

INFORMATIVES

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

- Location Plan and Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. 2427/PFF/04 Rev. B received 26/02/2025
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 2427/PFF/01 Rev. B received 14/02/2025
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 2427/PFF/02 received 14/02/2025
- Existing and Proposed Outbuilding Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 2427/PFF/03 Rev. B received 25/02/2025

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	30/04/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	30/04/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen