

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01235/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01235/HOUS
Location:	36 Ansdell Road, Rochdale, OL16 4TT
Proposal:	Proposed first floor rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Sikander Razzaq
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 10.02.2025	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. 36 Ansdell Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential estate in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 34 Ansdell Road to the south-west, adjacent to no. 38 Ansdell Road to the north-east, and faces the highway to the north-west. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the rear curtilages of nos. 37, 39 and 41 Buxton Crescent to the south-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, above the existing 6m single-storey rear extension. The extension is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form and is set down 0.75m from the ridge of the host dwelling with matching height to eaves.

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

Relevant History

23/00819/HH42 - Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 6m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.50m and height to eaves to 2.50m) - Resubmission of 23/00617/HH42 - Prior Approval Not Required

23/00617/HH42 - Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 6m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.50m and height to eaves to 2.50m) - Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objections as the proposal will not impact upon the highway.

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

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby 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 NPPF 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 enlarge the dwelling through a 3m first-floor rear extension which would sit above an existing single-storey rear extension of a 6m by 8.38m footprint. The cumulative impacts of the first-floor extension with the existing ground floor projection would result in a disproportionately large building which dominates the host dwelling from the rear.
- ☐ The site is located close to the junction with Buxton Crescent and as such is subject to reduced separation distances from nos. 39 and 41 Buxton Crescent. The sheer width of the extensions would therefore have an imposing and oppressive presence when viewed from the opposite facing properties.
- ☐ Owing to the open aspect nature of the curtilages of no. 38 Ansdell Road and no. 43 Buxton Crescent, the extensions would also be readily visible from the highway and would constitute prominent and harmful additions to the street scene.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted 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 adjoining no. 34 benefits from a recently constructed 6m single-storey rear extension (23/00632/HH42). Taking this into account, the proposed first-floor rear extension would project 3m from the first floor rear elevation of no. 34 and would accord with the standards set out in Section 5.10 of the SPD.
- ❑ With reference to Section 4.1 of the SPD, the rear-facing bedroom windows would also maintain a minimum separation distance of 23.77m from the directly-facing rear habitable room windows of nos. 35 and 37 Buxton Crescent and would not result in undue overlooking in this regard.
- ❑ The proposed extension would result in separation distances between 6.41m to 8.12m from the rear-facing bedroom windows to the directly facing curtilage boundary and would fail to meet the minimum standards of Section 4.1. The applicant has attempted to address this by obscurely glazing the rear bedroom windows. However, by virtue of its proximity to the curtilage boundary, the proposed extension would nonetheless instil a sense of being oppressed and overlooked when stood in the adjacent amenity space, regardless of any obscure glazing.
- ❑ In any case, the use of obscure glazing to the sole windows of the rear-facing bedrooms would remove the main source of outlook for the host occupants and is a wholly unsatisfactory and ill-advised design solution which would not be acceptable.
- ❑ The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of host property and would fail to accord 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.”*
- ❑ The proposal would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking space 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, built form, massing and design, the proposed first-floor extension, viewed with the existing single-storey rear extension, constitutes an overly dominant, and disproportionate and imposing addition to the host dwelling which would result in adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. 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', Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its siting and distance from the directly-facing curtilage boundary, the proposed first-floor rear extension, together with the single-storey rear extension would result in undue overbearing impact on the rear amenity space of nos. 37 and 39 Buxton Crescent, to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. 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.
3. The proposed first-floor rear extension would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of outlook to the proposed upper floor bedrooms through the use of obscured glazing and the absence of unobscured openings. 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	07/02/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	10/02/2025	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

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

- Location Plan – received 17/12/2024
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. 23.3093.3A received 17/12/2024
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 23.3093.1B received 17/12/2024
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 23.3093.SC1.1A received 17/12/2024

Report Author Sam Yuen

