

Application Number:	25/00351/HOUS
Location:	61 Juniper Drive, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3BE
Proposal:	Two-storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr Tim Buckley
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 23.05.2025	EXT OF TIME 13.06.2025
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. 61 Juniper Drive, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential estate in Firgrove. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 63 Juniper Drive to the south, adjacent to no. 59 Juniper Drive to the north, and faces the highway and no. 48 Juniper Drive to the north-west. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the rear curtilage of no. 105 Knowl Road to the south-east. Nos. 61 and 63 as a pair of dwellings is set forward of the adjoining building line. The property benefits from one off-street parking space to the front hardstanding.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side and rear extension which projects 2.56m from the side elevation and 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling respectively. The side extension is set back 1.2m from the main front wall of the dwelling and set down 0.35m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves. It comprises a half-hipped roof form to match the host dwelling. The rear extension is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form and is set down 1.42m from the ridge with matching height to eaves.

The submitted plans also indicate the addition of a bin store to the front elevation of the dwelling.

The proposal would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

This proposal will not generate any significant volume of traffic.

The plans submitted appear to show the extension being built on part of what currently is the driveway and off-street parking for this property. The remaining driveway space is not adequate to park a car fully clear of the highway. Loss of this single parking space is unacceptable and forces the car to park on the highway.

Exacerbating on street parking compromises the function and road safety of the highway and as such Highways cannot support these proposals.

Highways object to this proposal due to loss of parking and road safety. Should plans submitted show off street parking 2.4m x 5.5m available, the party would remove this objection and support the application.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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:

Policy 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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ The proposal seeks to construct a two-storey side and rear extension to the dwelling. The extension is set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would represent a subservient addition. The use of a half-hipped roof form would match the one of the host dwelling and raises no concerns. Whilst the use of the gable-fronted roof for the rear projection appears somewhat irregular in the context of the established surrounding built forms, this feature would not be readily visible due to its rear siting and is not considered to constitute undue harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.

- ☐ Both the ground floor and first floor of the side extension are set back 1.2m from the main front wall of the dwelling which meets the requirements of Section 5.12 of the SPD. Given this, and the siting of the pair of dwellings forward of the adjoining building line, it is considered the proposal would not give rise to harm arising from any potential ‘terracing effect’.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the addition of a bin store to the front elevation of the dwelling which would ensure the storage of refuse bins away from public view.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted CS, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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.
- ☐ The proposed side extension is set back from the main front wall of the dwelling and does not comprise of front-facing habitable room windows. As such, no harm has been identified in terms of overlooking impacts to the front-facing windows of no. 48.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension does not directly face any habitable room windows and is sited 12.47m away from the directly facing curtilage boundary of no. 105 and would thus accord with space standards of Section 4.1 of the SPD.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.9 and 5.10 of the SPD, the proposed two-storey extension projects 1.1m and 1.19m from the rear and front elevation of no. 59 respectively and is not considered to result in undue overbearing or overshadowing impacts to the neighbouring occupiers. Likewise, no amenity harm has been identified in relation to no. 63 as the extension does not project beyond the existing rear conservatory of no. 63.
- ☐ It is noted the proposal would create an elongated bedroom with a depth of 6.93m which may not allow for the provision of natural light to all parts of the room. Whilst this layout is less than ideal, the submitted plans indicate the bed to be sited directly adjacent to the rear window. As such, taking into consideration the primary function of the bedroom, the proposed arrangement would ensure a satisfactory standard of amenity for its occupants and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted CS, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.
- ❑ The proposed extension would encroach onto the front hardstanding and restrict the single off-street parking space for the property. The Council's Highways Officer has objected to the proposal on the grounds the loss of parking would force the vehicle onto the road and comprise the function and road safety of the highway.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, it is noted the property is located in a quiet and low-trafficked residential area where on-street parking is evident. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states *"development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios."* Given this site context, it is considered the addition of one vehicle to the road would not result in harm to highway safety so severe as to warrant a refusal. In any event, the residual space of 5.08m by 2.66m would meet the minimum space requirements stated in Section 3.15 of the SPD.
- ❑ With this in mind, the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable on balance, in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted CS and the NPPF.

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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ❑ Location Plan – received 28/03/2025
- ❑ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – drawing no. 24.3364.3 received 28/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Floor Plans – drawing no. 25.3364.1 received 28/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Elevations – drawing no. 25.3364.2 received 28/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Floor Plans – drawing no. 24.3364.SC1.1B received 28/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Elevations – drawing no. 24.3364.SC1.2A received 28/03/2025

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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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 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, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until such time as the bin store as shown on the approved floor plan ref. 24.3364.SC1.1B received 28/03/2025, has been constructed in complete accordance with the approved plans and made available for use. The approved refuse store shall be retained and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of the character and appearance of the street scene and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and 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	30/05/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	11/06/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Sam Yuen