

Application Number:	25/00026/HOUS
Location:	36 Arthur Street Rochdale OL12 6SJ
Proposal:	Front and rear dormer, part single storey party two storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Raja Shahbaz Saleem
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	n/a
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	n/a

Location

The application relates to no. 36 Arthur Street; a two-storey, semi-detached property on the edge of Rochdale town centre. Arthur Street comprises predominantly terraced houses finished in a variety of materials. The wider area is typically urban, consisting of linear terraced houses, various local amenities, and industrial units to the west.

No. 36 faces west, fronting the pavement and overlooking the adopted highway. To the south it adjoins the Jamia Haideryah Mosque (formerly the United Reform Church), which is listed by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset. To the north, the site borders the rear garden of no. 77 Mitchell Street, and to the east, it borders the rear garden of no. 75 Mitchell Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought, retrospectively, for a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension, together with a front and rear dormer extension to facilitate a loft conversion.

At ground floor level, the rear extension adjoins the existing two-storey outrigger and infills the vacant space in the rear garden. It comprises a sloped roof, a side door and window, and a rear window. It projects 4.6m from the original dwelling along the

boundary with no. 77 Mitchell Street, before projecting an additional 0.4m towards the middle, where it meets the shared boundary with no. 75 Mitchell Street. The ground floor extension measures 5.22m (width) X 3.3m (eaves height) X 4m (maximum height).

At first-floor level, the rear extension comprises a flat roof and a rear window. It projects approximately 2.8m from the original dwelling, and measures 2.5m (width) X 6m (height).

The front and rear dormer extension is effectively a 1m upwards extension above the original ridge height of the dwelling, comprising a flat roof, two front windows, and a single rear window. The measurements are 6.2m (width) X 5m (depth).

The proposed materials include white render to all elevations, UPVC windows and doors, composite cladding to the dormers, and concrete roof tiles.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 22/01/2025. Nine objection letters were received in relation to the following issues:

Objection	Officer's response
Appearance and design	Comments addressed in the 'design' section of this report.
Overshadowing towards neighbouring gardens.	Comments addressed in the 'amenity' section of this report.
Reduced privacy for neighbouring occupants.	Comments addressed in the 'amenity' section of this report.
Works not carried out in accordance with building regulations.	This is not a material planning consideration and will instead be addressed by the Council's Building Regulations department.
Dispute over red edge of site boundary.	Disputes over boundaries to curtilages are a civil matter and are not a material planning consideration.

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
JP-P2	Heritage

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:

P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that 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.

Dormers:

The Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD recognises that dormer extensions can appear incongruous if not designed and sited carefully. As such, paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 of the SPD establish design principles for dormer extensions, the following of which, the dormer extension has failed to comply with:

- Front dormer extensions will not normally be permitted;
- dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof;
- they should be set back from the eaves line;
- they should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;
- dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;
- the materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof.

It should be noted that paragraph 5.18 concedes that it may be acceptable to relax the guidelines on dormer extensions, There are numerous examples of front dormer extensions along Arthur Street and Mitchell Street which are subsequently considered to be characteristic of the area and the proposals could therefore be considered to be appropriate in this context.

However, the dormer extension is a discernibly different form of development to examples found on nearby properties, extending well-above the ridge height of the original dwelling, not being set back from the eaves line, and generally comprising a bulky, visually egregious and incongruous feature.

The siting, materiality and scale of the dormer would not mitigate the harm identified and only serve to exacerbate, the harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Based on these issues the design of the dormer is considered to be wholly unacceptable.

Rear extension:

Policy P3 of the Core Strategy states that new development should have regard to the layout, scale, density, and massing of surrounding buildings and areas. Prior to the rear extension being built, the applicant property had a rear yard within its curtilage, separating the dwelling from the rear yard of no. 75 Mitchell Street. The rear extension now occupies the majority of the former rear yard and extends to the boundary with no. 75 Mitchell Street, or within 0.5m. A site visit revealed that the rear extension is effectively acting as the boundary treatment with the rear yard of no. 75 Mitchell Street. As such, the design of the rear extension is considered to respond poorly to the density and urban grain and the patterns of surrounding built development through overdevelopment of a congested space. The rear extension

has eradicated an unacceptable amount of space between dwellings, leading to an excess of massing in too close proximity to the rear yard and windows of no. 75 Mitchell Street. Given its disregard for the surrounding built environment and harmful impact on views from the rear of no. 75 Mitchell Street, the design of the rear extension is considered to be wholly unacceptable.

Conclusion:

When considering the dormer and rear extension both in isolation and conjunction, their design is considered to be excessive, domineering, and incongruous relative to the host dwelling and surrounding context. As such, the design of the development is deemed to be especially harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding built environment, and fails to accord with the NPPF, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Impact on the amenity of future occupants:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that new development should create places which promote health and well-being, with high standards of amenity for existing and future users. Similarly, Places for Everyone Policy JP-P1 requires development to offer comfortable indoor and outdoor living environments with a high level of amenity, and policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires new development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents.

Regarding outdoor amenity space, paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that an extension that does not leave sufficient garden space is unlikely to be acceptable. The rear extension now occupies approximately 75% of the former rear yard, leaving approximately 6m² of uninhabitable space split across two areas. Given the development has created a five bedroom dwelling, able to accommodate up to 6 people (as per the Nationally Described Space Standards), the lack of any useable outdoor space to address both the functional and recreational requirements expected to be generated by a family dwelling is unacceptable. Without the provision of adequate outdoor space, the dwelling does not provide the required levels of amenity for future occupants or residents.

Regarding internal amenity, it is important that all new habitable rooms are served with an adequate level of natural light. The ground floor rear extension includes a rear window and a side door and window serving the kitchen. These additional windows/doors directly face elevations of neighbouring buildings, with only 0.5m of separation. As such, for the entire ground floor, only the front facing living room window would provide any meaningful level of natural light to a floor plate which is 10m deep, and would therefore provide an unsatisfactory standard of amenity for future occupants.

Impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants:

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to

protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.’ Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

It is recognised that the context to this site is a tight urban grain with minimal distances between buildings, habitable room windows, gardens, and boundaries. As such, occupants of the application dwelling and surrounding properties are accustomed to reduced levels of privacy versus what is prescribed by the SPD and the SPD concedes that exceptions to the standards may be acceptable where the development would not detract from the general levels of privacy and amenity typical in the area.

Notwithstanding, the impact of the development on the amenity of occupants at no. 75 Mitchell Street is considered to be unacceptable. Cumulatively, the two-storey rear extension and rear dormer result in an unacceptable amount of massing in too close proximity to the rear yard of no. 75 Mitchell Street. When viewed from the rear garden and windows of no. 75 Mitchell Street, the development is overbearing and significantly reduces their outlook. Furthermore, given the increase in the height of the dwelling, the development contributes to more overshadowing towards the rear garden and windows of no. 75 Mitchell Street, where there is already limited access to natural light.

For the avoidance of doubt no concerns are held over the impact to the privacy of no.75 Mitchell Street, as the proposals would only introduce rear facing bathroom windows at first floor level, which could be controlled by condition to ensure that they are obscurely glazed in the event that permission is granted.

Conclusion:

The development does not provide an adequate level of amenity for future occupants of the dwelling, due to a lack of habitable garden space and poor provision of natural light to the ground floor. Furthermore, the development is considered to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupants at no. 75 Mitchell Street by reducing the outlook from their rear windows and garden, and through overshadowing and its overbearing impact. The development is therefore unacceptable and fails to comply with the NPPF, PfE policy JP-P1, Core Strategy policy DM1, and the SPD.

Heritage: P2 and JP-P3

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The site adjoins Jamia Heddaria Mosque, 73 Mitchell Street. Formerly a United Reformist Church, the mosque is a non-designated heritage asset recognised for its age and architectural merit. However, the application dwelling adjoins an unattractive modern extension to the mosque on Arthur Street, and the development is not visible in primary views of the original building on Mitchell Street. Therefore, whilst the design of the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene, which includes the modern extension to the mosque, its impact on the heritage significance of no. 73 Mitchell Street is considered to be neutral.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development would have no bearing on the existing parking and servicing arrangements, and therefore accords with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation:

Refuse

1. By virtue of its poor design, the development as carried out, is considered to be excessive, domineering, and incongruous relative to the host dwelling and surrounding context. As such, the design is especially harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding built environment, and fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Council Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the development as carried out, is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupants of the dwelling and neighbouring occupants. The development does not provide an adequate amount of useable garden space which could serve the necessary requirements of a family dwelling. The proximity of rear and side facing ground floor windows to facing elevations would effectively limit the penetration of natural light to the ground floor to that provided by the single, ground floor front facing window. The development would also adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupants at no. 75 Mitchell Street by unduly reducing the amount of outlook and natural light received by no.75's rear facing windows. The development therefore fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policy DM1 of the Rochdale Council Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

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.

Notes for Applicant:

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

- Title Plan, HM Land Registry (SD 8813)
- Location plan
- Proposed floor plans and elevations: A102
- Proposed block plan

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	05/03/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg

Authorisation	05/03/2025	Signed: Ryan Killeen
----------------------	------------	----------------------