

Officer Report

Case Reference: NOT/2026/0514
Location: 1 Medley Street, Rochdale, OL12 0RQ
Proposal: Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 6m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 2.98m and height to eaves to 2.98m)
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Bob Melling

Description of Proposed Development

The Host Dwelling is: Terraced.

How far will the proposed extension extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house measured externally: 6.00m

What will be the maximum height of the proposed extension measured externally from the natural ground level: 2.98m

Neighbours notified:

3 Medley Street, ROCHDALE, OL12 0RQ

19 Noon Sun Street, ROCHDALE, OL12 0RT

6 Grasmere Street, ROCHDALE, OL12 0RW

4 Grasmere Street, ROCHDALE, OL12 0RR

Number of representations received: 2 objections.

Deadline for response: 06.08.2026

Consideration of the following conditions listed in the GPDO 2015

(a) Permission to use the dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class M, N, P or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule (changes of use)

Complies

(b) As a result of the works, the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse (other than the original dwellinghouse) would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original dwellinghouse).

Complies - the proposed extension would occupy 48.12% of the total area of the curtilage.

(c) The height of the part of the dwellinghouse enlarged, improved or altered would exceed the height of the highest part of the roof of the existing dwellinghouse;

Complies

(d) The height of the eaves of the part of the dwellinghouse enlarged, improved or altered would exceed the height of the eaves of the existing dwellinghouse;

Complies

(e) The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall which—

(i) forms the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse; or

(ii) fronts a highway and forms a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse;

Complies

(g) The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have a single storey and -

(i) extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 8 metres in the case of a detached dwellinghouse, or 6 metres in the case of any other dwellinghouse, or

(ii) exceed 4 metres in height;

Complies

(h) The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have more than one storey and—

(i) extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 3 metres, or

(ii) be within 7 metres of any boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse opposite the rear wall of the dwellinghouse;

Complies

(i) The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would be within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, and the height of the eaves of the enlarged part would exceed 3 metres:

Complies

(j) The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would:

i. Exceed 4 metres in height;

ii. Have more than a single storey, or

iii. Have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse

Complies

(k) It would consist of or include-

- i) The construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform
- ii) The installation, alteration or replacement of microwave antennae
- iii) The installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue, soil and vent pipe
- iv) An alteration to any part of the roof of a dwellinghouse

Complies

Is the dwellinghouse on Article 2(3) land or on a Site of Special Scientific Interest?

Complies

A.3 Development is permitted by Class A subject to the following conditions—

a) the materials used in any exterior work (other than materials used in the construction of a conservatory) must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse;

The development has begun on site prior to -

a) the receipt by the developer from the local planning authority of a written notice that their prior approval is not required;

b) the receipt by the developer from the local planning authority of a written notice giving their prior approval; or

c) the expiry of 42 days following the date on which the information referred to in paragraph (2) was received by the local planning authority without the local planning authority notifying the developer as to whether prior approval is given or refused.

Complies

Prior Approval Assessment

Under Class A of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), planning permission is granted for certain forms of enlargement to dwellinghouses, subject to a number of conditions and limitations. Condition A.4(7) states:

“Where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises.”

Two objections have been received from adjoining occupiers. The representations raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposed extension on neighbouring residential amenity, including a loss of natural light and outlook to neighbouring habitable rooms and rear gardens, increased overshadowing, an overbearing and oppressive appearance, and a greater sense of enclosure arising from the cumulative effect of extensions on neighbouring properties. Concerns have also been raised regarding loss of privacy, reduced airflow and ventilation, increased noise and disturbance, the potential structural impact of construction works, and the possibility of further extensions being undertaken in the future.

In assessing the application, only those matters relating to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises are material to the prior approval process under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. Accordingly, the assessment below focuses on the effects of the proposal on neighbouring living conditions, including matters of outlook, light and overbearing impact.

The provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO do not require Local Planning Authorities to determine applications in accordance with the development plan. However, the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) remain material considerations insofar as they relate to the specific matter under assessment, namely the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises.

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they would not adversely affect the amenity of existing or future occupiers through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing, loss of privacy or other detrimental effects. This approach is consistent with Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF, which seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

In assessing the impact of residential development on neighbouring occupiers, regard is also had to the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers. For single-storey rear extensions to attached dwellings, paragraph 5.6 identifies a maximum projection of 3m beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining property along the shared boundary. Paragraph 5.7 clarifies that these measurements should be taken externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining property, or from the rear of an existing extension where one exists close to the common boundary.

In this case, the proposed extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of No. 19 Noon Sun Street, which is set approximately 7.2m behind the front elevation of the application property. Furthermore, there are no side-facing windows within No. 19 that would be materially affected by the proposed development.

However, when assessed against the shared boundary with No. 3 Medley Street, the proposal would substantially exceed the guidance contained within paragraph 5.6 of the SPD. The extension would project approximately 6m beyond the rear elevation and would therefore exceed the SPD guideline by approximately 3m. Consequently, the proposal would result in a 3m high brick wall extending 6m in depth along the common boundary.

The extension would be situated to the south-east of No. 3 Medley Street and would therefore have the greatest impact on sunlight reaching the neighbouring property during the morning and early afternoon periods. Furthermore, it is noted that No. 5 Medley Street benefits from a substantial rear extension comprising both single-storey and two-storey elements. In

combination with the existing extension at No. 5, the proposed development at No. 1 would contribute towards a pronounced sense of enclosure, creating an oppressive tunnelling effect whereby the rear elevation and garden area of No. 3 would be enclosed by substantial built form on both sides.

Particular weight is given to the impact on the rear-facing kitchen window serving No. 3 Medley Street. Whilst this window serves a kitchen, the layout of the dwelling indicates that the ground floor is broadly divided between a front living room and a rear kitchen. The kitchen therefore represents a principal habitable room where occupiers are likely to spend prolonged periods of time. It is considered that the scale and siting of the proposed extension would materially reduce outlook from this room and result in a noticeable reduction in daylight. The proposal would also adversely affect the outlook and openness currently experienced from the rear garden.

It is noted that concerns have also been raised regarding loss of privacy, reduced ventilation, increased noise and disturbance, structural impacts arising from construction activity, and the potential for future extensions. However, these matters do not form part of the assessment required under Condition A.4(7) of Class A of the GPDO, which is limited to considering the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises. In any event, the proposal comprises a single-storey rear extension with no proposed side-facing windows and there is no application before the Council for any further enlargement of the dwelling. Consequently, these matters are afforded limited weight in the determination of this prior approval application.

Having regard to the concerns raised in the representations received, together with the site-specific circumstances described above, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the rear-facing windows and garden area serving the adjoining property at No. 3 Medley Street. The scale, depth and siting of the extension would also give rise to an overbearing and oppressive impact, creating an undue sense of enclosure for the occupiers of that property.

Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining premises by reason of a loss of light and outlook and an overbearing sense of enclosure. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (1)

- 1 By virtue of its siting, depth and design, the proposed extension would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for the occupiers of the adjoining property at No. 3 Medley Street by reason of a loss of light and outlook to the rear-facing window, an increased sense of enclosure, and an overbearing impact upon the rear garden area. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone

Joint Development Plan, the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

1

- Location Plan
- Existing Plans. Dwg no. 2435/1
- Proposed Floor Plan. Dwg no. 2435/2
- Proposed Elevations and Site Plan. Dwg no. 2435/3. Received 10.07.2026