

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0071
Location: 56 Fenton Street, Rochdale, OL11 3TH
Proposal: Part two storey, part single storey rear extension
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Majid Mir

SITE

The application relates to 56 Fenton Street, this is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling that fronts onto the highway. The dwelling does not benefit from off street parking. This is a characteristic of the area and has a small area of hardstanding at the rear of the property.

The property adjoins no. 54 for to the east. When compared to the neighbouring properties on the row of terrace properties on Fenton Street, no. 54 has a much larger rear garden, The extended rear garden wraps around the rear of no. 56. To the west of no. 56 is the adjoining property of no. 58. To the rear, along with the rear garden of no. 54, no. 101 Freehold Street is also sited to the rear. No. 54 and 58 have had substantial rear extensions and no. 101 appears to have had a substantial rear extension and outbuilding constructed close to the boundary.

An alleyway runs along the back of nos. 64 to 58 and allows access to the rear no. 56.

The site is located within the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission to construct a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. The proposed development will provide an extended kitchen on the ground floor and a bedroom with bathroom on the first floor.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

P3 Improving design of new development

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements

SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

25/00588/HOUS - Two storey rear extension. Decision: Refuse. Reason for refusal:

The proposed development would result in a significant and adverse overbearing impact on the rear windows and garden area of no.58 Fenton Street and would also result in a unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants of no.54 Fenton Street, as is evidenced by their non-compliance with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document. As such the proposal would not comply with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016) SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representation have been sent out to surrounding properties. No representations have been received.

AMENDMENTS

The internal layout has been amended with the ensuite previously being sited to the rear of the first floor element of the proposed extension. The bedroom is now sited to the rear of the first floor element of the proposed extension.

Design

The ground floor element of the proposed extension when combined with the existing extension would project out by 7.1m, and the first floor element would project out by 4.6m. The first floor element of the proposed development would have a dual pitched hipped roof design on the first floor element. This would replace an existing mono pitched roof. The ridge height would be set considerably lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling and the eaves would match that of the host dwelling. A lean to mono pitched roof would bridge the ground floor and first floor.

It is noted that there are numerous extensions of a similar scale on the neighbouring properties. There is a range of roof designs that can be found on these extensions. There is no uniformity in the design of the extensions. In this context, the proposed design of the roof forms are considered to be acceptable.

The proposed finishing materials will match the host dwelling and are considered to be acceptable. Additionally, the design of the fenestration is also considered to be acceptable.

Overall, the proposed development is considered to represent a relatively subservient addition that would be in keeping the host dwelling and the general character of the local area.

As such, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the PfE, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity

The SPD sets out guidance for two storey rear extensions, 'Planning permission will not normally be granted for two storey or first floor extensions to detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling' In regard to single storey extensions, the SPD states that a single storey extension shall not project more than 3 metres measured along the common boundary and from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling. The 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

In combination with the existing two-storey rear extension, the proposed development will extend approximately 7.1m at ground floor level and 4.6m at first floor level, when measured from the rear elevation of the host dwelling and the rear elevations of no. 58 and no. 54. The proposed extension would be set directly adjacent to the shared boundary with no. 58 and would be set approximately 2.2m from the shared boundary with no. 54. The proposed extension would therefore fail to meet the requirements set out in the SPD.

It is however noted that the both the adjoining properties have extensions that project out by a greater amount than set out in the SPD. The extensions project out by a greater distance than the overall projection proposed on the application property. It is further noted that the no. 54 has a canopy on the rear elevation closest to no. 56 and thereby reducing the light and outlook from the rear window sited close to the shared boundary. Additionally, no. 58 has a part two storey part single storey extension that has a combined projection of 8.3m and is set approximately 2.8m from the shared boundary. It is further noted that the rear of the properties face north. Finally, it is noted that there are similar extensions on the neighbouring properties. There is already a considerable impact on light and overshadowing experienced by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties due to partially the existing extensions on the host properties and partially by the extensions already constructed.

Taking the above into consideration, the impact of the proposal would not substantially alter the level of amenity that is already experienced by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and would be similar to the level of amenity experienced along this part of Fenton Street.

The application has been amended to include a window in the side elevation for a bathroom and a bedroom window on the rear elevation facing north. It is noted that there is an existing bedroom window on the side elevation that faces towards no. 54. It appears that this window has obscured glazing. The window is approximately 2.2m from the shared boundary. The amendment would see this existing window used to service the bathroom. The proposal would not see any loss of privacy or greater overlooking than is presently the case.

The application also proposes a window on the ground floor side elevation facing towards no. 54. Views of no. 54 are adequately screened by the existing boundary treatment.

The SPD states that a minimum separation distance of 21m should be retained between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level and 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage. The SPD adds that that exceptions to these minimum space standards may be acceptable in some circumstances and applications and will be considered on their individual merits.

It is noted that the rear facing bedroom window would be 7.3m from the shared boundary with no. 54 and 8.4m to the shared boundary with no. 101 Freehold Street. It is noted that the curtilage of no. 54 wraps around the rear of the curtilage of no. 56. Although the distance to the shared boundary would not meet the 10.5m required in the SPD, it would not directly face a habitable room. In regard to no. 101, it is also noted that the main garden area is to the side and therefore the addition of the window on the rear elevation would lead to greater overlooking onto the private garden area. Noting the existing level of amenity experienced in the vicinity of the site, it is considered that the character and density of the surrounding area would be preserved and the proposed extension would not detract from the general levels of privacy and amenity typical in the local area.

The habitable rooms of the application property will receive an adequate amount light and outlook when compared to the existing arrangement. A sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space would be retained when taking into consideration the size of the application property and the neighbouring properties.

As such, on balance, it is considered that in this location the proposals would not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties or the occupiers of the host property, and therefore accords with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the policy JP-P1 of the PfE, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Location Plan

- Block Plan 1200. Drawing number: CDBP/0613/MA - R1

- Existing GF & FF Plans and Elevations. Drawing number: CDBP/0613/MA - R1.
Received by email on 11/05/2026

- Proposed GF & FF Plans and Elevations. Drawing number: CDBP/0613/MA - R2.
Received by email on 11/05/2026

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

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.