

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00793/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00793/HOUS
Location:	8 Talbot Street, Rochdale, OL11 3SY
Proposal:	Proposed single storey extension at the rear including front and rear dormer to create habitable rooms.
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Amreen Nida & Shehraiz Asghar
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 17.11.2025	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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 8 Talbot Street, a two-storey terraced dwelling located in Milkstone. The dwelling is sited near the end of a cul-de-sac and is adjoined by no. 6 Talbot Street to the north, adjoined by no. 10 Talbot Street to the south, and faces the highway to the northeast. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto private yards which adjoins Mere Street to the southwest.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements to the host dwelling:

- ☐ A single-storey rear extension which projects 3.4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a hipped roof form and has a ridge height of 3.6m and a height to eaves of 2.7m.
- ☐ A front flat roof dormer which measures 3.6m in length, 1.91m in height and 3.26m; and

- ☐ A rear flat roof dormer which measures 3.6m in length, 2.38m in height and 4.05m in depth.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Four objection letters were received with the following representations:

- ☐ The proposed rear extension would restrict access for the maintenance of the adjacent party walls and potential cause structural issues. Small pets may become trapped in the intervening space.
- ☐ The extension would significantly reduce natural light to adjacent kitchen windows and rear yards.
- ☐ The proximity of the extension would create a sense of enclosure and reduce the open character between the properties.
- ☐ The submitted plans do not show the shared gutter located within the property which may cause drainage and maintenance issues.
- ☐ The proposed dormer would be overbearing and directly overlook into the rear of adjacent property.
- ☐ The proposal may impact on the structure of the adjacent properties.
- ☐ The proposed works will create noise pollution and impact of neighbour's health.
- ☐ The loft space is not big enough to accommodate the size of the extension and may not support the load bearing.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns over access to and/or damages to the neighbouring property relate to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.
- ☐ Concerns relating to overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts are assessed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns over damage and access to shared drains are not material planning considerations.
- ☐ Construction works are expected to result in a level of noise and disturbance and should not be a reason to prevent development. Noise and disturbance

generated in excess of what is 'acceptable' would be controlled via separate legislation through the Council's Public Protection Service.

- ❑ Concerns relating to structural integrity of development relates to Building Control and are not material planning considerations.

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

Amendments had been requested relating to the reduction in the size of the proposed rear dormer and the internal space of the loft bedroom. No amended plans have been forthcoming.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and 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 Framework 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, amongst other things, construct flat roof dormers on the front and rear roof slope of the dwelling respectively. Section 5.16 of the SPD notes *“dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.”* Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:
- i. *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
 - ii. *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
 - iii. *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
 - iv. *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;*
 - v. *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
 - vi. *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
 - vii. *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
 - viii. *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- ☐ The surrounding street scene is characterised by dense terraced properties where front and rear flat roof dormers are present features (as seen on nos. 2, 5, 9, 13 and 14 Talbot Street). Given this site context, it is considered the proposed front dormer would not detract from this established character and would be acceptable in principle.
- ☐ Whilst the proposed front dormer is considered to appropriately sized and sited in relation to its setting, concerns are had regarding the design of the proposed rear dormer which would be set flush with the rear external wall of the dwelling. The resultant structure would appear materially larger than the

existing dormer extensions on Talbot Street, which are all set some distance away from the eaves. This visual impact would be particularly prominent from adjacent Mere Street, where the rear elevation is readily visible and thus the proposal would fail to comply with point (ii) of Section 5.17.

- ❑ For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had regarding the design of the single-storey rear extension, which would constitute a subservient and in keeping addition to the host dwelling.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, by virtue of the excessive scale, siting and design of the proposed rear dormer, the proposal is unacceptable and fails to accord with CS Policies DM1 and P3, the SPD 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.
- ❑ Section 5.17 of the SPD states *“dormer extension should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4 [of the SPD]. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*
- ❑ The proposed dormers do not project beyond the front and rear elevation of the host dwelling and would retain the existing separation distance from the front and rear-facing properties. With regard to the overlooking impact to the adjacent rear gardens, the field of view afforded by the dormer window is limited due to its positioning and the reduced-sized window. As such, the proposed rear dormer is not considered to give rise to undue loss of privacy to the neighbouring amenity space.
- ❑ The submitted floor plans indicate the proposed dormers and loft conversion would result in two additional bedrooms. The proposed rear-facing Bedroom 3 comprises an internal floor area of 4.82m² which falls considerably short of the minimum space standards for a single bedroom as set out in the *Nationally described space standards (NDSS)* and would compromise the amenity of the host occupants.
- ❑ The proposed single-storey rear extension exceeds the space requirements of Section 5.7 of the SPD by 0.11m. However, this exceedance is marginal, and it is considered this additional projection would not result in undue overshadowing or overbearing impact to the neighbouring rear habitable room windows and amenity space.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, the extension would occupy much of the existing rear yard, leaving a 4m by 1m gap between the extension and the rear boundary wall. Given the limited amenity space available, it is considered the remaining space would not be sufficient for functional use for the proposed four-bedroom property and would be detrimental to the amenity of the host occupants.
- ❑ The proposal would therefore fail to ensure a satisfactory standard of amenity for the host occupants and would fail to accord with CS 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 host dwelling relies on on-street parking on Talbot Street; this arrangement would remain under the proposed plans. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with CS Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale and the failure of setback from the eaves, the proposed rear dormer constitutes an incongruous and prominent addition to the host dwelling and would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 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. The proposed extensions would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling due to the inadequate provision of internal space to the proposed rear-facing bedroom and the loss of the existing rear amenity space. The proposed development would fail to ensure an adequate standard of amenity for the host occupants and 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 Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11/11/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	17/11/2025	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

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

- ❑ Location Plan – received 31/07/2025
- ❑ Existing Site Plan – drawing no. 01 received 31/07/2025

- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – drawing no. 06A received 22/09/2025
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan – drawing no. 02 received 31/07/2025
- ☐ Existing Elevations – drawing no. 03 received 31/07/2025
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – drawing no. 04A received 22/09/2025
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – drawing no. 05 received 31/07/2025

Report Author Sam Yuen