

Application Number:	25/00580/HOUS
Location:	8 Sandstone Road, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3UH
Proposal:	Single storey side extension, front porch and rear canopy
Applicant:	Mr Kian Safari
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 08.09.2025	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 Sandstone Road, a two-storey semi-detached dormer bungalow located in a residential area in Milnrow. The dwelling is sited in a corner plot close to the end of the cul-de-sac and is adjoined by no. 7 Sandstone Road to the northeast, adjacent to nos. 6-11 Parsonage Walk to the southwest, and faces the highway and no. 1 Roadsford Avenue to the northwest. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the side curtilage of no. 11 Shorefield Close to the southeast. The host dwelling curtilage comprises land which protrude 3.8m towards Parsonage Walk to the southwest, currently used as private hardstanding for the property.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought for the construction of a rear timber canopy which projects 2.85m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The canopy is characterised by a flat roof form and includes a 2m-wide closed section of plywood construction adjacent to the common boundary of no. 7.

Planning permission is also sought for a number of additional enlargements and alterations, including:

- ☐ A single-storey front and side extension which projects 1.9m and 3.8m from the front and side elevation of the dwelling respectively, following the removal of the existing low boundary wall. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 2.2m.
- ☐ A front porch extension which projects 1.5m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is also characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 2.85m. The entrance access door would be relocated to the side of the porch. The applicant has not clearly specified the materiality of the proposed extension, however, based on the submitted plans, the extensions would be constructed from dark red/brown brickwork.
- ☐ Alterations to the fenestration including change of front garage door to a window and ground floor openings to a set of bi-fold doors.

Relevant History

88/D22578 - Garage And Dormer Bedroom Extension To Side Of Dwellinghouse. - Grant subject to conditions

86/D19104 - Single Storey Extension To Side Of Dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

80/D11849 - Car Port - Refuse

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

Highways have no objection to this application which will not impact upon the highway.

Representations

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

- ☐ The proposal would remove the existing driveway and off-street parking which will add pressure to the limited street parking.
- ☐ The proposed extension would obstruct views of oncoming traffic for residents reversing out of their driveways and would increase safety risk for drivers and pedestrians.
- ☐ The proposed extension does not fit the scale, layout and design of the properties in Sandstone Road and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- ☐ The proposed front porch is unsightly and completely out of character with the surrounding area.

- ☐ The proposed rear extension would result in considerable loss of light to the adjacent property and would have a dominant and overbearing effect.
- ☐ The proposal may result in increased noise and disturbance.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating to highway and public safety are addressed under the 'Highways and Parking' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to the visual amenity impacts are addressed under the 'Design and Appearance' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to overshadowing and overbearing impacts are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ 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.

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

Amendments

N/A

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 construct a number of enlargements to the host dwelling, the most prominent of which comprises a single-storey front and side extension which will occupy the hardstanding to the side of the dwelling.
- ❑ The dwelling sits at the end of a row of dormer bungalows which forms a strong defined building line. The proposed extension would project beyond this building line and would appear as an obtrusive and incongruous form of development to the street scene. The built form and the use of a flat roof design also relates negatively with the surrounding context and appears out of place against the established street layout.
- ❑ Similarly, the proposed front porch would introduce an obtrusive and incongruous addition to an otherwise unbroken building line. Whilst it is acknowledged neighbouring no. 3 comprises a front porch (as approved in 82/D14454), the projection is marginal and is largely contained within the eaves of the dwelling. In contrast, the proposed contains a much greater projection with an overhanging flat roof which appears intrusive when viewed with the host dwelling. There are also concerns regarding the relocation of the front door to the side of the porch, which reduces the legibility of the building facade.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate a large front-facing window to the proposed front porch and a narrow window to replace the existing garage door. Such alterations contribute towards the distortion of the front elevation and are not clearly justified in design terms.
- ❑ No details have been provided regarding the specification of the proposed brickwork, though the submitted rendering indicates a dark red/brown colour

which would be at odds with the beige/light brown brickwork used in the host dwelling and adjacent properties.

- ❑ The application also proposes a timber canopy to the rear of the dwelling. At the time of the Planning Officer's visit, it was noted timber posts have already been erected. By virtue of its materiality and skeletal design, the proposed canopy appears unsightly and does not constitute a high-quality addition to the host dwelling. However, it is accepted the canopy is a lightweight structure which ultimately has limited visual impact to the street scene due to its rear siting. On this basis, the design of the canopy would be acceptable on balance.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, taken as a whole, the design of the proposal would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and would fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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.
- ❑ Taking into account of Section 5.6 of the SPD, the proposed rear canopy does not project beyond the existing rear conservatory of no. 7 and is not considered to result in undue levels of overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the adjacent habitable room windows.
- ❑ Likewise, the proposed front porch extension does not exceed the minimum space standard of Section 5.6 and raises no concerns.
- ❑ The proposed front and side extension would be sited a minimum 14.28m from the front habitable room windows of no. 9 Parsonage Walk and would satisfy the minimum space standard of Section 4.1 of the SPD. The extension does not directly face any habitable room windows to the front and rear and is not considered to adversely harm the amenity of neighbouring occupants.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ❑ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, 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 proposed front and side extension would occupy a corner space at the junction between Sandstone Road and Parsonage Walk and would reduce the visibility of vehicles traversing in and out of Parsonage Walk. Whilst it is

considered this view is already somewhat obscured by vehicles parked in the private driveway, the extension would nonetheless result in a permanent obstruction in this position and would pose some safety risk to road users. In considering highway impacts, Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.”* The highway in question is a low-trafficked road in a residential context and at this location at the turning point to a cul-de-sac, it is anticipated vehicles would be traveling relatively low speeds. Given this context, it is considered the risk to highway safety would not be so severe as to warrant refusal.

- ☐ The proposal would also result in the loss of the existing hardstanding and off-street parking space. It is noted that properties along Parsonage Walk rely on on-street parking and thus the proposal would result in the proliferation of vehicles to the highway. However, taking into account of Paragraph 116 of the Framework, the addition of vehicles to this low-trafficked location is not considered to give rise to unacceptable impacts to highway safety. The Council’s Highways Officer was also consulted on the proposed plans and raised no objections.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale, built form, flat roof form, materiality, fenestration arrangements and design, the proposed single-storey front and side extension and front porch extension constitute obtrusive and incongruous additions to the host dwelling which appears out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 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.

Article 35 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	08/09/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	08/09/2025	Signed: TH

INFORMATIVES

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

- Location Plan – received 09/06/2025
- Existing Site Plan – received 14/07/2025
- Proposed Site Plan – received 14/07/2025
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. KS-EX-01 received 14/07/2025
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. KS-PR-01 received 14/07/2025

Report Author Sam Yuen