

Application Number:	25/00372/HOUS
Location:	9 Greenbooth Road Rochdale OL12 7TD
Proposal:	Two-story side extension comprising a new kitchen / diner to the ground floor plus a third bedroom, ensuite and balcony to the first floor.
Applicant:	Ms Rebecca Ashurst
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
DETERMINATION DATE 17.06.2025	EXT OF TIME 09/07/2025
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NA
	Contrary to previous decision?	NA
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NA

Location

The application site relates to a two storey end terrace dwelling. The dwelling benefits from the land to the side, which is the site of a former dwelling which is understood to have been demolished in the 1950s / 1960s. The area acts as off street parking for the property. There is no record that planning permission has been applied to change the use of the land to the side to the residential curtilage of No 9 however officers are satisfied that the use of land as curtilage will likely be lawful given the passage of time.

The dwelling is a stone-built terrace located at the end of the row. The street is cobbled, and the character of the street remains as a traditional stone streetscene.

The site is not within a conservation area, is not listed, nor within the setting of any heritage asset. The site is located within the defined urban area (Saved UDP Policies G/D/1) and partially within a Greenspace corridor (Saved UDP Policy G/8).

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension.

The proposal would be flush with the front elevation, and set back at first floor to the rear by 1.4m. The extension has a hipped roof which sits lower than the main ridge height, and a flat roof above the part ground floor area of the side extension.

The front door will be relocated to sit within the proposed side extension (with the existing opening blocked up) and contemporary, narrow windows with black frames are proposed with a sill and lintel height to match the original property. To the rear elevation, a horizontal window wraps around the ground floor corner to the rear. A Juliette balcony is proposed at the rear elevation on the first floor, with a part flat roof at the rear elevation.

Proposed materials include natural slate to the roof, natural stone and render to the elevations, and black upvc window and door frames.

Relevant History

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

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:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

G/8 Greenspace Corridor

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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).

Summary of comments from neighbours

Four letters of objection were received.

- Design and visual impact of the proposed extension. Blocking up the original doorway, the splayed extension and rendered walls are unsympathetic and detrimental to visual amenity.
- More stone to be in keeping with the terrace and not rendered block
- Query over the legal ownership of the land
- Privacy issue due to balcony
- The parking space would be removed which would exacerbate the already limited parking on Greenbooth Road. Access to the Greenbooth Mill site will be affected by increasing on street parking

- Concern over construction during works
- Access needs to be maintained for 11, 13 and 15 Greenbooth Rd
- Emergency access to Greenbooth road will be impeded
- Property was not built for extensions, stone built cottage on a quiet road, not designed to be extended
- Crime due to the gap between No 5 and 9 Greenbooth being reduced to a ginnel.

Officer response:

Disruption during construction works is covered under separate legislation. The applicant's agent was approached for clarification over the ownership and confirmed the Certificate A is correct. For clarity, an amended proposed site plan was submitted with the red line area consistent with the site location plan. Further clarification on this point was sought, and the applicant confirmed their ownership was correct.

Amendments

Amendments were submitted to reduce the render proposed and widen the proposed windows, as well as alterations to the fenestration to remove the original lintel and doorway. The balcony was removed at the rear to alleviate concern of overlooking. The proposed site plan was amended to reflect the same red line plan shown on the location plan. Prior to refusal of the application, the applicant was given the opportunity to make further amendments to address the outstanding concerns and was requested to agree to a time extension. However amended plans were not forthcoming and a time extension was not agreed.

Assessment

Design and Visual Amenity:

Despite the matching sill and lintel heights, the proposed windows (positioning and narrow shape) would bear little resemblance to the existing dwellinghouse and terrace row. Coupled with the relocation of the front door, the resulting property would disrupt the rhythm of the terrace row with imbalanced proportions and detract significantly from the simple uniformity of the historic street scene. It would appear wider than the adjoining dwelling in the row and would fail to replicate the door to the left and 1 window up, 1 window down arrangement as shown in images 1 and 2 below. This would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.



Image 1: Screenshot of Google Maps image of the application dwelling and adjoining terraced row on Greenbooth Road (Source: Google Maps, 2025).



Image 2: Proposed Front Elevation from dwg no. 0021/01_07 Rev B. (Source: Applicants submission to the Council)

The harm is exacerbated by the site's highly visible corner plot, as viewed when travelling north along Greenbooth Road.

The dwellings in this historic are constructed from natural stone, to all elevations. Natural stone is overwhelmingly the dominant material within this locality. As such, the proposed use of render to the side and rear elevation would further detract from the existing traditional character and appearance of the area, and be visible when travelling north along Greenbooth Road, also. A screenshot of a streetview image of the site can be viewed in Photo 1, which aims to demonstrate how the proposed extension's side elevation would be highly visible.



The proposed set back at first floor to the rear would not in isolation be unacceptable, however the set down of the roof further emphasises how the proposal would fail to be in keeping with the form of the traditional terrace row.

It is noted representations submitted that note the scale of the extension reduce the existing area between No 5 and No 9. The proposal does not seek to project any greater than the original dwellinghouse that was previously on the site, albeit in a different shape. The proposed footprint of the proposal is not unacceptable.

Neighbouring residents have strongly objected specifically to the harmful design of the proposed extension, with which, as explained above, Officers concur. Overall, the extension is unacceptable through its incongruous design relative to the host dwelling and has an unacceptably harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal fails to accord with CS Policies DM1 and P3, and PfE Policies JP-P1 which seek to ensure that new development respects local character. It would be contrary to the SPD which highlights that proposals should be in keeping with the host property. The proposed development would also conflict with the NPPF, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Residential Amenity:

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, 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. This is reflected in both the NPPF and PfE, which establish the importance of achieving high standards of residential amenity.

The proposed two storey side extension would propose an additional bedroom to the property with a floor area of 14.4sqm. The bedroom will be served by a floor length window to the front, and a Juliet balcony to the rear.

The windows to the front would face onto Greenbooth Road, which has mature trees to the eastern side, and therefore would not directly overlook any properties.

To the rear, the junction of the neighbouring terrace properties presents a close relationship between the properties, with small rear yard garden areas. Following the direct line of sight from the Juliet balcony, the proposal would face a dense hedge located at the rear of properties on Edenfield Road and Slaunt Bank, situated much higher up than the application property. Therefore; no concerns are raised in respect of overlooking on these properties.

In relation to the overlooking impact on the adjacent properties; the proposed bedroom would be set back at first floor, and therefore have a similar, if not less impact on the neighbouring properties than the existing arrangement at first floor.

It is acknowledged the presence of new development would result in a degree of overshadowing and overbearing on adjacent properties however given the siting, the end gable of No 5 has no side windows to be affected by this.

A flat roof is proposed above the ground floor extension; and a Juliet balcony at the rear of the bedroom. A planning condition is attached to ensure the flat roof is not used as a balcony at any time.

With note of the neighbour objections, it is not considered the presence of the extension would be unacceptable in regards to neighbour amenity. It is noted the stone cobbles show the former width of the ginnel between the terraces, and the width of the former ginnel would not be impeded by the proposed extension.

The proposal would result in the loss of the amenity area to the side of the property, however it is acknowledged this was used as a parking area for the applicant and does not remove any private amenity space, as it is wholly within public view. The existing garden curtilage that remains is of a similar size and scale to the adjacent properties, and for this reason, the loss of the area to the side is not considered unacceptable.

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

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	✓
Parking provision	✓

The proposed scheme would remove the existing area to the side which provides an off street parking space to the side of the property. The existing dwelling has 2

bedrooms. An additional bedroom is proposed, resulting in a 3 bedroom dwelling. Under the Council's adopted car parking standards, 2 spaces should be provided for a 2+ bedroom dwelling. Therefore officers must consider the acceptability of the loss of the 1 existing space. The minor increase in parking displacement onto Greenbooth Road is considered minimal overall and would not affect highway safety or access to Greenbooth Mill. Traffic restrictions are located on Edenfield Road. On balance the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, the proposed extension to the host dwelling would constitute an unsympathetic and unacceptably harmful addition that would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the streetscene and the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse when read with the existing terrace row. The proposal does not therefore accord with policies DM1, P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

1. 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.

Notes:

1. For the avoidance of doubt, the application relates to the following plans and documents:
 - ☐ Location Plan - received 04/07/2025
 - ☐ Amended Proposed Site Plan - 0021/01_05 Rev A - 03/07/2025
 - ☐ Amended Proposed Building Plans – 0021/01_06 – Rev B received 20/06/2025
 - ☐ Amended Proposed Building Elevations - 0021/01_07 Rev B - received 20/06/2025
 - ☐ Amended Artists Impression Front - 0021/01_08 - Rev B - received 20/06/2025
 - ☐ Amended Artists Impression Rear - 0021/01_09 - Rev C - received 20/06/2025
 - ☐ Application Form

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	13/08	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	13/08/25	Signed:LA

Report Author Rosalind Galton