

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0492
Location: 61 BRIMROD LANE, ROCHDALE, OL11 4QF
Proposal: Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Luke Rigby

SITE

The application site consists of a two-storey semi-detached residential dwelling located to the west of Brimrod Lane in a predominantly residential area of Rochdale. The existing dwelling is constructed of facing brick with a pitched roof and is bound by Brimrod Lane to the east and residential dwellings to the west.

Brimrod Lane is a street scene of eclectic character and is characterised by a variety of housing types which differ in visual character and appearance. The dwelling, however, forms a semi-detached pair that is almost visually identical to the adjacent semi-detached pair, therefore some semblance of uniformity within the street scene does exist.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory and construction of a two-storey side extension and a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

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 Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: In accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, notification letters were sent to immediate neighbours.

ASSESSMENT

Design, character and appearance

Amongst other things, at Paragraph 135, the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth, the Framework) requires new development to be of a high standard of design which functions well and adds to the overall quality of an area; be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and landscaping; and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Locally, Policies P1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires all new developments, including associated landscaping, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design and goes on to list relevant design principles. Further to this, Policy DM1 sets out general development requirements

and details a list of criteria which all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate compliance, including the need for high quality design.

Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states that development should be distinctive, with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used. Furthermore, JP-P1 states that development should be visually stimulating which creates interesting and imaginative environments.

At Paragraph 139, the Framework makes clear that development, which is not well designed should be refused, especially where this fails to raise the standard of design more generally in the area.

The application proposes the construction of a two-storey side extension projecting approximately 5.5m from the western flank of the dwelling. The extension would be set back from the principal elevation at first-floor level by approximately 1m and would incorporate a pitched roof to match the existing dwelling. At ground-floor, a single-storey extension with a mono-pitched roof is also proposed.

Whilst the proposed development would be set back at first floor to increase subservience to some degree, the proposed extension would fail to appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. The two-storey side extension would have a width of approximately 5.5m, almost equal to the width of the existing dwelling itself (approximately 5.8m). As a result, the extension would appear overly dominant in relation to the existing dwelling, fundamentally altering its proportions and eroding the visual hierarchy between the original dwelling and the later addition.

Whilst a side extension of this width may be capable of being accommodated in certain circumstances given the size of the plot, this would require a design approach that maintains a balanced and cohesive principal elevation. In this instance, the proposed extension does not replicate or respond to the key architectural features of the existing dwelling. Consequently, the extension would result in an unbalanced and visually discordant frontage, with the substantial addition appearing disconnected from the original form and character of the property.

Taken cumulatively, the scale, width and design of the proposed extension would result in a disproportionate and visually prominent form of development that would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling.

The application also proposes the construction of a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. The extension would project 3m from the rear elevation at first floor and have a dual pitched roof, and 3m at ground floor and have a mono-pitched roof. Approximately 1m would be retained between the development and the common boundary with No. 63.

Whilst there is no in-principal objection to the addition of a ground and first floor rear extension at the application site, the proposed rear extensions would appear as incongruous, overly dominant additions to the existing dwelling which fail to appear as subservient additions. The proposed gable to the first-floor extension would span most of the rear elevation of the dwelling and would appear as an obtuse and

oppressive addition to the existing dwelling and surrounding street scene. By virtue of the siting of the application site and the lack of screening to the boundary, this would be readily visible from Brimrod Lane and the alleyway to the side elevation of the dwelling and dwellings which lie adjacent to this alleyway.

Cumulatively, the proposed rear extensions and the proposed side extensions would fail to appear as subservient additions to the existing dwelling. The extensions fail to respect the size, massing, and design of the existing dwelling or surrounding street scene, and little regard has been had to raising the standard of design more generally in the area. The proposed developments therefore fall contrary to Policies DM1, P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the design provisions of the Housing SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential amenity

Paragraph 135 of the Framework requires development to achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to avoid adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be located to the south of the application dwelling and, having regard to the separation distances and orientation of neighbouring properties, is not considered likely to result in unacceptable impacts on residential amenity in isolation.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposed rear extensions are considered significantly detrimental to the amenity that neighbouring dwellings can reasonably expect to enjoy. Paragraphs 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9 of the Council's Housing SPD set out guidance for assessing the impact of rear extensions on neighbouring occupiers. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project approximately 5.5m from the rear elevation and would exceed the SPD's recommended projection guidance. Furthermore, the extension would intrude into the 45-degree visibility zone when measured at a point 3m along the common boundary. The proposed first-floor rear projection would also intrude at 30-degrees at a point 2.4m along the boundary and is therefore contrary to the SPD guidance.

The extent to which the proposed development conflicts with this guidance indicates a form of development likely to result in an unacceptable overbearing impact and loss of outlook for the occupiers of No. 63. In addition, no daylight or sunlight assessment has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in an undue loss of light to No. 63.

In the absence of such evidence, Officers are not satisfied that the development would adequately safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposed extensions would appear oppressive and overbearing when viewed from No. 63 and are likely to give rise to an unacceptable restriction in outlook and light. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the Framework.

Highways and parking

The application property would retain two off-street parking spaces and would have no unacceptable impacts upon highway safety in accordance with CS Policy T2 and CS Appendix 5.

Conclusion

The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, width, massing and design, fail to represent a subordinate addition to the host dwelling and would result in a disproportionate and visually discordant form of development.

In addition, the proposed rear extensions would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the occupiers of No. 63. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Housing SPD, and Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Officers note that pre-application advice was sought and that concerns were raised regarding the need for a more balanced frontage and a clearly subordinate form of development. Those concerns have not been adequately addressed within the submitted scheme. Consequently, there are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the Development Plan, and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

Article 35 Declaration

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.

Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family

life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (2)

- 1 The proposed developments, by virtue of their scale, massing, and design, would appear as incongruous and overly dominant additions to the existing dwelling which fail to appear subservient to the existing dwelling. The proposed developments would therefore be harmful to the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding street scene and fail to take the opportunity to raise the standard of design more generally within the area. The proposed developments therefore fall contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and Paragraph 139(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed rear extensions, by virtue of their depth, scale and siting, would result in an unacceptably overbearing and oppressive form of development when viewed from the adjoining dwelling No. 63 Brimrod Lane. The proposed developments would breach the Council's adopted

45-degree and 30-degree guidance for rear extensions, resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and likely loss of light to neighbouring occupiers. The proposed developments are therefore considered to be detrimental to the amenity that neighbouring occupiers can reasonably expect to enjoy, contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 1 For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans/documents:
 - Application Form
 - DWG No. RAD/3502/26/1/Rev. A (Existing and Proposed Plans)
- 2 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.