APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00295/HOUS

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER
25/00295/HOUS	Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 30.05.2025 **EXT OF TIME** 20.06.2025

Address: 92 Leander Drive Rochdale OL11 2XE

Proposal: First floor rear extension

PUBLICITY	**Weekly list expired?**	Y	**Site notice expired?**	N/A
	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?**	N/A
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE**

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: **LA** **DATE: 15/07/25**

SITE

The site is located at 92 Leander Drive, a two storey detached dwelling. The dwelling benefits from off street parking a front and rear amenity space.

The dwelling has an existing single storey rear extension and is located within the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a first floor rear extension, the proposed extension will have a flat roof and extend over the existing single storey.

The proposed development will increase the size of the two existing bedrooms and provide two ensuites.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

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

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

9. Places for People

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1 **Delivering a more prosperous economy**
E1 Establishing thriving town, district and local centres

SO3 **Improving design, image and quality of place**
P3 Improving design of new development

SO5 **Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport**
T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements
SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding properties and one objection has been received.

The objection has raised the following points,

- Concerns over distance between proposed development and boundary of their property.
- Concerns over existing rear single storey extension.
- Proposed development may block light.
- Concerns with run off

Planning matters will be taken into consideration.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development.

The proposed application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The site is located with a predominately residential area and the principle of development is considered acceptable.

Impact on Existing and Surrounding Occupiers

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

The proposed development does not comply with the Space Standards set out in the SPD. The SPD sets out that residential development should comply with, '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 and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.' The proposed development will be 4.9m from the rear boundary of no.37 Sherwin Way and 13.5m from the rear elevation of no.37 Sherwin Way, this is not considered acceptable as it contravenes the minimum distances.

The proposed development will be 7.5m from the rear boundary with no.35 Sherwin Way and 17.34m from the rear elevation of no.35 Sherwin Way, this is not considered acceptable.

The proposed development will be overbearing on no. 37 and 35 Sherwin Way and negatively impact their privacy. The proposed site is set on higher ground than properties to

the rear, this contributes to the proposed development having an overbearing impact on rear properties.

The proposed development will project 3m from the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling, this does not meet the standards set out in the SPD in paragraph 5.9. This will result in the proposed development having an overbearing impact on no.94 Leander Drive and is not considered acceptable.

The proposed development will introduce two new windows on the rear elevation, these will be frosted. Each proposed window will be the only window to serve a bedroom, frosted windows are not considered acceptable. Habitable rooms should receive sufficient light and outlook.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on neighbours and not provide an acceptable standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

Design

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

The proposed first floor rear extension will have a flat roof, this will look awkward against the pitched roof of the host dwelling. There are a limited number of first floor rear extensions in the area, and they have a pitched roof, they are also not of the same scale as the proposed development. The proposed flat roof is not considered a characteristic of the area, it is not considered to adhere to a high standard of design.

The proposed first floor rear extension is considered large in scale and does not consider the size of the host dwelling and is not considered acceptable.

The proposed development is to be finished in matching materials to the host dwelling, this is considered acceptable.

As such, the proposed development is not considered to achieve a high standards of design. It would therefore not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

The dwelling has two car parking spaces. The proposed development will not have an impact on the existing parking or highway and is considered acceptable for the reason the proposal is not increasing the number of bedrooms therefore not resulting in an intensification of the use.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would lead to an unacceptable impact on residential amenity for neighbouring dwellings. Occupiers of no. 35 and 37 Sherwin Way would experience a loss of privacy and an increase in the perception of overlooking from the proposed development. The development would have an overbearing negative impact on no.94 Leander Drive due to it not complying with the Residential SPD. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its size and design the proposed rear extension would constitute an incongruous and poorly designed addition which is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The flat roof will appear at odds with the host dwelling and is not considered a characteristic of the area. The proposed development fails to improve the character and quality of the area and is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans:

- Site Location Plan and Block Plan OL11 – 01 V4
- Proposed Plans and Elevations OL11 – 03 V4

Report Author Aimee Bovaird