

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0203
Location: 20 CROSSGATES ROAD, MILNROW, ROCHDALE, OL16 3EW
Proposal: Two storey side extension with front and rear dormers and formation of new door opening on front elevation to replace existing window.
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Rosalind Gralton

SITE

The application site is a one and a half storey bungalow property, set within a residential area of Milnrow with properties of the same scale and design. The site is located on the northern side of Crossgates Road. The site has rear and front amenity space with a 3m distance to the side boundary. While alterations have been undertaken to the properties, the properties remain uniform in scale with minimal side extensions undertaken.

The application property, No 20 Crossgates Road, has recently been rendered, and an increase amount of hardstanding to the front of the property, providing additional off-street parking.

The site lies within the defined urban area.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a one and a half storey side extension to provide a utility room, downstairs bedroom and an additional master bedroom and en suite at first floor. As part of the proposals the existing front and rear dormers would be extended across to match. The extension would project 3.5m from the side of the existing dwelling and would be sited approximately 300mm away from the shared side boundary at the closest measurement. Both front and rear dormers would be sited 180mm from the plane of the roof. The amended proposal shows the extension set back 700mm from the front elevation of the property.

The proposal is to be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling.

For the avoidance of doubt, the application is to be assessed on the amended drawings.

AMENDMENTS

Amended plans were submitted showing a set back of the extension, of approximately 700mm. The extension is not reduced in width.

HISTORY

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) 2024:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local Guidance

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 Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (SPD) 2016

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: Sent 08/03/2026

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding dwellings, and five letters of representation were received.

Concerns raised included the following

- Loss of light and overshadowing
- Impact of overbearing and loss of outlook
- Loss of privacy
- Out of character
- Impact of terracing, consequences for future extensions
- Impact on property prices
- Disruption during construction
- Overdevelopment of the plot
- There have been a number of vehicles on the property
- Requested Construction Management Plan to show designated parking for construction vehicles
- The property is being used for a business purpose
- Obstruction of the highway
- Increase in number of vehicles at the property

The comments with regards to residential character, design, overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking are material considerations and will be considered within the assessment of the application in this report.

Comments with respect to neighbour relations are civil matters and are not considered within this planning application. Disruption caused during construction of the works are covered under separate legislation. The impact of the proposal on property prices are not a material planning consideration.

ASSESSMENT

Design, character and appearance

When read collectively, the NPPF, CS policies P3 and DM1 and PfE policy JP-P1 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. SPD paragraph 5.1 also states that extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

NPPF paragraph 139 states that 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 proposed side extension presents a setback, 3.2m wide side extension. A setback of 700mm is proposed and matching materials are used. Despite the setback, the dormer continues along the same positioning to extend the existing front dormer across and over into the proposed side extension. This has the effect of the dormer appearing proportionately larger as it is set forward further relative to the side extension. The proposed extension would use the existing materials of render on the front elevation and render on the rear dormer across the extension. Render is also proposed on the side elevation gable, where there is currently the original brickwork of the property.

While the setback introduced on the amended plans show an extension appearing more subservient than the originally submitted plans, the amended proposals would still remove the space to the side of the property and erode the gaps between the surrounding buildings, a key characteristic of the residential area.

The following paragraphs of the Council's Residential standards SPD are relevant in this case.

5.11 'Where two-storey or first floor side extensions to semi-detached or detached dwellings extend up to the main front wall of the house and close to the boundary of the curtilage, they can lead to houses appearing to be a terrace rather than separate dwellings, which can harm the character of the property and the area. Proposals that would create this sort of 'terracing effect', or which would have the potential to contribute to such an effect if neighbouring properties extended in a similar way, will not normally be supported.'

The SPD continues *'5.12 To avoid the 'terracing effect', two storey and first floor side extensions that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary of the property will not normally be permitted unless either: (i) The first floor of the extension is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house (Figure 8); OR (ii) The ground and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house (Figure 9).'*

Paragraph 5.15 of the SPD also states *'Factors that will be taken into account when determining what constitutes 'sufficient space' include the presence of a strong building line and any overriding need to protect it, the proximity of neighbouring buildings, and the space surrounding other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site and the contribution this space makes to the overall character of the street scene.'*

It is acknowledged the property is not a two-storey extension and the relationship with No 22 is staggered, and the amended proposals show a setback from the front elevation of the property by approximately 700mm.

The proposed side extension, dormer extensions and use of materials would cumulatively amount to a development that would be cramped and not appear subservient to, and would visually overwhelm the host dwelling, creating a clear visual imbalance with the adjoining semi-detached property and comprising an incongruous addition to Crossgates Road.

According to the National Design Guide, new development should respect existing symmetry and patterns to preserve local character. The space between the properties plays a key role in local character and the sense of space should be maintained. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with the requirements of the NPPF in respect of the need for development to be well-designed, PfE policy JP-P1, CS policies DM1 and P3, and the SPD.

Residential amenity

CS policy DM1 requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. This is reflected in PfE Policy JP-P1, which requires new development to achieve a high standard of amenity that addresses, inter alia, issues such as sunlight and shade. The NPPF advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The proposed side extension, as amended, due to the siting of the property adjacent to No 22 Crossgates, would not result in any unacceptable overshadowing or overlooking impact.

The proposed side extension, as amended, would present a large, 5.8m high blank gable adjacent to the shared boundary. On the basis that the side elevation of No 22 includes only secondary and non-habitable room windows, it is not considered that the proposals would give rise to an impact so severe as to warrant refusal.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

The proposed scheme would remove the existing space to the side of the property, reducing the amount of capacity for on-site parking. Additionally, the amended proposal would add 2 bedrooms to the property. However, a minimum of 2 spaces are retained and the maximum car parking standard as included within the Rochdale Core Strategy. The proposals would not result in any unacceptable parking arrangements or unacceptable impact upon road safety.

It is noted neighbour representations comment requesting a Construction Management Plan be submitted for this application in the instance of an approval. Given the scale of the proposed works as a householder extension, it is not considered that in the instance of an approval, a Construction Management Plan would be necessary, and would fail to meet the required tests for a planning condition, set out within the National Planning Policy Guidance.

The amended proposal would have no unacceptable impact on the existing off-street parking arrangements and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (1)

- 1 By virtue of their size, scale, design and materiality the cumulative appearance of the proposed extensions would appear a wholly dominant and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling that would unbalance the shared appearance with the adjoining dwelling and appear unduly prominent and incongruous within the context of the surrounding area and causing detrimental harm to its character and appearance. The proposed extensions would erode the sense of spaciousness between the properties resulting in a development which would be a disproportionate addition and therefore does not accord with policies DM1, P3 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.

- 1 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.

- 2 For the avoidance of doubt, this decision notice relates to the following documents and drawings:
 - Application Form
 - Amended Proposed Details - Proposed Side Extension and Front and Rear Dormers - Drawing Number 26.3746.SC2.1D
 - Amended Proposed Block Plan - Proposed Side Extension and Front and Rear Dormers - Drawing Number 26.3746.2A