

Officer Report

Case Reference: 25/00923/HOUS
Location: 8 Dingle Road Middleton Rochdale M24 1NH
Proposal: First floor side and front extension with Juliet balcony to rear elevation, single storey rear extension, alteration to ground floor bay window and addition of first floor bay window to front elevation, construction of raised decking to rear and associated front boundary treatments - retrospective
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Sam Yuen

LOCATION

The application relates to no. 8 Dingle Road, a two-storey detached dwelling located in Middleton. The property faces northwest towards the highway, is adjacent to no. 10 Dingle Road to the northeast and no. 6 Dingle Road to the southwest. The rear garden falls sharply towards the south-east and extends some 25m to the rear boundary of the curtilage, which is shared by nos. 13 and 15 Parkside.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements and alterations to the host dwelling:

- A first-floor side extension which projects 2.89m from the side elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a cross-hipped and gabled roof form with matching ridge and eaves height. The extension also comprises a gabled projection of 0.33m forward of the front elevation of the dwelling set down 1.39m from the ridge line. The external walls are finished in black composite cladding. To the rear elevation is a Juliet balcony with glass balustrade.
- A single-storey rear extension which projects 2.94m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a flat roof form with a 0.42m overhang and has a ridge height of 3.2m. It is also finished in the black composite cladding.
- The construction of a raised decking area of up to 7.54m across two levels of 1.03m and 2.34m height respectively. Each terraced area is accessed via a set of steps and clad in artificial grass and accompanied by 1.15m-high balustrade.
- A double-height box bay window, replacing the existing ground floor bay window.

- The construction of a roof canopy above the front porch with a maximum 0.73m projection.

The submitted plans also indicate the addition of boundary treatments, including the following:

- Boundary wall surrounding the front curtilage measuring a maximum 1.23m in height constructed in brickwork matching the host dwelling.
- Front boundary metal sliding gate and pedestrian access gate with maximum height of 1.22m and 1.36m respectively.
- Side common boundary fencing to the rear curtilage of stepped height in line with each terraced level. The maximum height is 1.98m.

The application follows a number of previous submissions for works to the host dwelling, including 23/00762/HOUS and 22/00958/HOUS which were granted planning permission. However, the works that have been carried out do not match the approved plans, namely the use of composite cladding, the design of the bay windows and the additional of the lower terraced area. The current application seeks to regularise these discrepancies.

RELEVANT HISTORY

24/00840/HOUS - Erection of roof terrace to first floor rear elevation – Refuse

Officer's Comments:

1. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed raised terrace would result in an undue loss of privacy for the occupants of nos. 6 and 10 Dingle Road. The proposed development therefore fails to provide a high level of amenity for neighbouring properties, contrary to policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

23/00762/HOUS - First floor side extension with Juliet balcony to rear elevation, single storey rear extension, alteration to ground floor bay window and addition of first floor bay window to front elevation and construction of raised decking to rear - Grant subject to conditions

22/00958/HOUS - First floor side extension with Juliette balcony to rear elevation and single storey rear extension - Grant subject to conditions

94/D30778 - Single Storey Side Extension To Dwelling - Permitted Development-Build Regs Req'd.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

The extension as built has no increased detrimental impact upon the highway than the property as previously existed. Highways have no objection to the proposal.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One representation was received with the following comments:

- Obscurely glazed screens must be required to the side of the proposed roof terrace to prevent overlooking into the adjacent rear gardens.

Officer's Comments:

- The proposal does not seek to construct a roof terrace beyond a Juliet balcony to the rear-facing window. Any proposals for a roof terrace above the single-storey rear extension would require planning permission.

POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

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

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 principle of the proposed side and rear extension in terms of its overall built form and scale has been accepted in 22/00958/HOUS. The principle of the upper terraced area and front bay window was also accepted in 23/00762/HOUS. With this in mind, the assessment of the proposed development would relate to the material changes and its impact on visual amenity.

The surrounding street scene is characterised by a set of redbrick residential dwellings in a leafy, suburban setting. There is a variety of built forms, architectural styles and material finish including render but there remain an attractive and cohesive character and appearance.

The proposed first-floor side extension has been constructed in black composite cladding. Whilst this finish is not part of the original material palette, it is considered the appearance of the cladding would not detract from the overall appearance of the area. The cladding is also of a high-quality, contemporary finish and would represent an enhancement in appearance over the previously proposed render finish.

Likewise, the proposed front metal sliding gate is also of a similar colour and appearance to the cladding and proposed fenestration and would constitute a satisfactory standard of design.

It is considered the forward projection of the proposed first-floor side extension, and the enlarged box bay window projection are not of a scale and design which would have a material impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding street scene and would be acceptable in this regard.

The proposed curtilage space has been subject to substantial groundworks to create a multi-tiered terraced area. Whilst there are some concerns regarding the overly engineered appearance and the use of artificial grass cladding, this section of the

proposal would not be readily visible from the highway, or from the neighbouring property due to the high boundary fencing and heavy woodland separating the plots. With this in mind, the proposed works would not amount to undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area and would be acceptable on balance.

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 adopted 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 amenity impacts of the proposed single-storey rear extension and upper terrace area have been assessed in 22/00958/HOUS where no concerns were raised.

The proposed first-floor side extension is sited in excess of 24m from the front windows of no. 7 Dingle Road and would have comply with Section 4.1 of the SPD, The window also serves an ensuite which would reduce any potential overlooking impact. With reference to Section 5.6 of the SPD, the minor front projection of 0.33m is also not considered to result in undue overshadowing impacts to the adjacent habitable room windows.

The proposed lower terrace area would project further beyond the existing terrace area from the finished floor level by 3.94m. It is acknowledged that owing to the topography of the land to the rear of the dwelling, the rear garden space of the adjoining line of properties are readily visible in its original arrangement and are already subject to some levels of overlooking. Notwithstanding, it is considered the side boundary fencing provides sufficient screening to mitigate any overlooking impacts to the adjoining rear garden space. The lower terrace area is also site in excess of 16m from the rear curtilage boundaries of nos. 13 and 15 Parkside and is not considered to result in undue overlooking in this regard.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DM1 of the adopted 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 front boundary treatments are not of a height or scale which would be detrimental to vehicles and road users accessing this section of the highway. The existing parking arrangements to the front driveway would be retained and would comprise sufficient space for manoeuvring in and out of the property.

The proposal would not result in adverse harm to highway safety and the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (1)

- 1 The development relates to the following drawings and documents hereby approved:
 - Location Plan and Proposed Site Plan - drawing no. 0.02 received 06/11/2025
 - Existing Site Plan - drawing no. 0.03 received 07/11/2025
 - Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations - drawing no. 0.2b received 21/07/2026

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.

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.