

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0504
Location: 103 CROW HILL SOUTH, MIDDLETON, MANCHESTER, M24 1LA
Proposal: Single storey rear ground and lower ground extensions creating raised terrace with glass balustrade and external stairs following demolition of existing outbuilding Alterations to main roof including hip to gable, rear dormer extension to facilitate loft conversion. Formation of new pitched roof to existing flat roof side extension.
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Luke Rigby

SITE

The application site consists of a two-storey semi-detached residential dwelling located in a predominantly residential area of Middleton. The existing dwelling is constructed of facing brick with a hipped roof. The existing dwelling benefits from a two-storey side extension with a flat roof.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a hip-to-gable loft conversion, single storey rear ground and lower ground extensions creating a raised terrace with glass balustrade and external stairs following demolition of existing outbuilding, and the formation of a gable to the roof of the existing two-storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PL/2026/0208 – Application for a certificate of lawfulness for proposed alterations of main roof from hip to gable, formation of pitched roof over existing two storey side extension, rear dormer extension and installation of rooflights on front elevation. Permitted Development.

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

The application proposes the construction of a hip-to-gable loft conversion and formation of a gable to the front elevation of the dwelling to replace the existing flat roof of the two-storey extension. It is also proposed to construct a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope; this would extend across the entirety of the rear roof slope.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed alterations to the roof of the dwelling and existing extension would be significant, resulting in a dwelling of significantly different visual appearance than the existing, it is acknowledged that an existing fallback position exists. Application PL/2026/0208 established a fallback position for a hip-to-gable loft conversion (including replacement of existing flat roof with pitch) and

construction of similar dormer window. This is a fallback position which carries significant weight.

Whilst the proposed development in this application would see the roof of the existing two-storey extension raised to match the ridge of the main dwelling, the visual impact of this is not considered significantly more detrimental than the established fallback position in this instance. It is therefore considered acceptable on balance.

The dwellings along this section of Crow Hill South have an irregular topography to the rear elevation and therefore are set at differing elevations with the rear of the site sloping away from the main dwelling and public highway. The application proposes the demolition of the existing conservatory and construction of a single storey rear extension and lower ground extension which would double as a terrace with glass balustrade; this kind of development is common along the rear of Crow Hill South and several dwellings (including the attached semi, No. 101) have identical developments. The addition of such, including the glass balustrade, is therefore not considered to appear significantly incongruous or out of character; it would be screened from view of the street scene in any case.

Concerns have been raised regarding the use of grey roof tiles and the impact on the character of the street scene, particularly the fact that it would unbalance the semi-detached pair. Crow Hill South is a street scene characterised by differing roof styles and forms. Furthermore, there are dwellings along Crow Hill South that have grey/black roofs and therefore the use of grey roof tiles in this location is not considered significantly detrimental to visual character. Whilst it would unbalance the semi-detached pair to some degree, the level of harm arising as a result of this is considered low.

Having regard to the above, the proposed developments are considered to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the design guidance of both 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 roof alterations are not considered to give rise to an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

It is acknowledged that the proposed dormer window would give rise to an increased sense of overlooking. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, however, and some degree of overlooking is to be expected. The degree arising as a result of the proposal is not considered significantly detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

Furthermore, it is acknowledged that degree arising would be materially identical to the fallback position established in PL/2026/0208.

Impact on No. 101

No. 101 Crow Hill South is the attached semi and is sited to the east of the dwelling. During the site visit it was observed that site levels between No. 101 and the application site are effectively the same, if not marginally higher at No. 101. It has a single storey rear extension along with a terrace almost identical to the proposed under this application.

In respect of the proposed rear extension, the extension would be single storey and would have a height comparable to the existing extension at No. 101; it would project no further than the extension at No. 101. As such, it is not considered that the proposed rear extension would appear significantly overbearing or overshadowing for No. 101.

In respect of the terrace, it is acknowledged that a terrace introduces a more sustained form of use than general garden area, and that occupiers standing or seated on the terrace would have some outlook towards the private amenity space of No. 101. However, given the parity of the site levels and relationship between the two dwellings, this outlook would not result in a level of overlooking which would be considered significantly detrimental to the amenity of No. 101.

It is also relevant to note that the relationship between the two dwellings is mutual and broadly symmetrical: No. 101 itself benefits from an equivalent terrace, such that any outlook towards the application site would be reciprocated.

Having regard to this, it is noted that No. 101 has a terrace of broadly identical scale, form, and position, and does not have a privacy screen; nor does another dwelling nearby. An unscreened terrace in this location with this relationship with its neighbours is therefore characteristic of, and consistent with, the established pattern of development. It is therefore, having regard to Paragraph 206 of the Framework, considered that the imposition of a condition requiring the installation of a privacy screen would be unreasonable in this instance.

Impact on No. 105

No. 105 is located to the west of the application site. The proposed rear extension would retain a separation distance of approximately 3.9m from the common boundary with No. 105. It is therefore not considered that the proposed extension would appear significantly overbearing or overshadowing.

The relationship between the application site and No. 105 is slightly irregular in the fact that there is no substantive boundary treatment between the two dwellings at the rear, only a low-rise boundary wall. As such, it is possible to see directly into the rear garden area of No. 105 from the application site as existing and vice-versa. It is not considered that the use of the area as a terrace would alter this relationship to a degree which would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of No. 105 given that

one could already sit in the rear garden of the application site immediately adjacent to the boundary and the overlooking would be broadly identical.

Having regard to the above, the proposed developments are not considered significantly detrimental to the amenity that neighbouring dwellings can reasonably expect to enjoy. The proposed developments are therefore considered to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy 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

Subject to the conditions set out below and taking into account the provisions of the development plan and all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

1No. objection received in relation to the use of grey cladding to the dormer and roof tiles, which are not representative of the dwellings along the street scene which use red roof tiles. Comments were made in relation to the hip-to-gable conversion, which is also not characteristic of the street scene, however the objector did not wish to object on this ground.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application, and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan. [AC1]

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: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason – To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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

- DWG No. 1057-14A (Proposed Elevations and Section)
- DWG No. 1057-10A (Proposed Ground Floor Plan)
- DWG No. 1057-13A (Proposed Roof Plan)
- DWG No. 1057-11A (Proposed First Floor Plan)
- DWG No. 1057-08 (Proposed Site and Location Plan)
- DWG No. 1057-12C (Proposed Loft Floor Plan)
- DWG No. 1057-09A (Proposed Lower Floor Plan)

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 Unitary Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall be those specified on approved DWG No. 1057-14A.

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.

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.