

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00677/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00677/HOUS
Location:	11 Regent Street Rochdale OL12 0HQ
Proposal:	Proposed single-storey rear extension
Applicant:	Liaqat Hussain
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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. 11 Regent Street: a terraced house on the outskirts of Rochdale town centre. Regent Street predominantly comprises warehouses and industrial buildings but has a short row of terraced houses at the southern end. The surrounding area is typically urban, consisting of residential, industrial and commercial buildings.

No. 11 faces east, overlooking a driveway and the adopted public highway. It adjoins no. 9 to the south and no. 13 to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces west, bordering the rear gardens of nos. 14-16 Elliott Street.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension with a flat roof, a side door and a rear window. The proposed extension would adjoin an existing single-storey rear extension.

The proposed extension would project 2.6m from the host dwelling, measuring 2.7m (width) X 2.8m (height). Proposed materials include red brick and UPVC.

Relevant History

14/01376/HOUS- Grant STC
Single-storey rear extension

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable

Representations

Notification letters were sent to neighbours 18/07/2025; no objections were raised.

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

Amended plans have been received to clarify a drawing error to the roof.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Are the following acceptable?

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

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 5.5 of the SPD states that it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers. Paragraph 5.6 therefore sets a maximum standard, for single storey rear extensions to attached properties, of a point 3m along the common boundary, when measured from the rear elevation or existing extension of the adjoining house. If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45-degree line measured from the point along the common boundary.

The proposed rear extension would project 2.6m along the common boundary with no. 9, when measured from the neighbour's rear extension. Comparatively, as no. 13 doesn't have a rear extension, the proposed rear extension would project 5.6m along the common boundary. Yet because the proposed rear extension is set away from the common boundary with no. 13, it would not project beyond a 45-degree line drawn from the 3m point.

The proposed extension therefore complies with paragraph 5.6 in terms of its relationship with both no. 9 and no. 13 Regent Street. By virtue of its compliance, the extension would not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupants through overshadowing or oppressiveness.

Overall, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Informative

Upon visiting the site, it was discovered that the applicants have a large outbuilding in their garden. Permitted Development rights allow for the erection of an outbuilding within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse, but the eaves height of the outbuilding must not exceed 2.5m. Should the height of the outbuilding exceed 2.5m, it would be in breach of planning legislation. It is therefore advised that the applicant seeks planning advice and submits a retrospective application if necessary.

Recommendation:

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:

- Proposed elevations, floor plans and site plan: 2313/2
- Location plan

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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 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, except as indicated in the email received on 28.05.2025 specifying that the flat roof material will be a durable waterproof membrane cover.

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	29/08/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	03/09/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Hamish Rigg