

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00978/HOUS

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
25/00978/HOUS

CASE OFFICER
Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 18.11.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: 15 Bonscale Crescent Middleton M24 5LX

Proposal: Part two, part single storey rear extension, front porch extension, insertion of new window to side elevation and the application of render to match existing

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	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
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N

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

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE:17/11/2025

SITE

The site is located at 15 Bonscale Crescent, Middleton. This is a two storey end terraced dwelling. The property faces the highway to the east and is adjoined to 17 Bonscale Crescent. The property benefits from off street parking and a rear amenity space.

The site is located within the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

The applications seeks permission for a part two, part single storey rear extension, front porch extension, insertion of new window to side elevation and the application of render to match existing.

On the ground floor the extension will provide an accessible bedroom and extended living room. On the first floor the proposed development will provide an additional bedroom with an ensuite and bathroom.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

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

Sub-Regional Policy

Places For Everyone (PfE)
JP-S1 Sustainable Development

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:
G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

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).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

25/00570/HOUS - Part two storey, part single storey rear extensions, front porch extension, insertion of new window to side elevation and the application of render to match existing. Refused

24/00647/HOUS - Proposed single storey front extension. Refused

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Not applicable.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding occupiers, 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 development will be finished with a pitched roof, this will fit in with the host dwelling and is considered acceptable.

The proposed development is to be finished in render to match the existing dwelling, this is considered acceptable.

The proposed development would also consist of a front porch, this is considered modest in scale and would not have a negative impact on the street scene.

For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposals would comprise a good standard of design and are considered acceptable and accords 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."*

For a single storey extension, *'a point 3m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling'* the proposed single storey extension projects 4m from the rear elevation of the adjoining house at no. 17 and this does not comply with the SPD, furthermore, the positioning of the extension to the southwest of No.17 would also make the property give rise to a greater level of overshadowing than other orientations.

The SPD also sets out guidance for first floor rear extensions, it sets out that planning permission will not normally be granted for first floor extensions that *'project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from*

the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling'. The proposed development does not comply with the SPD as demonstrated below in Fig.1. This will result in the proposed development having unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers no. 13 Bonscale Crescent, through overshadowing and oppressiveness. To comply with the SPD the projections would need to be reduced by 1.65m.




Figure 1

The scale of the proposed two storey rear extension would be seen from the rear garden on no 13. Bonscale Crescent and would result in a negative impact on the enjoyment of their outdoor amenity space.

As such, it is considered that the proposals would not comprise a good standard of amenity for future occupiers and surrounding occupiers and not accord with the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

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

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF

Personal Circumstances

The SPD sets out in paragraph 5.22 *“Personal circumstances, such as a disability, may make it difficult to provide necessary facilities within the standards set out in this document. The Council may interpret these standards flexibly in such circumstances, but proposals that significantly exceed the standards set out in this document are unlikely to be appropriate. The more general planning considerations, such as the impact of a development on the character of an area and its impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, are still the principal considerations by which the planning application will be judged; the needs of a person may exist for only a few years whereas built development is likely to last for decades.”*

Paragraph 12 of the Framework confirms, amongst other things, that the development plan is the starting point for decision making and where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted.

Due regard has been given to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Regard is also had to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

In this regard, it is noted that the applicant has provided medical evidence that there is a dependant with additional needs and therefore require an accessible bedroom and bathroom, which are not currently provided for within the application property, and would allow the care of this relative with the necessary dignity. The LPA have no reason to doubt that this would be the case and that, in this regard, the proposal has the potential to be beneficial to the dependants and family's quality of life. This is a personal circumstance to which weight is afforded in favour of the appeal.

However, the application is not supported by any evidence to suggest that this proposal is the only way of achieving this goal and that a suitable scheme could not be devised which provides the desired outcome, but which is more sympathetic to the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring properties. In weighing the personal circumstances in the balance, this has to be considered against the unacceptable effect that the development would have on their living conditions. Balancing these effects with the applicants need for the development, it is not considered that granting planning permission would be proportionate in this instance.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. By virtue of its siting, size and scale, the proposed extension would fail to comply with the requirements of paragraph 5.9 of the Standards and Guidelines for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the proposed development would be unduly harmful to the amenity of nos 13 and 17 Bonscale Crescent through overshadowing, an overbearing impact and visual intrusion. Whilst the personal circumstances advanced in the application are noted, such matters are not sufficient to outweigh the harm

identified and the proposal would therefore be contrary to the residential amenity aims of Policy DM1 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.

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

- Location Plan
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan Sheet 6
- Proposed Plans Sheet 4
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 5

Report Author Aimee Bovaird