Application Number:	25/00471/HOUS
Location:	25 Ipswich Street Rochdale OL11 1JS
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension and rear dormer extension, following demolition of existing single-storey rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Amir Khan
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
RECOMMENDATION:	**Grant subject to conditions**

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?	**N**

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

Location

The application relates to no. 25 Ipswich Street, a two-storey terrace house on the outskirts of Rochdale town. Ipswich Street comprises a terrace row of houses with a uniform design and white render finish, overlooking a central grass area. The surrounding area is typically urban: high-density linear terrace housing, local amenities, and light industrial and commercial units.

No. 25 faces south, fronting the pavement and overlooking the adopted public highway. It adjoins no. 27 to the east and no. 23 to the west. The rear boundary faces north, bordering an alleyway separating the rear gardens of Ipswich Street from Maldon Street.

Description of Proposal

The application is for a single storey rear extension and a rear dormer extension, following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension.

The proposed rear extension comprises a sloped roof form, with 2no. roof lights and a rear door and window. It would project 3.5m from the host dwelling, measuring 4.4m (width) X 4.3m (height) X 2.5m (eaves height). Proposed materials include brickwork and tiles to match the existing, together with UPVC windows and roof lights.

The proposed rear dormer comprises a flat roof form and 2no. windows. It would measure 4.3m (width) X 1.6m (height) X 4m (depth). Proposed materials include hung slate tiles and a UPVC window.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring houses 28/05/2025; no objections were raised.

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

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

Removal of front dormer. Reduced projection of single storey rear extension.

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.

Rear dormer:

Paragraph 5.16 of the SPD recognises that dormer extensions are visually prominent and therefore need to be carefully designed and sited. As such, paragraph 5.17 establishes design principles for dormer extensions. The proposed dormer complies 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 the 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;

(vii) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof;

In terms of principle 'iv', the proposed flat roof would be in keeping with the other flat roof dormers seen to the rear of Maldon Street and Ipswich Street. By virtue of its compliance with the design principles outlined in the SPD, the design of the proposed dormer is considered acceptable. In addition, given the dormer's location to the rear, it would have limited visual impact on the street scene.

Single storey rear extension:

The proposed rear extension follows a modest and uniform design which would appear subservient to the host dwelling, as well as integrated with the existing form and materials.

Amendments:

The original proposal included a front dormer to match the proposed rear dormer. It was advised that the proposed front dormer was removed due to its potentially incongruous appearance and harmful impact on the visual amenity of the street scene. The SPD is explicit in that 'dormers to front elevations will not usually be permitted'. It is acknowledged that there is a front dormer at 19 Ipswich Street and several along Maldon Street. Whilst Maldon Street is in close proximity to the site, the front dormer extensions are not seen in conjunction with no. 25 Ipswich Street and therefore do not establish a precedent. Furthermore, the existing dormer at no. 19 Ipswich Street and several along Maldon Street pre-date the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. Since the adoption of the SPD, the Council strive to a higher standard of design and therefore examples of poor design which pre-date the SPD do not offer justification for further poor design.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

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. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. 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. Regarding outdoor space, paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that an extension that does not leave sufficient garden space is unlikely to be acceptable.

Single storey rear extension:

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD establishes a maximum standard for how far single storey rear extensions can project from the host dwelling in order to ensure that they do not result in adverse overshadowing or oppressiveness to neighbouring occupants. For attached properties, this is a point 3m along the common boundary, measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling. The proposed rear extension projects 3.5m.

In relation to no. 23 Ipswich Street, the proposed rear extension would project 0.8m beyond the neighbour's rear elevation and therefore complies with the SPD. In relation to no. 27 Ipswich Street, the proposed rear extension would project 3.5m beyond the neighbour's rear elevation. It is acknowledged that this exceeds the limits of paragraph 5.6. However, there is an existing single storey rear extension and adjoining outbuilding at no. 25 Ipswich Street which have a combined projection of 5.65m along the common boundary with no. 27. As such, the proposed 3.65m projection would in fact reduce the overbearing and overshadowing impact towards no. 27 Ipswich Street. Overall, the proposed single storey rear extension would therefore not unduly impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

Whilst there is no planning application associated with the existing outbuilding, imagery from Google Street View confirms that it has existed for at least ten years and is therefore deemed lawful.

Outdoor amenity space:

Paragraph 5.4 of the SPD states that it is important that sufficient garden space is retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupants. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is likely to be refused.

The existing and proposed garden space measures approximately 9m2 and as such, there would be no loss of outdoor amenity space. However, the proposed dormer would accommodate an additional bedroom and potentially additional occupants, thus creating added pressure on the available garden space. Notwithstanding, there is an outdoor play area adjacent to no. 31 Ipswich Street and Stoneyfield Park within seven minutes walking distance of the site. Given the availability of public outdoor amenity spaces and the net retention of existing private garden space, there would be an adequate level of outdoor space to support the needs of a family dwelling.

Natural light and outlook:

The proposed roof lights, rear door and window, and open internal floor plan would ensure that the ground floor and habitable rooms would have sufficient outlook and natural light.

Dormer:

There are no amenity concerns in relation to the proposed rear dormer.

Overall, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of future or neighbouring occupants, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation:

Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

   Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. This permission relates to the following plans:

   - Location plan: Sheet 1
   - Proposed elevations: Sheet 5
   - Proposed floor plans: Sheet 4
   - Existing and proposed site plans: Sheet 6

   and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

   Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	31/07/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	08/08/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Hamish Rigg