

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0673
Location: 20 CROSSGATES ROAD, MILNROW, ROCHDALE, OL16 3EW
Proposal: Two storey side extension with rear dormer. Alterations to fenestration on the front elevation including new entrance doorway and 2 no. roof lights
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Bob Melling

SITE

The application site is a one and a half storey bungalow set within a residential area of Milnrow. The site is located on the northern side of Crossgates Road, and the property has rear and front amenity space with a c.3.5m distance to the side boundary. The application property has recently been rendered, and additional hardstanding has been laid to the front of the property for off-street parking.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a one and a half storey side extension to provide a utility room, downstairs bedroom with en-suite and an upstairs bedroom with en-suite. The extension would be set back 1.75m from the existing front elevation and it would project 3m from the existing side elevation. The existing rear dormer would be extended and roof lights would be installed on the front roof slope. The development would be finished in materials to match the existing property.

HISTORY

PL/2026/0203: Two storey side extension with front and rear dormers and formation of new door opening on front elevation to replace existing window. Refused on 12.05.2026 for the following reason:

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.

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) 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 Documents (SPD):

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

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: 26.08.2026

Weekly List: 31.08.2026

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

Eight representations have been received, comprising five letters of support and three letters of objection.

The objections raise the following issues:

- Loss of light and overshadowing.
- Overbearing appearance and impact on outlook.
- Loss of privacy arising from the proposed windows.
- Harm to the character of the area.
- Scale, bulk and massing.
- Whether the extension appears subordinate.
- Impact on the balance of the semi-detached pair.
- Impact on the street scene.
- Loss of spaciousness between properties.
- Overdevelopment of the plot and creation of a terracing effect.

Officer Response: These matters are material considerations addressed within the following report.

- Impact on access, boundaries and future maintenance.
- Impact on property value.
- Disruption during construction, including noise, vehicle parking and damage to footpaths.

Officer Response: Matters relating to property values, land ownership, boundary disputes, access arrangements, maintenance responsibilities and potential encroachment are not material planning considerations. Concerns regarding noise, vehicle parking, damage to footpaths and other disruption arising during construction are temporary in nature and would be subject to separate legislation and controls where necessary. These matters do not affect the assessment of the planning merits of the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

ASSESSMENT

Design, character and appearance

When read collectively, the NPPF, Core Strategy Policies P3 and DM1 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P1 seek to secure high-quality design that responds positively to local character and context. Development should be visually attractive, respect the scale, massing, form and materials of surrounding development and contribute positively to the quality of an area. Paragraph 5.1 of the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that extensions should be in keeping with the host dwelling and generally appear subordinate to it.

The proposal seeks permission for amendments to a scheme previously refused on design grounds. In response to the previous concerns, the width of the side extension has been reduced by approximately 0.2 metres, the setback from the front elevation has been increased by approximately 1 metre, the previously proposed front dormer extension has been omitted and replaced with rooflights, and the side gable would be finished predominantly in brickwork to match the existing dwelling rather than render.

The revised design results in a clearer visual distinction between the host dwelling and the extension. The increased setback from the front elevation ensures that the extension appears appropriately subordinate to the original dwelling and significantly reduces the prominence of the development within the street scene. The omission of the front dormer is also a notable improvement as it removes a feature which previously contributed to the perceived bulk and dominance of the development when viewed from the public realm.

The use of matching brickwork to the side gable better reflects the materials and detailing of the existing property and preserves the architectural character of the dwelling. The revised material palette avoids the overly expansive use of render previously proposed and assists in integrating the extension into the existing building.

Whilst the development would inevitably reduce the gap to the side boundary, the amendments ensure that sufficient visual separation is retained between the application property and neighbouring dwellings. The increased front setback and reduced overall scale lessen any perception of a terracing effect and ensure that the spacious character of the street scene is preserved. The proposal would not appear cramped, unduly dominant or visually overwhelming when viewed in the context of the host dwelling or the wider streetscape.

Taken cumulatively, the amendments have overcome the previous design objections. The extension would appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition that respects the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such it is considered that the proposed extension and alterations would be acceptable, in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Residential amenity

Core Strategy Policy DM1 requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of existing or future occupiers. This is reflected in Places for Everyone Policy JP-P1, which requires development to achieve a high standard of amenity, including consideration of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. The NPPF also seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The property most directly affected by the proposal is No. 22 Crossgates Road. The proposed side extension would be positioned adjacent to the shared boundary; however the revised scheme has reduced the width of the extension, removed the

front dormer and increased the setback from the front elevation when compared to the previously refused proposal, thereby reducing its overall visual presence.

With regard to daylight and sunlight, it is acknowledged that the development would alter the outlook from parts of the neighbouring property and would introduce additional built form adjacent to the boundary. Nevertheless, having regard to the scale of the revised proposal and the relationship between the properties, it is not considered that the development would result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring habitable rooms or private amenity areas. Whilst some limited additional shadowing may occur at certain times of the day, this would not be so severe as to justify refusal of the application.

In respect of outlook, the side elevation of the extension would present a blank gable facing No. 22. However, the neighbouring side elevation contains secondary and non-habitable room windows, and whilst the proposal would inevitably be visible from the neighbouring dwelling and driveway, it is not considered that the resulting relationship would appear unduly overbearing or oppressive to the extent that it would significantly harm living conditions.

With regard to privacy, the proposal does not introduce side-facing windows overlooking the neighbouring property. The proposed rooflights and front-facing openings would principally afford views towards the public highway and surrounding area. Any overlooking opportunities would be comparable to those already available from the existing dwelling and would not result in a material loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would comply with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

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.

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.

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 must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Details. Dwg no. 26.3746.1A
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Dwg no. 26.3746.2B
- Scheme 2 - Proposed Details. Dwg no. 26.3746.SC3.1A

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.

- 3 The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

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.