

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00902/HOUS**

<b>Application Number:</b>	25/00902/HOUS
<b>Location:</b>	29 Emma Street, Rochdale, OL12 6QW
<b>Proposal:</b>	Single storey rear extension
<b>Applicant:</b>	Khalel Ahmed
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Bob Melling
<b>DETERMINATION DATE</b> 30.10.2025	<b>EXT OF TIME</b> N/A
<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 by Ward Member?</b>	<b>N</b>

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national, sub-regional and local policies and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the Planning Officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

**Policy****National**

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

**Sub-Regional**

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) 2024:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places  
JP-P2 Heritage

**Local**

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area  
BE/17 New Development Affecting Conservation Areas

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

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

### **Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel**

N/A

### **Assessment**

#### **Impact on Designated Heritage Assets**

Section 72 of the Planning and Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 (as amended) states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states: 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

PfE Policy JP-P2 requires development proposals to ensure the heritage significance of a site or area is considered in accordance with national planning policy.

CS Policy P2 sets out the aim of protecting the borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, such as Conservation Areas.

The proposed development lies within the setting of the Grade I listed Church of Saint Edmund but is sufficiently removed from it so as not to have a negative impact on the setting or significance of the listed heritage asset.

Moreover, the relatively modest extension to the rear of the application property could not reasonably be considered to give harm to the character and appearance of the Saint Edmund Conservation Area.

Overall, it is considered that the extensions would not have a harmful impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets. The extensions would reflect the design of the host property and would have an appropriate scale in the context of the neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposal would accord with CS Policy P2, PfE Policy JP-P2 and the relevant policies contained within the NPPF.

**Design and Visual Amenity:** Are the following acceptable?

Impact on street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line	✓
Height and massing	✓
Facing materials and detailing	✓
Roof style	✓
Window proportions	✓
Bin storage	✓
Impact on trees	✓

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, PfE and the NPPF.

**Residential Amenity:** Are the following acceptable?

Impact on privacy, light & outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	✓
Light and outlook of application property	✓
Remaining garden space of application property	✓

It should be noted that that the rear elevation of the adjacent property, no. 27 Emma Street, is skewed towards the application property. Moreover, no. 27 is at a lower ground level than the application property. However, it is noted that the extension is set in approximately 2m from the gable end of the application property and 3.3m from the common boundary with no. 27. Therefore, it is not considered the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of no. 27.

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

**Highways and Parking:** Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	✓
Parking provision	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

**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:

- Location Plan
- Existing Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Sheet – 1 Existing Plans & Elevations. Dated May 2025
- Sheet 2 – Proposed Plans & Elevations. Dated May 2025

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 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.

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Officer</b>
<b>Report Completed</b>	25/09/2025	Signed: BM
<b>Authorisation</b>	10/11/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Bob Melling