

## DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

**APPLICATION NO.**

25/00515/VRCON

**CASE OFFICER**

Sam Yuen

**DETERMINATION DATE** 15.07.2025 **EXT OF TIME** 08.08.2025

**Address:** 238 Hill Top Drive, Rochdale, OL11 2DY

**Proposal:** Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (Plans) of planning permission 22/00355/HOUS (Two storey rear extension and replacement of door with window on existing side elevation)

|           |                            |     |                       |     |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|
| PUBLICITY | Weekly list expired?       | Y   | Site notice expired?  | N/A |
|           | Neighbour letters expired? | N/A | 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?      | Y |

|     |                                                  |     |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|-----|
| EIA | Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase? | N/A |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|-----|

|            |                                                                      |     |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CONDITIONS | Pre-commencement conditions proposed?                                | N   |
|            | Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)? | N/A |

**RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE**

**CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY:** TH

**DATE:** 08.08.2025

## **SITE**

This application relates to no. 238 Hill Top Drive, a two-storey semi-detached redbrick dwelling located in a residential estate in Kirkholt. The dwelling adjoins no. 240 Hill Top Drive to the northeast and is adjacent to no. 236 Hill Top Drive to the southwest. The rear of the property faces and is readily visible from Snowdon Street to the south-east.

## **PROPOSAL**

Planning permission is sought to vary Condition 2 of the planning permission of 22/00355/HOUS. The proposed changes relate to the alteration of the material of the two-storey rear extension from matching brickwork to white render.

The Officer has confirmed from the site visit the development has commenced.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### **National Guidance**

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

### **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

### **Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):**

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19<sup>th</sup> 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

### **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**

22/00355/HOUS - Two storey rear extension and replacement of door with window on existing side elevation - Grant subject to conditions

## **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

N/A

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

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

## **ANALYSIS**

### **Design and Appearance**

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 PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials.

The proposed use of white render to the two-storey rear extension would appear materially different to the established use of brickwork in the surrounding street scene. It is noted the use of render is present on the first floor of a number of properties on Hill Top Drive to the north, though this house type is not seen together with the two-storey rear extension. A number of neighbouring dwellings have also been subject to full application of render; however, it is unclear whether such works benefit from planning permission. Notwithstanding, the proposed extension is readily visible from Snowdon Street where brickwork remains the established materiality. Considering the scale of the extension, the use of white render would therefore be seen as a stark contrast to the existing redbrick and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene.

The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with CS Policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

### **Residential Amenity**

The revised plans do not indicate changes to the footprint or fenestration of the two-storey rear extension. No undue residential amenity impacts have been identified, and the proposal therefore accords with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

### Other Considerations

The Officer has noted the circumstances set forward by the applicants behind the proposed changes and appreciates the rationale for the use of render. However, considerations have to be given to the visual amenity of the surrounding area and as such, any changes to the external finish and colour must remain sympathetic and in keeping with local context. It is considered that the personal circumstances do not outweigh the visual harm arising from the proposal.

### **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

1. By virtue of its materiality and design, the proposed use of white render constitutes an unsympathetic form of development which is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposal would not be well-designed and fails to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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.

### **Notes for Applicant:**

### **INFORMATIVES**

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

- Location Plan – received 20/05/2025
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan – drawing no. 25.3563.4 received 20/05/2025
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 25.3563.1 received 20/05/2025
- Approved Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 25.3563.2 received 20/05/2025
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 25.3563.3 received 20/05/2025

Report Author Sam Yuen