

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00539/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00539/HOUS
Location:	9 Lister Road, Middleton, M24 4RB
Proposal:	Erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension and a two storey side extension including alterations to the existing fenestration.
Applicant:	Jonathan McLaughlin
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 18.06.2025	EXT OF TIME 29.08.2025
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 9 Lister Road, a two storey dwelling located at the end of a terraced block in a residential area of Middleton. The application property adjoins no. 11 Lister Road to the southwest and is adjacent to no. 7 Lister Road to the northeast. No. 8 Lister Road is positioned across the highway to the northwest and there is a dense line of trees to the rear, beyond which lie the River Irk and the M60.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side extension and a part two, part single storey rear extension. The side extension would project approximately 2.92m from the existing side elevation and would be stepped back from the main front wall by 0.5m. The rear extension would have a depth of 3m at both levels and extend the full width of the extended dwelling at ground floor level. At first floor level, the rear extension would be set in from the side walls. Materials for construction would match those used in the exterior of the existing dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no responses were received.

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 Development

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

Amendments were sought to reduce the scale of the rear extension at first floor level in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 7 Lister Road.

Assessment

Character and Appearance

- ☐ Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *'of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area'* and to *'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.'*
- ☐ Section 5.1 of the SPD explains that extensions *'should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.'*
- ☐ The proposed side extension would measure less than half the width of the existing dwelling and would be set back 0.5m from the existing principal elevation, with the ridgeline set down accordingly. As such, it is considered that the extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- ☐ The extensions would be characterised by hipped roof forms to match the existing roof form and a gap of 0.9m would be retained to the side boundary, which would enable the storage of bins out of public view.
- ☐ Moreover, the extension would be finished in materials to match the existing property.
- ☐ Although the provision of off-street parking to the front of the dwelling would result in the loss of the existing front garden, it is noted that the parking spaces would be flanked by areas of soft landscaping. While the loss of the front garden is less than ideal, it is not considered to be unduly harmful, particularly given that it would result in a reduction in kerbside parking.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.'*
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *'it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.'*
- ☐ Section 5.8 of the SPD explains that *'Two storey or first floor rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbouring occupiers than single storey extensions, particularly on their enjoyment of their garden area due to the potential oppressiveness of a two-storey wall close to a common boundary.'*
- ☐ Firstly, it is noted that the proposed rear extension would comply with the SPD projection limits with regard to no. 11 Lister Road, which benefits from

an existing single storey rear extension measuring approximately 3m from its rear elevation.

- ☐ Having regard for no. 7 Lister Road, while the first floor extent of the proposed rear extension would comply with the SPD projection limit, the ground floor extent would exceed the projection limit by approximately 0.7m. However, it is considered that there are site specific facts and circumstances that can allow for a relaxation of the SPD guidance with regard to the ground floor extent of the rear extension.
- ☐ No. 7 Lister Road is set on slightly higher ground than the application property and is also set away from the common boundary by a distance of approximately 3.7m. Moreover, the main window serving the ground floor of no. 7 is set approximately 1.7m further from the common boundary. Lastly, it is noted that there is an existing shed within the rear garden of no. 7 which is sited against the common boundary. Given these site-specific conditions, it is considered that the 0.7m exceedance of the SPD guidance can be justified and a reason for refusal could not be substantiated on the grounds of residential amenity.
- ☐ It is not considered that the proposed side extension would have an undue impact on no. 7 given that the side elevation of no. 7 is blank.
- ☐ It should also be noted that the proposed extensions would comply with the minimum separation distances outlined under section 4.1 of the SPD.
- ☐ All habitable rooms within the application property would receive sufficient natural light and a 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 occupiers of the application property.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or the application property in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

- ☐ At present, the site does not benefit from any off-street parking. However, the proposals indicate the formation of a driveway to the front of the dwelling for two cars. This would reduce the amount of kerbside parking along Lister Road and would comply with the Council's parking standards for a dwelling of this size.

Ecology

- ☐ The proposals would result in the loss of the existing hedge along the front boundary as well as the existing front lawn.
- ☐ While the side extension would result in built development in close proximity to the existing hedge along the side boundary, including a tree (not protected), it is considered that the development would be possible without substantive harm to the hedge or tree. While pruning works would likely be required, it is noted that the hedge is already overgrown and in need of pruning.
- ☐ Overall, while the loss of soft landscaping is not ideal, it is considered acceptable on balance given that it would result in the provision of off-street

parking where none currently exists. In addition, the plans indicate that there would be areas of soft landscaping to the side of the proposed parking spaces.

Drainage

- The application proposes the provision of hardstanding to the front. The plans indicate that it would be sustainably drained through the provision of a permeable surface. This is considered acceptable in respect of policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan. Dwg no. 100
- Block Plans. Dwg no. 101. Rev B
- Existing Plans. Dwg no. 102
- Existing Elevations. Dwg no. 103
- Proposed Plans. Dwg no. 104. Rev A
- Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. 105. Rev B

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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 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.

4. The proposed driveway shown on drawing no. 101. Rev B shall be first surfaced solely in permeable materials and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To prevent an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development and to ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved Policy EM/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	27/08/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	28/08/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling