

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00714/HOUS**

<b>Application Number:</b>	25/00714/HOUS
<b>Location:</b>	24 Taylor Street, Rochdale, OL12 0HX
<b>Proposal:</b>	Single storey side and rear extensions and front porch.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Mahmood
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Bob Melling
<b>DETERMINATION DATE</b> 19.09.2025	<b>EXT OF TIME</b> 31.10.2025
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	<b>Grant subject to conditions</b>

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

<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>Planning Panel comments received?</b>	<b>N</b>
	<b>Neighbour comments received?</b>	<b>N</b>

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

**Location**

The application relates to no. 24 Taylor Street, a two storey end-terrace dwelling located in Central Rochdale. The dwelling is sited on a corner plot and is adjoined by no. 22 Taylor Street to the southwest, adjacent to no. 26 Taylor Street to the northeast, and faces the highway to the northwest. The side and rear boundary of the curtilage borders Folly Walk to the northeast and southeast.

**Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension, a single storey side extension and a front porch. The rear extension would extend across the width of the dwelling with a depth of 6m. It would have a hipped roof with a height to eaves of approximately 2.8m and a maximum height of 3.8m. The side extension would extend the length of the dwelling and project 2.7m from the existing side elevation. It would also have a hipped roof and stand at the same height as the rear extension. The front porch would measure 2.5m by 2m with a lean-to roof and a maximum height of approximately 2.7m. The materials for construction are indicated to match those used in the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.

## **Relevant History**

23/00128/HH42: Prior approval for a larger home extension measuring 6m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 2.8 and height to eaves 2.5). Approved March 2023.

*It was noted on a site visit that the extension approved under the above application has been partially built, although it has not been built in accordance with plans submitted under application 23/00128/HH42 as the roof is pitched rather than flat, hence the inclusion of the extension under the current application.*

## **Township/Member comments**

N/A

## **Consultee responses**

N/A

## **Representations**

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no comments 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 change the roof design of the front porch from hipped to lean-to.

### **Assessment**

#### **Character and Appearance**

- ☐ The NPPF establishes that achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PfE policy JP-P1 and CS policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. In addition, section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ Although the scale of the rear extension would be relatively substantial, with a depth of 6m, it is important to note that the extension is largely as was approved under application reference 23/00128/HH42 except for the use of a hipped roof rather than a flat roof.
- ☐ Although the overall massing would be greater, it is considered that the use of a hipped roof would result in an improved built form that would better reflect the character of the host dwelling and street scene.
- ☐ The side extension is considered to be a proportionate addition to the host dwelling with an appropriate roof design and window detailing.
- ☐ Section 5.14 of the SPD advises that extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Section 5.15 goes on to explain the factors that will need to be taken into account when determining the acceptability of a side extension on a corner plot. These factors include the presence of a strong building line and any overriding need to protect it, the proximity of neighbouring buildings, and the space surrounding other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site and the contribution this space makes to the overall character of the street scene.
- ☐ While the side extension would erode the space between the gable end and Folly Walk, it is not considered that the extension would be out of keeping with the layout and general character of the locality.
- ☐ The absence of a strong building line, the layout of the street and the fact that the extension would be single storey are factors that combine to ensure the extension would not have an unduly harmful impact on the overall character of the street scene.

- ☐ Furthermore, the side extension would not result in the loss of the existing boundary wall along Folly Walk.
- ☐ Although front porches are not an original feature of the terraced block, it is noted that two dwellings along the block have erected porches with lean-to roofs. While the porch proposed under the current application would be larger, it would be set back comfortably from the highway and the roof design has been amended to reflect the porches at nos. 12 and 20 Taylor Street.
- ☐ On balance, it is considered that the porch would be a proportionate addition to the host dwelling that would not result in undue harm to the character of the street scene.
- ☐ Lastly, it is important to note that the extension would be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with CS policies DM1 and P3, PfE policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

### **Residential Amenity**

- ☐ CS policy DM1 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.*'
- ☐ The proposed rear extension would exceed the projection limit for single storey extensions set out in section 5.6 of the SPD by approximately 0.18m. However, it is important to note that the extension would occupy the same footprint as the extension approved under application reference 23/00128/HH42. While the use of a hipped roof would increase the massing of the extension, it is noted that the roof would be hipped away from the side boundary with a relatively shallow pitch. Furthermore, the expanse of brick wall along the common boundary would be no different from the approved extension with the eaves height remaining the same.
- ☐ Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the adjoining occupiers.
- ☐ The side extension would measure approximately 13m to the facing elevation of no. 26 Taylor Street, which is in accordance with the minimum separation distances outlined under section 4.1 of the SPD.
- ☐ Moreover, it is not considered that any of the openings would result in an undue loss of privacy for any neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or the application property in accordance with CS policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

### **Highways**

- The development would have no bearing on the existing parking and servicing arrangements, and therefore accords with CS 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. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing. Dwg no. TAY-01-20
- Proposed. Dwg no. TAY-03-20. Amendment 1b

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory development in accordance with the policies 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.

**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.

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Officer</b>
<b>Report Completed</b>	30/09/2025	Signed: BM
<b>Authorisation</b>	14/10/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling