

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00063/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00063/HOUS
Location:	41 Hazelhurst Drive, Middleton, M24 6TL
Proposal:	Proposed first floor rear extension
Applicant:	Ms Muriam Zubair
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 05.06.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

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. 41 Hazelhurst Drive, a two-storey detached dwelling located on a residential estate in Middleton. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 43 Hazelhurst Drive to the north and no. 39 to the southwest. It faces the highway to the southeast and the rear curtilage boundary backs onto the rear curtilage of no. 6 Kielder Hill to the northwest. The property is located on the inside of a bend in the road, meaning the curtilage narrows to the rear with the rear elevations of the application property and no. 43 skewed towards each other.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension that would project 4m from the existing rear elevation at ground floor level and 3m at first floor level. The extension would be characterised by a hipped roof with the ridgeline set down from the main ridgeline. The proposal would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. 1 letter of support was 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:

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1, P3 and JP-P1

- ☐ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes good design as a key aspect of sustainable development, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone (PfE) and policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy (CS), 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 enlarge the dwelling through a rear extension that would project 3m at first floor level and 4m at ground floor level. The proposal would result in a significant volumetric increase, however it is not considered that the resultant scale and massing would be unduly harmful or disproportionate in regards its visual impact. Further, the overall design would be compatible with the design values of the host dwelling.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and would accord with CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS policy DM1 which explains that 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.'*
- ☐ It should be noted that no. 39 Hazelhurst Drive benefits from a recently constructed 4m single-storey rear extension (ref: 22/00478/CPL). Taking this into account, the proposed extension would comply with both the ground and first floor projection limits set out in sections 5.6 and 5.9 of the SPD. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the occupiers of no. 39 Hazelhurst Drive.
- ☐ No. 43 Hazelhurst Drive benefits from a rear conservatory which is set away from the common boundary with the application property. The conservatory has doors within the south-facing side elevation which open out onto the main patio area. The proposed extension would significantly exceed the SPD projection limits in relation to no. 43 by approximately 2.34m at ground floor level and 3m at first floor level. The extension would be located directly to the south of no. 43 and in close proximity to the common boundary. Moreover, the rear elevations of the application property and no. 43 are skewed towards each other, which would exacerbate the harm. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact on the rear-facing

habitable room windows and the patio area of no. 43 Hazelhurst Drive. It would also result in a harmful loss of natural light and outlook for the occupants of no. 43.

- ❑ The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of no. 43 Hazelhurst Drive and would fail to accord with CS policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ CS policy 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 proposal would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces to the front driveway. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with CS policies T2 and DM1.

Other Matters: Personal Circumstances

- ❑ Section 5.22 of the SPD states:
 - o *Personal circumstances, such as a disability, may make it difficult to provide necessary facilities within the standards set out in this document. The Council may interpret these standards flexibly in such circumstances, but proposals that significantly exceed the standards set out in this document are unlikely to be appropriate. The more general planning considerations, such as the impact of a development on the character of an area and its impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, are still the principal considerations by which the planning application will be judged; the needs of a person may exist for only a few years whereas built development is likely to last for decades.*
- ❑ The applicant has provided evidence that they have an elderly relative who is struggling to live alone and requires additional support. While the Council does not dispute this and supports the applicant's need for additional bed spaces, it has not been demonstrated why these facilities cannot be provided in a way which would not significantly harm the living conditions of no. 43 Hazelhurst Drive.
- ❑ The proposed extension would significantly exceed the standards set by the Council and it has not been demonstrated that this is the only viable option.
- ❑ The proposed floor plans show that the extension would be used to accommodate a 22.5sqm kitchen at ground floor level with a 20.3sqm bedroom (including ensuite) and a 7.7sqm carer's bedroom at first floor level. It would seem feasible that the ground floor layout could be reconfigured with a smaller kitchen and the necessary bed spaces at ground floor level. Further, it should be noted that a 4m single-storey rear extension could likely be constructed without planning permission under Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
- ❑ Overall, the personal circumstances identified in the supporting evidence are not considered to sufficiently outweigh the harm caused by the development in respect of its impact on the residential amenity of no. 43 Hazelhurst Drive. .

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its scale and massing together with its proximity to the side boundary, the proposed extension would result in an undue overbearing impact on the rear amenity space and habitable room windows of no. 43 Hazelhurst Drive. It would also result in an undue loss of light and outlook for the occupants of no. 43. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	02/05/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	15/05/2025	Signed: RC

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan
- Existing. Dwg no. A101
- Proposed. Dwg no. A102

Report Author Bob Melling