

Application Number:	25/00042/HOUS
Location:	8 Furzegate Rochdale OL16 4RP
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extensions
Applicant:	Sohail Sarwar
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?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

Location

The application relates to no. 8 Furzegate; a two-story detached property at the foot of a cul-de-sac. Furzegate forms part of a wider housing estate comprising houses of a similar design and material palette. The character of the area is typically suburban, comprising medium density housing, quiet streets, and a semi-verdant character.

No. 8 faces south, overlooking a front driveway and garden, set away from the adopted highway. The site border no. 6 Furzegate to the east and no. 145 Broad Lane to the west. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces north

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension.

The proposed two-storey side extension comprises a pitched roof at first floor and a lean-to roof at ground floor level to the front. It would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling at first floor level by approximately 1m and would sit flush with the rear elevation. The extension includes a ground floor and first floor window at the front and rear, as well as a rear access door.

The proposed rear extension comprises a lean-to roof and would span the full width of the rear elevation. It would include two sets of bi-folding doors.

Proposed materials include red brick, concrete roof tiles, and UPVC windows and doors to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit were consulted but failed to provide any comments.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 22/01/2025; 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
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland

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).

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
G6	Enhancing Green Infrastructure

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

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.

Side extension:

The proposed side extension follows a uniform design which integrates with the form and material palette of the host dwelling. The first-floor 1m set back ensures that the side extension appears subservient to the host dwelling. Given the orientation and position of the host dwelling, away from the public highway, the side extension would be partially screened from key vantage points, therefore having minimal impact on the street scene.

Rear extension:

The proposed rear extension follows a uniform design and subservient design which integrates with the form and material palette of the host dwelling.

Doors and windows:

The proportions, materials, and layout of the proposed doors and windows are considered acceptable.

Overall, 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.

Rear extension:

In view of the above, paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets a maximum standard for how far a single-storey rear extension can project from the original dwelling. For single-storey rear extensions to detached properties, the maximum standard relates to a point 4m along the common border with an adjacent property, to be measured from the rear elevation (including extensions) of the adjacent dwelling. The proposed rear extension projects 4m and therefore complies with the SPD. By virtue of its compliance, the proposed rear extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

Other matters:

The proposed development complies with the separation distance between habitable room windows, two-storey elevations, and boundaries to neighbouring properties.

The proposed development would ensure that all habitable rooms are served by sufficient levels of natural light and have an acceptable outlook.

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.

Impact on trees: JP-G7 and G6

The NPPF recognises that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and should be retained wherever possible. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should consider the amenity value of trees which may be impacted by new development, and can

consider measures to ensure the protection of such trees. Policy JP-G7 and G6 promote the protection of urban trees and states that where development would result in the loss of existing trees, they should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1.

There is a row of mature trees within the curtilage of no. 145 Broad Lane, directly adjacent to the western boundary of the site. The trees are considered to hold particular amenity value as they contribute to the semi-verdant character of the area and provide natural screening between Broad Lane and the more modern houses on Furzegate. In addition, the trees support the aims of Core Strategy policy G6 to establish a green network within the borough and therefore their retention and protection is strongly supported.

For the avoidance of doubt, these trees do not fall under a Tree Preservation Order and are not within the application site boundary. Nonetheless, they are directly adjacent to the proposed side extension and within falling distance of the dwelling. At the request of the LPA, the applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

The report (Roavr Group: 25_5837_03_21, 25/03/2025) found that the proposed extension encroaches on the radial root protection area of five trees (T1, T2, T3, T4, T5). The report advised that in order to avoid unacceptable damage to these root systems, the extension must be constructed using a low impact foundation system, such as ground screws or an above-ground raft and ring beam, in accordance with the design of a structural engineer. This approach will ensure the structure sits above the existing ground level, maintaining soil permeability and allowing continued air and water movement to the roots, thus ensuring the long term retention and health of the trees.

Additional recommendations included canopy reductions to T1, T2 and T3, as well as further inspection of T1 where a large basal cavity has been observed.

The report recommends that the above measures should be detailed in an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA via condition. Subject to the recommendations of the arboricultural impact assessment and a suitably worded condition, the impact of the development on neighbouring trees is considered to be acceptable, in accordance with the NPPF and policies JP-G6 and G6.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposed development would have no bearing on the existing parking arrangements, and is therefore considered acceptable.

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:

- Proposed elevations: 2246/4
- Proposed site plan and floor plans: 2246/3
- Location plan
- Aboricultural Impact Assessment (Roavr Group: 25_5837_03_21, 25/03/2025)

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.

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.

4. No development shall take place until and aboricultural method statement and tree protection plan, in line with the recommendation of paragraph 4.15 of the submitted aboricultural impact assessment (Roavr Group: 25_5837_03_21, 25/03/2025), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any measures identified within the Plan or Statement shall be installed in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction' prior to any works taking place.

The necessary protection measures shall be retained throughout the construction phase of the development and no work, excavation, tipping, or stacking/storage of materials shall take place beyond such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with Policies P3, G1, G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy Policies JP-P1, JP-G6 and JP-G7 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for Pre-Commencement: The trees must be protected before any works take place.

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	11/04/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	16/04/2025	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Informative:

Trees

The development has a potential to impact trees which are off-site and not under the applicant's control. The applicant should satisfy themselves that the proposals do not give rise to any civil complaints before undertaking any work, which may include consultation with the owner(s) of any trees.