

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01268/HOUS

Application Number:	24/01268/HOUS
Location:	435 Bury Road Rochdale OL11 5EU
Proposal:	Single storey rear wrap around extension.
Applicant:	Mr Jahidur Bhuiyan
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

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

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

Location

The application relates to no. 435 Bury Road; a two-storey terraced house in Rochdale. The dwelling forms part of a residential terrace on the south side of Bury Road (B6222); a key thoroughfare linking Rochdale and Bury, predominantly comprising red brick terraced housing. The wider is residential and has a semi-verdant character as well as plenty of green space.

No. 435 faces north, overlooking a front garden and the adopted highway. It adjoins no. 437 to the west and no. 433 to east. The rear boundary faces south, bordering an alleyway running adjacent to the rear residential gardens along Linnet Hill.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The extension would project from the dwelling's main rear elevation and wraparound the existing two-storey rear extension. It would comprise a hipped roof form, double doors, a single window, and two skylights. Proposed materials include red brick, concrete roof tiles, and UPVC windows and doors.

The extension would project a maximum of 5m, and measure 5.4m (width) X 2.4m (eaves height) X 3.3m (maximum height).

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

None

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 15/01/2025. One objection was raised on the grounds that the proposed development did not comply with Permitted Development rules nor local planning regulations, in terms of its how far it extends from the original house. These matters will be addressed in the 'Amenity' and 'Other Matters' section of this report.

The same objector also referenced a legacy of negligent construction by the applicant which has had a harmful impact on neighbouring dwellings. This is not a planning matter, and will not be considered within this assessment.

Policy

National

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

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:

JP-P1 Sustainable places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

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).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

By virtue of its subordinate form and conventional appearance, together with its position away from the street scene, the design of the extension is considered to be acceptable. The proposed materials, to match those of the host dwelling, are similarly considered acceptable. Overall, the design of the proposal accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Considering the above, and with reference to the aforementioned objection, paragraph 5.6 of the SPD is relevant, as it establishes maximum standards for single-storey rear extensions, in order to ensure that they do not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupants. Paragraph 5.6 states that planning permission will normally be granted for single storey rear extensions to attached properties, which do not extend beyond a point 3 metres along the common boundary, measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling. Paragraph 5.7 goes on to state that the 3 metre point will be taken from the rear of any extension adjoining property, if one exists and is close to the common boundary. The proposed rear extension would project approximately 1.8m along the common boundaries with nos. 433 and 437 Bury Road, when measured from the rear of both their existing extensions. By virtue of the proposed extension's compliance with the SPD, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants is considered to be acceptable.

There is some concern that the proposed extension would result in an inadequate amount of natural light reaching the central living area. Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires new development to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, including the provision of natural light to habitable rooms. Measures have been taken to mitigate for the loss of natural light, such as the proposed installation of skylights and external double doors. Whilst it is disputed as to whether such measures would be sufficient, the proposed extension falls within the parameters of the General Permitted Development Order, and as such it would be difficult to refuse planning permission.

Overall, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Other matters:

In response to the objection that the proposed development exceeds the limitations of Permitted Development Rights, this is incorrect. The proposed rear extension would comply with Class A, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order, which allows the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse to have a single-storey which extends 6 metres from the rear, for an attached property not on article 2(3) land or on a site of special scientific interest, subject to the larger home extension criteria being satisfied.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development would have no impact on the existing parking arrangements and is therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation:

Grant subject to the following conditions

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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Plans & Elevations as Existing and Proposed (001:A)
- Location plan: PP-13655107v1

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the saved

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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 order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	24/02/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	26/02/2025	Signed:LA

Report Author Hamish Rigg