



Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0638
Location: 10 MOUNT ROAD, MIDDLETON, MANCHESTER, M24 1DZ
Proposal: Single-storey rear extension and alteration to fenestration
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Luke Rigby

SITE

The application site consists of a two-storey detached residential dwelling located to the south of Mount Road in a predominantly residential area of Middleton. The existing dwelling is constructed of facing brick with a hipped roof. The application dwelling has been extended significantly over the years.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

NOT/2026/0480 – Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 7.50m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.10m and height to eaves to 3m). Refuse

25/00633/FUL – First floor side extension, formation of gable roof to existing side extension, formation of a pitched roof to the existing front porch, alteration to fenestration on all elevations and render to front and side elevations, following removal of existing chimney to side. Refuse

25/00955/HOUS – First floor side and rear extensions including alteration to fenestration to side and rear elevations. Approve Subject to Conditions

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single-storey rear extension, it is a resubmission of a prior approval application (NOT/2026/0480). Following Officer recommendation, the proposed extension has been significantly reduced in scale and built form.

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.

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

2No. objections received which can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development will impact on light into neighbouring dwellings
- The application site has been left open to the road which raises security concerns.
- There has been disruption for over a year since development to the front elevation of the dwelling began
- Concerns over the conduct and behaviour of construction workers
- Concerns over damage to the public highway and footpath as a result of development
- There has been damage to the grass verges along Mount Road due to parking
- Concerns over the use of drones

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received.

ASSESSMENT

Design, Character and Appearance

Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development proposals should respond to their context so that they integrate with, and enhance their surroundings. Paragraph 2(g) of DP3 goes on to state that development proposals should create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish and maintain a strong sense of place and pride.

Locally, Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development to be of high quality and to take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area whilst Policy P2 states that development should enhance the Borough's identity and sense of place by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to scale, density, massing, height, and layout.

The application proposes the construction of a single-storey extension projecting approximately 5.25m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. Whilst it is not considered that the proposed extension would appear particularly subservient taking into account previous extensions to the dwelling, it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would be to the rear of the dwelling and its impact on the street scene would be limited. The proposed extension is therefore not considered to be of such harm to justify refusal in this instance. The proposed flat roof of the extension would alleviate some of the perceived bulk of the development, and whilst this would not be in keeping with the roof form of the main dwelling it is not considered to appear significantly incongruous or out of character owing to its siting at the rear.

Materials would be facing brick, aluminium fenestrations, and partial render. These are considered acceptable on design terms.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is 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 provisions of the Housing SPD and National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential amenity

Policy P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development proposals should be appropriate to their location, taking into account the impact of the development on living conditions. It goes on to state that development proposals should not give rise to, or contribute to, unacceptable reductions of daylight/sunlight for neighbouring occupiers or give rise to unacceptable levels of noise pollution. 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.

Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.7 of the Housing SPD give general guidance relating to the projection of single storey rear extensions. It states that for a detached dwelling, a single storey extension should project a maximum of 4m from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling when measured from the common boundary; where an extension is offset from the common boundary this distance may be increased proportionate to that offset so long as it does not intrude into a 45-degree visibility line when drawn at that point along the common boundary.

The application site is a detached dwelling. To the west is a Telephone Exchange and to the east are residential dwellings, particularly No. 12. The proposed extension is not considered to have a significantly detrimental impact on Telephone Exchange by virtue of overbearing or overshadowing.

In relation to No. 12, the application dwelling has undergone previous extensions, including a two-storey side extension and therefore projects further to the rear than No. 12 as existing. Notwithstanding, a separation distance of approximately 1.3m between the dwelling and the common boundary remains. As such, the maximum projection allowed by the SPD would be 5.3m from the rear elevation of No. 12.

The proposed extension, when taking into account the existing two-storey side extension, would project approximately 5.3m from the rear elevation of No. 12 and is therefore in accordance with the guidance contained within the SPD. It is therefore not considered that the proposed extension would appear significantly overbearing or overshadowing.

Notwithstanding, it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would have a flat roof, and that if this roof were to be used as a terrace, balcony, or similar amenity area in the future, this would adversely impact on the amenity of No. 12 by virtue of overlooking. It is therefore considered necessary to restrict this via condition in the interest of protecting the amenity of No. 12.

Concerns have been raised regarding the proposed development reducing the amount of light into neighbouring dwellings. The proposed extension has been reduced in size to be compliant with the SPD guidance and therefore it is not considered that the proposed development would appear overbearing, overshadowing, or detrimentally reduce the amount of light received into neighbouring dwellings.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is considered to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and parking

The application property would retain two off-street parking spaces to the front elevation of the dwelling and is therefore in accordance with Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

The proposed development is not considered to give rise to any unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

Other Matters

Concerns have been raised regarding disruption during development. Such disruption is a necessary byproduct of development and is generally transient.

Comments have been received regarding the conduct of contractors/builders during construction works. Such matters are not material planning considerations in the determination of this application. Any allegations of unlawful activity are matters for the relevant authorities.

Concerns have been raised regarding damage to the highway and public footpath during development. This is a matter for the Council's Highways Department to address utilising the powers afforded to them under the Highways Acts. Similarly, damage to grass verges which are maintained at public expense should be reported separately to the Council.

Comments received regarding damage to neighbouring properties during the course of development are civil matters between the two parties and are not material considerations in the determination of this application.

The concerns over the use of drones is acknowledged. This is a matter for Greater Manchester Police to address and is not a material consideration.

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) (4)

- 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. TOROM2S170081835771 (Location Plan)

DWG No. 1950 Revision P3 (Proposed Site/Block Plan)

DWG No. 2020 Revision P2 (Proposed Roof Plan)

DWG No. 2200 Revision P2 (Proposed Elevations)

DWG No. 2000 Revision P5 (Proposed Floor Plans)

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. 2200.

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.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order (with or without modification), the flat roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony, terrace, or similar amenity area without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason – In the interest of safeguarding the amenity of neighbouring dwellings, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 5 The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.