

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

25/00129/HOUS

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 07.04.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: 132 Furbarn Lane Rochdale OL11 5RA

Proposal: Single-storey front extension

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: TH **DATE:** 11.06.2025

SITE

The site is located at 132 Furbarn Lane, a two storey detached dwelling. The dwelling benefits from an attached garage, front and rear amenity space. The dwelling is on a large plot and has been previously extended and altered.

The site is accessed via a private lane off Clay Lane. The site is located within the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a single storey front extension. The proposed front extension will consist of a swimming pool, gym/ studio and changing room.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

9. Places for People

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

P3 Improving design of new development

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements

SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

23/01292/HOUS - Part Single storey part two storey front extension, first floor side extension and rear balcony. – Approved

92/D28585 - Conservatory and porch to front of dwellinghouse. – Approved

87/D21282 - Detached granny flat – Approved

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No public comments were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The proposed development is within the Defined Urban Area, as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

The principle of development is considered acceptable within the Defined Urban Area and further matters will be considered below.

Design

Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and enhance the borough's identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. In addition, paragraphs 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused

The SPD sets out guidelines for extensions, it sets that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and in general be subservient to it. The proposed development is a single storey front extension projecting 10.7m from the front elevation and is a proposed 3.8m in height. The proposed development does not comply with the SPD in this regards and this is not considered acceptable.

The proposed development will block a large portion of the front elevation and part of the first floor, this proposal is not considered to be subservient to the host dwelling and is not considered acceptable. The proposed development is considered to be large in scale and does not take the existing design of the dwelling into consideration. The proposed development is considered to have poor siting as it extends from the principle elevation and this is not considered acceptable,

The proposal is considered poor design as the finishing materials would be metal cladding and brick, the metal cladding is not considered to fit in with the existing dwelling and is not considered acceptable.

It is noted due to the position of the plot being set back from the highway the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the street scene, however this does not outweigh the design in terms of scale and finishing materials.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Surrounding Occupiers.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

Due to the layout of the site and position of surrounding dwellings the proposed development will not have a negative impact on neighbour amenity, the development will not be overbearing for neighbours.

The proposed development will leave a sufficient amount of garden space for occupiers.

As such, it is considered that the proposals would comprise a good standard of amenity for future occupiers and surrounding occupiers and accords with the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy DM1 states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

As part of the application process the Council's Highway Department has been consulted and raised no objections. The proposed development will not have an impact on the existing parking or highways and is considered acceptable.

The proposal accords with the requirements of Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposed development is considered poor siting and design, it is not subservient to the host dwelling as it is large in scale and dominates the

principle elevation. The design of the proposed extension is not acceptable as it would project from the front elevation and the materials would not match the host property. The proposed development fails to improve the character and quality of the area and is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

For avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans

- Location Plan
- Location Plan and Block Plan PL - 001
- Proposed Floor Plan PL - 105
- Proposed Elevations PL - 20

Report Author Aimee Bovaird