

Application Number:	25/00297/HOUS
Location:	22A Furness Road, Middleton, M24 6EG
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension
Applicant:	Ms Claire Dodge
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

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)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

1 objection was received which raised concerns regarding loss of light and the impact of construction vehicles on highway safety. Loss of light is a material planning consideration and will be assessed under the heading 'Residential Amenity' however the impact of construction vehicles is not a material planning consideration.

Assessment

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 proposed extension would have an appropriate scale, massing and roof style including the use of a material palette in keeping with the existing property. The window detailing would also be acceptable and the existing bin storage arrangements would not be affected.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PpE Policy JP-P1, the SPD 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	✓

While an objection was received citing the potential for the extension to result in an unacceptable loss of light towards a neighbouring rear garden, it should be noted that the extension has been designed in compliance with the projection standards outlined in the SPD for residential development. Whilst there would be some overshadowing, as there is with any similar extension, the impacts from this would not be unacceptable and be beyond those which are within the normal realm of what is considered to generally be acceptable for closely spaced dwellings. Therefore, it is considered that the development would not result in any undue impact on the neighbour and it would not be possible to substantiate a reason for refusal regarding loss of light.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD 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 CS Policy T2, CS Appendix 5 and the NPPF.

As detailed above, whilst there are objections regarding the impact on construction traffic, this is not a material planning consideration and any refusal on such grounds could not be reasonably substantiated.

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:

- Location Plan
- Existing Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Existing Floor Plans & Elevations
- Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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 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	28/04/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	15/05/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling