

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00610/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00610/HOUS
Location:	31 Rosefield Crescent, Rochdale, OL16 5BD
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single storey side extension and two storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Applicant:	Mohammed Saim
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 10.09.2025	EXT OF TIME
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. 31 Rosefield Crescent, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 33 Rosefield Crescent to the east, adjacent to no. 29 Rosefield Crescent to the west and faces the highway to the south. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the rear curtilage of no. 15 Margaret Avenue to the north. The property benefits from a detached garage to the rear curtilage space.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension to the host dwelling, following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory. It comprises the following:

- A 2.25m side extension with the first-floor element set back 3.51m from the main front wall of the dwelling. The single-storey extension is characterised

by a hipped roof form and measures 3.19m in ridge height and 2.48m in height to eaves.

- ② A rear extension with a maximum projection of 3.63m including a single-storey section along the common boundary of no. 33. It is also characterised by a hipped roof form and is set down 0.56m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves. The rear and side projections join to form an L-shaped wraparound extension.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

No comments received at the time of writing.

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.
- ☐ 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 proposal seeks to substantially enlarge the host dwelling by means of a part-two, part single-storey side and rear extension. The resultant development would have a maximum depth of 10.08m and width of 8.12m and would appear as a dominant and bulky addition which fails to be subservient to the host dwelling.
- ☐ Whilst it is acknowledged that views of the extension from the highway would be limited to the modest 2.25m side projection, the breadth of the rear extension would nonetheless be prominent from the rear windows and amenity spaces of the adjoining properties, particularly from adjacent no. 29 where no boundary treatments current exist between the properties, and would represent an obtrusive and oppressive structure which is out of scale with the dwellings in the vicinity.

- ❑ The proposal would result in a circa 110% increase in floor space over and above the original dwelling and would constitute an overdevelopment of the plot.
- ❑ Additional concerns are had regarding the inclusion of the 1.5m by 1.03m single-storey rear extension, which is an irregular and unnecessary addition and appears to exist solely to meet the maximum standard of the SPD.
- ❑ As a result of seeking to maximise the quantum of development based upon the restrictions of the SPD in respect of the amenity of adjoining neighbours, the proposals would read as a wholly dominant, and unresolved assemblage of forms with a discordant and confused roof form. The proposed development is not considered to be well-designed and would result in undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord 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.
- ❑ The proposed single-storey rear extension does not project beyond the existing rear conservatory and is not considered to result in additional amenity impact to the occupants of no. 33. The proposed two-storey rear extension marginally projects beyond the requirements of Section 5.9 of the SPD by up to 0.23m but would not amount to material amenity harm in this regard.
- ❑ The proposal does not comprise habitable room windows to the front elevation and would be sited in excess of 24m and 11m from the rear habitable room window and curtilage boundary of no. 15 Margaret Avenue respectively, in compliance with the space standards of Section 4.1 of the SPD.
- ❑ Notwithstanding the above, the rear extension would project beyond a 30-degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 29 and would result in undue overbearing and overshadowing to the amenity space and rear-facing windows of the neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ The proposal would therefore unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, 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.

- ❑ Notwithstanding the loss of the hardstanding to the side of the dwelling, the proposed development would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces to the front driveway.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale and width, massing and design, the sum of the proposed extensions constitutes non-subservient and obtrusive additions which would dominate the host dwelling and would represent an overdevelopment of the plot. The proposed development would not be well-designed and would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted 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 Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its size and siting, the proposed two-storey rear extension would result in undue overbearing and overshadowing impact to the rear amenity space and habitable room windows of no. 29 Rosefield Crescent. The proposed development would therefore lead to an undue loss of amenity to the neighbouring occupiers and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	10/09/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	10/09/2025	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

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

- Location Plan – received 23/07/2025
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan – drawing no. 25.3593.3A received 16/07/2025
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 25.3593.1 received 16/06/2025

- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 25.3593.2 received 16/06/2025

Report Author Sam Yuen