

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0007
Location: 93 CHARLOTTE STREET, ROCHDALE, OL16 4TN
Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension including excavation works, a retaining wall and garden staircase
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Rosalind Gralton

SITE LOCATION

This application relates to no. 93 Charlotte Street, a semi-detached two storey property. The property has two storey outrigger and an existing single storey rear extension behind.

The site has a varied topography with land levels increasing to the rear. Properties on this side of Charlotte Street have a typically higher land level, almost the height of single storey, at the rear of their amenity space. To the rear of the property, the property is covered in pebble dash render. The existing extensions appear to be constructed in brick without the use of render.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension, including excavation work to the rear garden area. The proposals include work to the retaining wall and a staircase up to the higher part of the rear garden area. The application form states the extension would be constructed in a Civic Multi style brick or similar, with Grey Marley tiles. Windows and doors would be UPVC to match the existing property.

POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024

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:

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).

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

Objection neighbours were received from both No 91 and 95 Charlotte Street. Concerns raised were the following:

- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Overshadowing due to a taller structure in the garden
- Excavation and ground level changes
- Overbearing and loss of outlook
- Impact on amenity
- Character of area
- Concern if maintenance needed to the wall along the boundary
- The risk and impact of carrying out excavation work on a shared tiered landscape between the two properties.
- The removal of the current outbuilding would put risk that my own would be adversely affected particularly as the water supply for my washing machine and boiler originates via the shared wall.
- Concern over maintenance of the rear garden area with this being on a higher level

Concerns relating to loss of privacy and overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing impact & loss of outlook are all addressed within the 'Amenity' section of the report. Matters relating to the appearance of the development and any subsequent impact upon the character of the area are considered within the 'Character and Appearance' section of the report. Matters relating to damage to property, potential safety

implications and security are civil matters which do not form a material planning consideration.

Character and Appearance

CS Policies P3 and DM1 require development proposals to adhere to high quality design and enhance the borough's identity and sense of place 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. In addition, paragraph 131 of NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF explains 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. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The proposals would constitute a single storey rear extension, which would project 6m beyond the rear of the existing property. The proposed extension would be a dual pitch which follows the height of the existing ridge on the existing extension, with a 2.2m high wall facing the adjoining property.

The adjoining property at No 91 has a similarly designed existing extension, which the current projection is the same. The proposed extension would increase the applicant's extension 6m in projection along the shared boundary. It is noted the projection would mean the extension is visible from the rear yard of 91, and from No 95. However, it is not considered the proposed extension would result in an unacceptable design, nor would be visually intrusive upon either property, due to the varied topography and the siting, form and scale of the extension.

The staircase to the rear leads to an area 2.3m above ground level of the property, to the higher rear end of the garden. The proposed retaining wall is shown to be a breeze block wall which will separate the lower-level ground area for the extension and support the retention of land to the rear of the property which is at a higher land level. It is expected engineering works will be required to remove the land mass to the rear and support the land to the side along the boundary with No 91, however no details of this are provided or required. The amended scheme shows a dual pitch roof with a maximum ridge height of 3m set 1800mm away from the shared boundary. Given the changes of land levels across the site, including the land levels on the adjoining property, it is not considered this would have a detrimental visual impact.

Residential Amenity

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, which states development proposals should ensure they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or

loss of privacy. This is reflected in both the NPPF and PfE, which establish the importance of achieving high standards of residential amenity.

The proposals would constitute a single storey rear extension which would project 6m beyond the rear of the existing property. The proposed extension would have a dual-pitch roof, with the outer skin of the 2.3m high blank wall adjacent to the boundary and facing the adjoining property.

Single Storey Rear Extensions

Section 5.5-5.7 including Figures 5 and 6 of the Residential Guidance SPD outlines the maximum projection for a single storey rear extension.

5.5 It is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers, bearing in mind that detached properties normally have more space around the property than attached properties, such as terraced and semi-detached dwellings.

5.6 The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions:

- For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);
- For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).

5.7 The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any extension if one exists close to the common boundary. 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. This is illustrated in figures 5 and 6'

The projection would be 3m above the acceptable projection and would project beyond a 45-degree measured from the point along the common boundary.

There are no rear windows at the ground floor level at the rear of the outrigger at No 91. It was also clear from the site visit the topography of the land varies, rising significantly to the rear of the garden, where the vast majority of the outdoor amenity space is located. Notwithstanding this, there is some outdoor patio space at the ground level of the property, and this is still considered an important consideration. It is considered that, given the projection and distance away from the boundary with No 95, it is not considered this would cause an overbearing, overshadowing or unacceptable privacy impact.

There is existing 1800mm high (approximate) fencing located along the boundary and therefore given the amended proposed extension projection of 6m would not have any overbearing or overshadowing impact, due to the low profile of the roof and the varying topography. Despite exceeding guidance within the SPD, may be

acceptable, as the proposed outer wall adjacent to the boundary, would effectively act as the retaining boundary wall, masked by the increase of land mass to the rear garden area of No 91. As such, the 2.3m high wall would not read as a 3.3m high wall, and comparatively, as high as the existing fencing between the properties.

The proposed upper level of the garden on the application site, would be a similar arrangement to both neighbouring properties, and it is not considered this would have any undue overlooking impact on neighbouring properties, over and above that of the existing situation on the site.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in conflict with CS Policy G9, DM1, the SPD, PFE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

OTHER MATTERS

It is noted in the neighbouring representations concerns are raised with regard to the construction of the proposals and uncertainty regarding safety and security during the works. This is not a material planning consideration and is covered under separate legislation. The proposed plans show a retaining wall which appear to provide stability for the adjoining garden. There are no planning merits on which this would constitute a refusal. In relation to accessibility, this would be a civil matter in relation to the party wall act.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (4)

- 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:

- Application form
- AMENDED PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS - Project Single Storey Rear Extension Revision C 30.03.2026 Drawing No SL11625
- Site Location Plan

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.

- 4 The finished floor level of the extension hereby approved shall match that of the existing dwelling.

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.