

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

## PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 24/00863/HOUS

|                                                                                      |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Name and address for correspondence:                                                 | Applicant name: |
| Mr V Alyas<br>Architek<br>916 Stockport Road<br>Levenshulme<br>Manchester<br>M19 3AB | Ms Misbha Riaz  |

### Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 27 November 2024

|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Proposal:</b> | <b>Part two storey, part single storey side extensions together with a single storey rear extension, associated landscaping and boundary treatments including the installation of electric sliding gates to the front elevation and the erection of one self-contained annexe</b> |
| <b>Location:</b> | <b>19 Birch Road, Wardle, Rochdale, OL12 9QQ</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

### Part II - Particulars of decision

The Rochdale Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that planning permission has been **REFUSED** for the carrying out of the development referred to in Part I hereof for the following reason(s).

#### **Reasons:**

- 1 By virtue of its excessive scale and width, massing and design, the sum of the proposed extensions constitutes non-subservient and disproportionate additions which would dominate the host dwelling and would be an overdevelopment of the plot. Additional concerns are had with the dark grey metal and composite sliding gate which represents an obtrusive and unsympathetic feature. The proposed development would not be well-designed and would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. It therefore fails to accord with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 By virtue of its scale and projection, the proposed development would substantially reduce the occupant's outdoor amenity space. It would result in insufficient garden space of a functional layout for a development of the size proposed, and would have

an unacceptable impact on the standard of amenity for existing and future occupants. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the 'Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development' SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 By virtue of its siting by a busy classified road, the proposed electric sliding gate would result in vehicles obstructing the adopted highway upon entry into the property and would pose as a hazard to road users and pedestrians. The proposal is therefore considered to be detrimental to the safety of both pedestrians and highway users, contrary to Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and 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.

Date Decision Issued            22 January 2025

Melanie Hale  
Head of Planning Services

**IMPORTANT**

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE READ AND FULLY UNDERSTOOD THE CONTENTS OF THIS DECISION NOTICE. YOUR ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE ATTACHED NOTES.

**INFORMATIVE:**

The Local Planning Authority's reasons for its decision are set out in the accompanying officer's report.

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

- Location Plan - Drawing no. A100 Rev. P1 received 07/10/2024
- Existing Site Plan - Drawing no. A101 Rev. P1 received 07/10/2024
- Proposed Site Plan - Drawing no. A102 Rev. P1 received 07/10/2024
- Existing Floor Plans - Drawing no. A102 Rev. P1 received 02/09/2024
- Existing Elevations - Drawing no. A103 Rev. P1 received 02/09/2024
- Proposed Floor Plans - Drawing no. A104 Rev. P1 received 02/09/2024
- Proposed Elevations - Drawing no. A107 Rev. P1 received 07/10/2024
- Proposed Annexe Floor Plans and Elevations - Drawing no. A109 Rev. P1 received 02/09/2024
- Proposed Street Scene Drawing - Drawing no. A103 Rev. P1 received 07/10/2024
- Proposed 3D Floor Plans - Drawing no. A108 Rev. P1 received 07/10/2024