

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/01095/HOUS

Application Number:	25/01095/HOUS
Location:	42 Penistone Avenue, Rochdale, OL16 4AL
Proposal:	First floor rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Mohammad Akbar
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 25.12.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

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. 42 Penistone Avenue, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in Kingsway. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 44 Penistone Avenue to the west, adjacent to no. 40 Penistone Avenue to the east, and faces the highway to the south. Penistone Avenue is on a small residential estate comprising houses of a similar design and material palette. The estate is bound by the Metrolink line to the north, Rochdale Canal to the east and Rochdale Bypass (A664) to the west. The wider context is more urban, including warehouse units, local amenities and key transport infrastructure.

The host dwelling has recently gained approval for a single-storey rear extension and a rear dormer pursuant to applications 21/00904/HH42 and 24/00898/CPL respectively. However, it was noted on a site visit that the single-storey rear extension is only partially complete. Moreover, the dormer has not been built in accordance with the approved plans. For example, the roof of the dormer is physically attached to the neighbour's dormer (Figure 1).



Figure 1 - Site Photo of Application Property on 24.11.25 (Source: Author)

As a result, the plans submitted under the current application are not accurate. A separate planning application will be required to regularise the unauthorised works.

The following report will consider the development as shown on the submitted plans with the caveat that the plans do not reflect the as-built structure.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension which projects 2.4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, above an approved 6m single-storey rear extension. The application property benefits from an existing rear dormer, and the hipped roof of the proposed extension would intersect with the face of the dormer. The proposal would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

24/00898/CPL - Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed rear dormer extension – Granted.

21/00904/HH42 - Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 6m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.8m and height to eaves 2.7m) - Prior Approval Not Required.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. 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 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

N/A

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 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 subservient to it.
- ☐ It is considered that the cumulative impacts of the proposed first-floor rear extension with the single-storey rear extension and rear dormer would add substantial massing to the rear elevation of the dwelling which would be highly visible from the curtilages of neighbouring properties and the Metrolink line to the rear.
- ☐ Furthermore, the application property is set slightly forward of the adjacent no. 40 Penistone Avenue with the front elevation of no. 40 skewed away from the application property. Given this relationship and the gap between the properties, the proposed development would be visible when stood on Penistone Avenue to the southwest of the application property.
- ☐ When viewed together, the extensions would read as a substantial volumetric increase that would dominate, distort and subsume the original built form. On this basis, there would be a clear lack of subservience, and the development would not be in keeping with the original built form of the host property.
- ☐ The estate consists of modest semi-detached dwellings with various extensions, although the extensions tend to be modest in scale and single-storey in height.
- ☐ It is noted that there is another dwelling (no. 23 Deepdale Avenue) located on the estate approximately 250m to the southwest of the application site which benefits from a part single, part two storey rear extension and a large, box-style rear dormer. While planning permission was granted in 2021 for a part single, part two storey rear extension, the extension has not been built in accordance with the approved plans and includes a large rear dormer. Notwithstanding, it is important to note that each application is determined on its merits, taking into consideration site specific facts and circumstances. The Core Strategy is clear in this regard, advising that existing poor-quality development in the vicinity should not be used to justify lowering design standards elsewhere (p. 80). The development at no. 23 Deepdale Avenue is considered to be a visually harmful form of development that negatively affects the character of the host dwelling and the locality. The replication of this development should be avoided.



Figure 2 - Image of 23 Deepdale Avenue Taken on 24.11.25 (Source: Author)

- ❑ Ultimately, it is considered that the sum of the extensions to the application property would represent an incongruous and poor design solution that would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
- ❑ As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within CS Policies DM1 and P3 and PfE Policy JP-P1. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the 'Residential Development' SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

- ❑ Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which states that 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.
- ❑ With reference to Section 5.9 of the SPD, the proposed first-floor rear extension is not considered to result in adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts on the neighbouring habitable room windows or garden areas.
- ❑ Taking into account Section 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed rear bedroom windows would overlook the Metrolink line and would be sited in excess of 59m and 50m from the rear elevation and curtilage boundary of no. 16 Moss Avenue and would be acceptable in this regard.
- ❑ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms of the application property and that 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 occupants.

- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or the application property, in accordance with CS Policy DM1, PfE, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

- ☐ CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account the proposed use and location.
- ☐ The existing parking arrangements comprise at least two off-street parking spaces to the front of the application property, which would remain unchanged under the proposed plans.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with CS Policies T2 and DM1.

Other Matters

- ☐ *Unauthorised works* - The existing dormer has not been built in accordance with the approved plans (planning application reference 24/00898/CPL). This matter has been passed to the Council's Planning Enforcement service.

Recommendation

Refuse for the following reason:

1. By virtue of their excessive scale, massing and design, the sum of the existing and proposed extensions would constitute non-subservient and obtrusive additions which would dominate the host dwelling and would not be in keeping with or subservient to its original built form. The development would not be well-designed and would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 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.

Informatives

1. For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan
- Existing Plans. Dwg no. A 2191/1
- Proposed Plans. Dwg no. A 2191/2

2. The existing dormer has not been built in accordance with the approved plans (planning application reference 24/00898/CPL). You are advised to contact the Council's Planning Enforcement Team at dme@rochdale.gov.uk to discuss.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	28/11/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	11/12/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Bob Melling