

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0146
Location: 48 Bader Drive, Heywood, OL10 2QS
Proposal: Two storey side extension and alteration to fenestration on the rear ground floor elevation
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Sam Yuen

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to no. 48 Bader Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the end of the cul-de-sac in Heywood. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 50 Bader Drive to the west, adjacent to no. 46 Bader Drive to the south-east, and faces the highway to the south. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto no. 14 Oldbury Drive to the north-east, which is situated on an elevated position to the host property.

PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension which projects 3.83m from the side elevation of the dwelling. The extension is set back 1.5m from the main front wall of the dwelling. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form which is set down 0.35m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves.

The submitted plans also indicate the alteration of the ground floor rear elevation fenestration.

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

SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

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

- Concerns the proposed extension would be too close to the boundary fencing and that it may be damaged or altered.
- Proposal would result in unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring garden through overshadowing and overbearing impact.
- The proposed extension could affect the openness currently experienced between the buildings.
- Neighbouring property was subject to restriction preventing installation of windows to side elevation. The proposal would create an unfair precedent.
- No windows should be permitted to the front elevation and should be located in the rear elevation and either obscurely glazed or non-opening.

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 the impact on openness are addressed under the 'Design and Amenity' heading of the report.
- Concerns relating to overshadowing and overbearing impacts are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.

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)

DESIGN

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 PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, 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.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling and would appear subservient. The use of a dual-pitched roof would also be in keeping and raises no concern.

The proposed extension is set back from the main front wall by 1.5m and is not considered to result in any potential harm arising from the 'terracing effect'. In any case, the extension would be sited at an angle to the adjacent no. 46 and thus would not be read to form such a spatial relationship.

With regard to objector's concerns relating to the erosion of openness between buildings, it is noted there is an established sense of enclosure between the dwellings surrounding the cul-de-sac. The siting of no. 14 Oldbury Drive behind the application site further contributes towards this sense of enclosure. Given the extension is sufficiently set back from the host dwelling, the building would not appear to be dominant or prominent and is not considered to significantly comprise the openness between the dwellings.

Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling and would be designed appropriately for this context.

It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and the NPPF.

AMENITY

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.

The proposed side extension would be sited at a minimum 12.66m from the rear habitable room windows of no. 14 Oldbury Drive, which would fall short of the space standard of Section 4.1 (ii) of the SPD. Notwithstanding, the extension is sited at an angle to the rear boundary of no. 14 and is located in a lower position, separated by a line of trees and shrubbery. The extension is also sited at an angle to the side boundary of no. 46 and thus the adjacent garden space would not directly face the side elevation extension wall. Given this spatial relationship, it is considered the extension would not result in undue levels of overbearing or overshadowing impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed extension does not comprise any habitable room windows to the rear. Notwithstanding, a condition for obscure glazing has been recommended as to safeguard any potential overlooking impact to the garden of no. 14.

The proposed front bedroom window does not directly face any habitable room windows to the south-east and is not considered to give rise to amenity harm in this regard. Owing to the siting of the host property and adjacent no. 46, the side curtilage space of no. 46 would be subject to indirect views from the proposed bedroom window. However, it was noted during the Officer's visit that this space is mostly occupied by a lean-to shed and a covered outbuilding. With this in mind, it is considered this parcel of land is unlikely to be used for recreational purposes such as sitting out or playing. Any potential overlooking into this space is limited and would not amount to undue amenity harm to the neighbouring occupiers.

Whilst views from the proposed bedroom window may be marginally disrupted by the front of nos. 44 and 46 Bader Drive, it is considered the bedroom would still benefit from a sufficient degree of outlook to the south.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

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 development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property and would therefore be acceptable in terms of highways and parking, in accordance with Policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (4)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that any conditions imposed on the original permission remain in force other than as expressly hereby varied and development must be started in accordance with Section 73(5) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Location Plan - received 16/02/2026
- Proposed Site Plan - received 16/02/2026
- Existing Ground Floor Plan - drawing no. 007 received 16/02/2026
- Existing First Floor Plan - drawing no. 009 received 16/02/2026
- Existing Front Elevation - drawing no. 005 received 16/02/2026
- Existing Side Elevation - drawing no. 003 received 16/02/2026
- Existing Rear Elevation - drawing no. 001 received 16/02/2026
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan - drawing no. 008 received 16/02/2026
- Proposed First Floor Plan - drawing no. 010 received 16/02/2026
- Proposed Front Elevation - drawing no. 006 received 16/02/2026
- Proposed Side Elevation - drawing no. 004 received 16/02/2026
- Proposed Rear Elevation - drawing no. 002 received 16/02/2026

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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 the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof, prior to first occupation of the extension, the first-floor en-suite window to the north-facing rear elevation on the development hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass, which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent), and shall be non-opening below 1.7m from the internal floor level. The windows shall be retained as such thereafter:

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.