

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
25/00922/FUL

CASE OFFICER
Nick Brookman

DATE
24th December 2025

DETERMINATION DATE

14th January 2026

Address: 231 Boarshaw Road, Middleton, M24 2WQ

Proposal: Construction of a first floor extension and change of use of the first floor of the existing convenience store to create four self-contained residential flats including the formation of a bin store, a new side entrance door and associated window openings and roller shutter doors.

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site Notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N/A
-----	--	-----

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RG

DATE: 14 January 2025

SITE

The application site relates to 231 Boarshaw Road which is currently occupied as a Local Convenience Store at ground floor level with some associated storage and break out area space at first floor to the rear. The application site lies within the Defined Urban Area.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a number of terraced and semi-detached properties in the immediate vicinity. However, the site does form part of the Boarshaw Road Local Centre and Linear Commercial Area as characterised by UDP Saved Policy S/6 given the site is located in close proximity to commercial premises comprising of hot foot takeaways, cafes, a hair a beauty parlour, a car wash and a pharmacy.

The site is located approximately 1.7km to the north of Middleton Town Centre.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a first floor extension and change of use of the first floor of the existing convenience store to create four self-contained residential flats including the formation of a bin store, a new side entrance door and associated window openings and roller shutter doors.

External alternations would include the insertion of new windows along the entire first floor west elevation to provide light and ventilation into the proposed apartments. Other external alterations on the same elevation comprise of the pedestrian access door to the apartments as well as two other roller shutter doors to serve the new bin store for the apartments and storage space associated with the existing Convenience Store which is remaining at ground floor level.

The existing air conditioning units are remaining in situ along the west elevation.

One window is proposed to be inserted onto the north facing elevation. There are no external alterations proposed to the east facing elevation. Two new windows are proposed on the south facing elevation

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

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

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

DM1 General development requirements

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

- C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
- C3 Delivering the right type of housing
- C6 Improving health and well being

SO3 Improving Design, image and quality of place

- P1 Improving Image
- P3 Improving design of new development

SO4 Promoting a greener environment

- G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability

SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

- T2 Improving Accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 - Defined Urban Area

S/6 - District Centre, Local Centre and Linear Commercial Areas

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

Urban Design Guide.

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-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-H1	Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
JP-H2	Affordability of New Housing
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design and New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C5	Streets for All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

19/00243/FUL Change of use of part of first floor of convenience store to create two self-contained studio flats including formation of new door openings in side elevation, erection of two side dormers, insertion of roof lights and re-positioning of existing air conditioning units. Refused 4th June 2019.

10/D53042 The Installation Of An Automated Teller Machine And 2 Anti Ram Bollards. Approved 11th May 2010.

10/A5836 Internally Illuminated Atm Sign. Approved 11th May 2010.

- 01/D39304 Erection Of Anti-Ram Raid Bollards To Front Elevation. Approved 29th October 2001.
- 00/D37667 Erection of two storey rear extension and first floor above existing shop to form living accommodation. Approved subject to conditions in July 2000.
- 78/D06804 New fascia and infill of window. Approved in July 1978.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways

No objection.

Environmental Health (Noise)

No comments received.

Conservation Officer

“The application site was identified as a non-designated heritage asset as part of planning application 19/00243/FUL. it was identified as an NDHA due to its architectural values: ornate frontage including ceramic tiles and it dates from c.1934. The architectural interest has been somewhat undermined by the later shopfront which has been installed.

The proposal is for an upwards extension to the building, and the plans show that this frontage would be lost. This would result in harm to the significance of this asset through the loss of architectural detailing to the front. This is a material consideration in the planning balance.

While there may be scope in heritage terms for an extension, the existing frontage should be retained and incorporated into the design. A heritage statement should also be required in accordance with NPPF paragraph 207”.

United Utilities

No comments received.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to the occupiers of surrounding buildings on 26th November 2025. In addition, a site notice was displayed adjacent to the site on the 25th November 2025.

No representations were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application seeks permission for the construction of a first-floor extension to create 4 residential apartments within a highly accessible and sustainable location. In such

locations, the Core Strategy (CS) actively encourages new housing development particularly where there is good access to existing facilities and infrastructure (Policy SP2). This is echoed in Policies C1, C2 and DM1 of the CS.

Places for Everyone establishes the need for at least 616 net additional dwellings per year in Rochdale to meet the housing needs of the borough. Policy C1 of The Core Strategy seeks to focus housing development on previously developed sites within the urban area, setting a target of 80% of new housing on previously developed land.

Core Strategy Policy C1 sets out that, inter alia, in the south of Rochdale Borough (which includes the township of Middleton), the opportunity to provide new housing in sustainable locations will be maximised. Housing should be located within or close to key economic growth areas or town centres.

CS Policy C3 goes on to state, amongst other things, that higher density development (residential) should be focused around Rochdale, Middleton and Heywood town centres. Policy C3 recognises that higher density development should be focused in areas that can sustain higher densities, and this includes accessible sites in and around town centres, sites on or close to high frequency bus routes and sites close to railway stations or Metrolink stops.

Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that *“Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses”*. Paragraph 125 of the NPPF advises that *“Planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land”*. Under sub paragraph (d) of Paragraph 125 of the NPPF, *“Planning policies and decisions should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing..”*.

Further to those relevant policies as identified in the Rochdale Core Strategy, relevant policies in Places for Everyone (PfE) have been identified. PfE Policy JP-S1 sets out that development should seek to maximise economic, social and environmental benefits. Preference should be given to previously-developed (brownfield) land. PfE Policy JP-H2 states that there should be a significant increase in the supply of new housing, including, specifically, the supply of low-cost market housing. Furthermore, as set out in PfE Policy JP-H4, new housing should be delivered at a density appropriate for the location and taking into account the site’s accessibility.

Whilst Rochdale can presently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, this does not preclude the delivery of additional housing. The need for boosting housing in urban areas is clearly set out in National Policy. The opportunity to develop the site for 9 apartments would offer a positive contribution to housing land supply which should be apportioned due weight in the decision making process.

In this instance, it is considered that the proposal would lead to the provision of much needed and sought after residential accommodation in a highly sustainable location. The proposed units created would assist the Borough in meeting its housing requirements.

As such, the proposal is acceptable in principle and in accordance with adopted Rochdale Core Strategy Policies C1 and C3, Places for Everyone Policies JP-S1, JP-H2 and JP-H4, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

Heritage, Design and Appearance

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that *“the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve”*. Paragraph 135 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Additionally, paragraph 139 sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

The National Design Guide (NDG) states that *“The long-standing, fundamental principles for good design are that is it: fit for purpose; durable; and brings delight”*. The NDG advises that scale, appearance materiality and detailing of buildings are key components for well-designed places. The Building for a Healthy Life guidance document states that building forms and materials should be used to reflect local character.

The above considerations are largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which ultimately require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

CS Policy P1 sets out that high quality design will be required in all new developments, requiring that under-used land and buildings are re-used and creating people-friendly and safe environments.

In addition, Core Strategy Policy C3 requires a high standard of development and layout that produces attractive places. Furthermore, Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires that *‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

CS Policy DM1 states that all development proposals should be of a high-quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.

The proposed development will be constructed of facing brickwork which will match the materiality of the existing ground floor side elevation which is entirely red brick. The roof will be hipped and constructed of slate tiles. The proposed window and door sizes, locations and proportions on the proposed building have evidently been considered to provide balanced elevations of an acceptable amount.

In terms of massing and bulk of the proposed development, the proposal would in the opinion of Planning Officers sit comfortably in the application site when viewed against the context and character of the surrounding area and within the vicinity of the application site where two storey properties are dominant.

However, the application site was identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) as part of planning application 19/00243/FUL. It was identified as an NDHA due to its architectural values: ornate frontage including ceramic tiles and it dates from c.1934.

Paragraphs 207 and 208 of the NPPF require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting; and that the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance; local planning authorities should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Paragraph 210 sets out three considerations which local planning authorities should consider when determining applications:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 216 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

PfE Policy JP-J2 (Heritage) sets out that particular consideration will be given to ensure that the significance of key elements of the historic environment which contribute to Greater Manchester's distinctive identity and sense of place are protected from harm. These include historic town centres, places of worship, historic transport routes including the canal network, industrial buildings and structures including textile mills, farmsteads and other sites, buildings, and areas of identified archaeological, architectural, artistic and/or historic value.

Development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets and/or their settings will be considered having regard to national planning policy. Development proposals which will help safeguard the significance of and secure a sustainable future for Greater Manchester's heritage at risk will be supported in principle, provided they are not contrary to national policy or other policies in the development plan. Proposals should be informed, as necessary, by the findings and recommendations of the appropriate heritage assessment(s) in the development plan evidence base and/or any updated heritage assessment submitted as part of the planning application process.

Amongst other criteria, Policy P2 of the Core Strategy sets out that the Council will protect the boroughs heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.

The Council's Conservation Officer was consulted on this application and commented that the aforementioned ornate frontage would be lost as part of the development and this would result in harm to the significance of the NDHA through the loss of the existing architectural detailing to the front which is a material consideration in the planning balance.

Accordingly, as proposed the development would fail to meet the requirements of the NPPF, PfE Policy JP-H2 and CS Policy P2. The development is therefore unacceptable in terms of design and appearance through the loss of the ornate architectural detailing on the front elevation. Nevertheless, in the event of an approval it is recognised by Officers that the design as a whole could be re-configured to ensure this detailing is retained.

Occupier and Neighbour Amenity

Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy requires that all development proposals are compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents.

Development should not affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and development should mitigate against any impacts due to noise, dust, light and odour pollution. Policy G9 also requires that sensitive new development such as housing, are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution such as roads and certain types of industry.

Privacy

The SPD – Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development sets out minimum space standards that should be applied to all new residential development and development which affect existing residential properties. These are:

- 21m 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 a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;
- 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room; and
- 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

The SPD advises that where these separation distances cannot be achieved, proposals should be "compatible with the density and character of surrounding development".

Of key consideration to this application is the impact of the proposed development on existing neighbouring residents at No 225 Boarshaw Road and the amenity space to the rear of this property. All new habitable room windows of the proposed development on the west facing elevation would directly face this space and therefore overlook the existing amenity space.

All west facing windows of the proposed development would serve either the proposed bedrooms or open plan lounge and kitchen areas which would only be 10m away from

the boundary of No 225 Boarshaw Road. This is marginally below the required 10.5m distance set out within the aforementioned SPD.

Application 19/00243/FUL made the following determination insofar as commenting that:

“The habitable room windows of the studio flats would face directly towards the outdoor amenity space of the residential dwelling above the shop at No. 225 Boarshaw Road at a distance of approximately 10m which is marginally below the required minimum separation distance contained within the SPD. Whilst existing tree screening and separation by Roydes Street would lessen the impact to some degree, the lower level of the garden would increase the feeling of being overlooked from the proposed dormer windows. It is also noted that these would be the only windows from which the future occupiers of the proposed dwellings would have an outlook, thus increasing the likely intensity of their use”.

The circumstances remain the same and whilst the existing tree screening previously referred to is still in situ and likely more mature given the previous application was determined over 5 years ago, the privacy issue is exacerbated this time round because there are more windows and more residential units proposed meaning the impact on privacy has now been intensified even further. In addition, as was assessed under application 19/00243/FUL, two of the apartments only benefit from windows facing out onto No 225 Boarshaw Road meaning that all future occupiers of those apartments would only have an outlook onto this neighbouring property which would also intensify the issue.

Taking the above concerns into account, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to ensure a satisfactory standard of residential amenity would be maintained owing to the clear and unacceptable level of direct overlooking that No 225 Boarshaw Road would be subjected to. The development would not function well in this application site and the development would not create a high standard of amenity for existing residents which is contrary to Paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

Occupier Amenity

In terms of occupier amenity, Officers must consider if the proposed development provides both sufficient internal and external space that is proportionate to the size of the dwelling ensuring that any space provided meets the needs and requirements for future occupiers for the lifetime of the development.

The Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) is a technical standards document produced by the Government to ensure internal space within new dwellings is sufficient for future occupiers. Additionally, in accordance with PpE Policy JP-H3 (Type, Size and Design of New Housing), it is a requirement for all new dwellings to comply with the nationally described space standards and be built to the accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. These standards can be found here and any future development must adhere to the space standards: [Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/technical-housing-standards)

The Nationally Described Space Standards state in order to provide one bed space, a single bedroom must be at least 7.5sqm in area and at least 2.15m wide. In order to provide 2 bed spaces, a double bedroom must have a floor area of at least 11.5 sqm.

The tables below shows an assessment of the proposed NDSS against the required NDSS.

Apartment	Bed Space	Bedroom SQM Required	Overall NDSS Required
1	1 Double Bed 2 Person	11.5	50
2	1 Single Bed 1 Person	7.5	37
3	1 Single Bed 1 Person	7.5	37
4	1 Double Bed 2 Person	11.5	50

Apartment	Bed Space	Proposed Bedroom SQM	Overall NDSS Proposed
1	1 Double Bed 2 Person	12.3	36
2	1 Single Bed 1 Person	8.4	36
3	1 Single Bed 1 Person	8.4	34
4	1 Double Bed 2 Person	15.2	42

On review of the submitted proposed floorplans and as demonstrated by the tables above, each apartment meets the minimum required bedroom sizes. But, the proposed development does not meet the minimum requirements set out within the NDSS as a whole as the apartments are inadequately sized.

Outdoor Space

With regards to outdoor amenity space for future occupiers of the new apartments, as defined within the Council's Residential Development SPD residential amenity is; *'The benefit enjoyed from physical external space which is part of the private home. The level of enjoyment is dependent on a number of factors, including location, size, orientation, sounds, noise, accessibility and enclosure, and general quality of space.'*

Under paragraph 7.33 of PfE, the provision of appropriate outdoor amenity space is defined as being *'vital in delivering high quality homes that support good health'*.

The proposed development does not provide for any outdoor amenity space, however, due to the sites highly sustainable location there are opportunities to access other outdoor public amenity spaces within close proximity and further afield.

Light

Overall, the submitted proposed drawings demonstrate that the proposed apartments would generally be subjected to a good level of natural light. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to provide an appropriate standard of daylight and sunlight for the intended residential use.

Summary

Owing to the impact on neighbouring residential amenity, the proposed development is contrary to CS Policies DM1 and the NPPF in this regard.

In addition, the floor space of the proposed residential apartments as demonstrated on the submitted proposed floor plans fails to meet the NDSS and the development therefore does not succeed in providing an acceptable level of occupier amenity contrary to PfE Policy JP-H3.

Trees, Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

Core Strategy Policy G7 sets out that it is expected that development proposals will protect and include existing biodiversity and take opportunities to promote biodiversity and create new habitats using landscaping and building and construction features wherever possible. CS Policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

PfE Policy JP-G9 seeks to deliver a net enhancement of biodiversity resources through a collective of measures which are broadly aligned with the approach to BNG outlined within the Environment Act (2021), the NPPF and supporting guidance documents. The provisions of the Environment Act in respect of BNG are now a statutory requirement for planning applications but given the urban and built environment on and around the application site, it is acknowledged that this site does not impact any biodiversity and the site has a completely sealed surface and therefore has a biodiversity value of zero.

Accordingly, it is not considered that the statutory requirement to provide 10% BNG is applicable here.

Noise

Core Strategy Policy G9 sets out the Council's requirements approach to all forms of pollution including the risk of noise, as they relate to new development.

Paragraph 198 of the NPPF also states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.

The NPPG states that local planning authorities' decision taking should take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider: whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved.

Paragraph 135 also seeks to ensure that planning decisions create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies DM1 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users, also requiring that development does not have impacts that lead to an unacceptable increase in air, water, noise, light or other pollution.

Whilst the resulting scheme by its very nature would not cause any significant impacts in terms of noise and disturbance, the existing air conditioning units are sited

immediately adjacent to 3 of the 4 proposed apartments. A Noise Impact Assessment was undertaken by RAD Acoustics and submitted in support of this application. Environmental Health were consulted on this application but no comments have been received. Nevertheless, the submitted Noise Impact Assessment concluded that all airborne tests failed the required criteria to comply with the required of the Building Regulations Approved Document E. However, recommendations were made which suggested that sound insulation could be added between walls, roof space, and floor joists.

At this stage it is not definitively possible to determine that the scheme would be considered acceptable in terms of amenity in accordance with Policy G9 and DM1 and the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. But, in the event of an approval an appropriately worded condition could require the implementation of a suitable noise insulation and sound mitigation scheme and the subsequent submission of a verification report to establish that the proposed works have addressed and complied with the requirements of the relevant legislation.

Drainage

Policy G8 requires that new development does not lead to any increased form of flooding locally or further downstream, does not impede natural water and flood risk management, is not detrimental to existing or potential flood storage areas, contributes where possible to alleviating existing flood risk and is itself well protected from flood risk and ensures prudent use of water resources.

Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment) of PfE expects developments to manage surface water runoff through sustainable drainage systems and development should achieve greenfield run-off rates unless it is demonstrated to be impracticable.

The application site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at a low risk of flooding (less than 1 in 1000 or 0.1% annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year).

United Utilities were consulted on this application but their comments remain outstanding. Nevertheless, the proposed development would not increase or re-direct surface water elsewhere and the proposed foul water drainage would likely connect to the existing drainage.

Officers therefore consider that the proposed development would accord with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-S4 of PfE and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the Core Strategy sets out that development and infrastructure proposals are required to satisfy the Council's accessibility hierarchy and in all circumstances, the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area will have priority, while providing reliable journey times for those travelling through. The Council's Maximum Car Parking Standards are set out in Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy. Policy JP-C8 of PfE states that 'we will require new development to be located and designed to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use, to reduce the negative effects of car dependency, and help deliver high quality, attractive, liveable and sustainable environments'

The site is in a sustainable location and is situated on a public transport route as well as being within close proximity to Middleton Town Centre. The proposal includes no parking provision but the Council's Highways Officer acknowledges the sustainable

location of the site and has advised that this proposal will not generate any significant volume of traffic.

The scheme is not considered to have an adverse impact on highway safety and would not generate a level of additional traffic which would have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the immediate local highway network, or strategic routes. Highways Services have raised no objections. The development therefore complies with the requirements of CS Policies T1 and T2, Policy JP-C8 of PfE and the NPPF.

Conclusion

The proposed development proposes 4 apartments in a sustainable location which is accessible via non-car travel modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport links. As a matter of principle, a development of this type and nature is acceptable and would accord with the planning framework and wider strategies for the borough.

However, for reasons identified above relating to neighbouring and occupier amenity, the scheme as a whole fails to accord with the requirements of the Core Strategy Policies DM1 and G9 and the supplementary planning document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016).

The development also fails to provide an acceptable level of occupier amenity contrary to PfE Policy JP-H3 and the NDSS.

With all of the above in mind, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in direct overlooking and loss of privacy of the private outdoor amenity space associated with the residential dwelling No. 225 Boarshaw Road. The application therefore fails to accord with the requirements of the Core Strategy Policy DM1 and G9, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016) and the NPPF.
2. The proposed development fails to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and the development therefore does not succeed in providing an acceptable level of occupier amenity contrary to PfE Policy JP-H3.

Procedure Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable, and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.