

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00919/HOUS

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
25/00919/HOUS

CASE OFFICER
Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 11.11.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: 1 Mainway Middleton Rochdale M24 1LE

Proposal: Single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and rear dormer extensions including hip to gable and roof lights following demolition of existing conservatory

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	N	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N/A
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

SITE

The site is located at 1 Mainway, Middleton, this is a large, detached dwelling finished in red brick. The property benefits from off street parking, front and rear amenity space.

The property has had additions over the years and the neighbouring properties differ slightly in character.

The site is located in the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and rear dormer extensions including hip to gable and roof lights following demolition of existing conservatory

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**National Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional**Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)****9. Places for People**

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1	Delivering a more prosperous economy
E1	Establishing thriving town, district and local centres
SO2	Creating successful and healthy communities
SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P3	Improving design of new development
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving accessibility
DM1	General development requirements
SD1	Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

01/D39206 – Conservatory extension to rear of dwelling. Approved

93/D30178 – Two storey side extension to dwelling. Approved

86/D19458 – Single storey extension to side of dwellinghouse. Approved

85/D17682 – First floor extension to side of dwellinghouse.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding properties and no comments have been received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The proposed application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The site is located with a predominately residential area and the principle of development is considered acceptable.

Design

Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, which is largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

The proposed side extension combined with the hip to gable roof will not result in a terracing effect, however the totality of both will transform the frontage of the dwelling resulting in a substantial increase in massing of the dwelling. The proposed ridge will match the existing ridge and will be flush with the front elevation. This is not considered to be subservient to the host dwelling producing an expansive and unbroken massing. The proposed side extension would extend the ridge line of the building 10m beyond its existing and would appear visually disproportionate as a result. The proposed development will become visually dominant within the street scene.

No concerns are held over the use of matching materials, however such materiality would do little to mitigate the visual impact of such a visually disproportionate building, or break up its expansive front elevation. Similarly, the matching window detail would assist in tying in the new development with the existing, although the misalignment would appear conspicuous and irregular, and would exacerbate the harm identified.

The SPD sets out guidance for dormers in paragraph 5.17, the proposed rear dormers comply with this. They would not be seen from the highway and are of an appropriate scale.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is unacceptable and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Impact on Surrounding Occupiers.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

The SPD sets out guidance for single storey extensions, the proposed extension will project 6m from the common boundary with no. 3 Mainway, this will comply with the SPD and not have a negative impact on neighbour amenity.

The plans confirm the provision of light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

There are no windows proposed on the side elevations, the proposed windows on the front elevation will not have a negative impact on surrounding occupiers due to the distance between properties.

In view of the above assessment, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The proposed development will not have an impact on the existing parking layout or highway.

The proposal accords with the requirements of Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. By reason of its scale and form, the proposed side extension combined with the hip to gable roof extension would not read as a subservient addition to the host dwelling and would produce an expansive, and unbroken massing of significant width which would be uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. The result of the development would be an overly dominant and incongruous feature within the street scene that would give rise to adverse harm to character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. The proposed development therefore fails to be suitably well-designed and is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the 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 requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

For avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan 9200/001 Rev A
- Proposed Plans and Elevations 8000/001 Rev A

Report Author Aimee Bovaird