

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00220/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00220/HOUS
Location:	410 Birch Road, Wardle, Rochdale, OL12 9LX
Proposal:	Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory together with single storey front porch extension
Applicant:	Mr Lawrence Fox
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 20.05.2025	EXT OF TIME 27.10.2025
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. 410 Birch Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Wardle. The dwelling is set back circa 18m from the highway and is adjoined by no. 412 Birch Road to the west, adjacent to no. 408 Birch Road to the east, and faces the highway to the south. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto no. 17 Newhouse Close and an unadopted access road to the north. The property benefits from a large outbuilding to the rear curtilage and hardstanding to the front.

Birch Road is identified as a classified road and serves as the main thoroughfare between Wardle and Rochdale Town Centre.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements to the host dwelling, including the following:

- ② A part-two storey, part single-storey rear extension which projects 2.4m and up to 4.5m respectively from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory. The two-storey element is characterised by a cross-gable roof form and is set down 0.1m from the ridge of the host dwelling with matching height to eaves. The single-storey element is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of up to 3.85m and a height to eaves of 2.5m; and
- ② A single-storey front porch extension which projects 1.8m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of up to 3.06m and a height to eaves of up to 3.88m.

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

Relevant History

22/00144/HOUS - Two storey side and single storey rear extension including front porch, following demolition of existing conservatory - Grant subject to conditions

02/D41031 - Two Storey Side Extension To Dwelling - Grant subject to conditions

78/D07365 - Front Porch – Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Environmental Agency

The EA objects to this application as it involves building works within 8 metres of a culverted watercourse. As submitted, it is unlikely that a flood risk activity permit would be granted for this application. The proposed development is likely to adversely affect the construction and stability of the culvert, which will compromise its function. The proposal will therefore increase the risk of flooding to the community.

Section 3.4 of the supplied FRA states *"Careful consideration and planning will be given to the design of the extension structure and foundations to ensure the works to construct the proposed extension can be undertaken to mitigate any impact to the function, operation or integrity of the existing culvert. With the existing culverted watercourse (Wardle Brook) remaining unaffected by the proposed extension works"*.

This detail will need to be supplied so it can be assessed to understand if this construction design will place additional load on the culvert.

To overcome the objection, the applicant should submit an FRA which demonstrates that the development is safe without increasing risk elsewhere. Where possible, it should reduce flood risk overall.

UPDATE:

Based on the additional foundation details submitted, the EA have no objection to the proposal.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No comments received at the time of writing.

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-S4 Flood Risk and the Water Environment
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
G8 Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk

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 proposed two-storey rear extension is marginally set down from the ridge of the host dwelling which would constitute a subservient addition. The use of the gable-fronted roof form would also be in-keeping and raises no concerns.
- ☐ Likewise, no concerns are had with the proposed single-storey rear extension with its lean-to roof form, which would constitute a subservient and sympathetic addition.
- ☐ It is noted the single-storey rear extension comprises a chamfered wall adjoining the common boundary. Whilst this represents an irregular and less than ideal design feature, it is acknowledged this feature would not be readily visible due to its rear siting. Given this, it is considered the extension would give rise to undue visual harm and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The proposed front porch would introduce a projection to a building line where porches are not currently present (it is noted adjoining no. 412 comprises a larger, extant front and side extension though it does not appear to benefit from planning consent.) Notwithstanding, the host dwelling is set back circa 5m from the line of dwelling comprising nos. 402 to 408, and a further 15m from the edge of the highway. Given this substantial setback, the screening afforded by the heavy front landscaping, and the modest size of the porch, it is considered this addition would not appear overly obtrusive against the street scene and would be acceptable.
- ☐ 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 design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the 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.
- ☐ With reference to Section 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed two-storey rear extension would retain a separation distance in excess of 35m and 21m from the rear windows and curtilage boundary of no. 17 Newhouse Close respectively. As such, no undue amenity harm has been identified in this regard.
- ☐ The host dwelling comprises an existing rear conservatory with a 4.5m projection which though not associated with any planning history, has stood extant in excess of 20 years based on existing aerial imagery. The proposed replacement single-storey extension would comprise the same projection as the existing and as such, would not result in additional material amenity harm to the rear habitable room windows of no. 412.
- ☐ No concerns are had with the amenity impacts of the single-storey extension to no. 408, the front porch extension and the two-storey rear extension, which accord with the relevant parts of Section 5.6 and 5.9 of the SPD.
- ☐ It is noted the proposed rear-facing bedroom falls short of the requirements set out by the *nationally described space standard (NDSS)*. Notwithstanding, it is acknowledged the smallest of the existing bedrooms is already below the minimum space standards. Given these are not principal bedrooms of the dwelling, it is considered the proposed layout would not be detrimental to the occupier amenity and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, 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 development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property and would therefore be acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Flood Risk: G8

- ❑ Policy G8 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's strategy for managing water resources and flood risk more effectively in the interests of public safety, protecting property and infrastructure and the conservation of the natural environment.
- ❑ The host dwelling is located above the culverted Wardle Brook which is a Statutory Main River. Following the submission of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and additional foundation details of the proposed extensions, the EA has raised no objection to the proposal. Notwithstanding, an informative has been attached in relation to the need for flood risk permit.
- ❑ It is considered the flood risk to the proposed development would be acceptable, in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-S4 of the PFE 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 07/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Site Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Site Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Ground Floor Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Existing First Floor Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Front Elevation – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Side Elevation – received 25/03/2025
- ❑ Existing Rear Elevation – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed First Floor Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Front Elevation – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Side Elevation – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Rear Elevation – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Rear Elevation and Foundation Details – received 15/07/2025
- ❑ Proposed Section Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Ground Level Section Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Proposed Roof Plan – received 20/03/2025
- ❑ Existing and Proposed Landscape Plan – received 20/03/2025

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.

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	24/10/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	24/10/2025	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES:

1. The applicant is reminded that under The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, a permit must be obtained for any activities which will take place:
 - ☐ on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
 - ☐ on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)
 - ☐ on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
 - ☐ involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
 - ☐ in the floodplain of a main river if the activity could affect flood flow or storage and potential impacts are not controlled by a planning permission

Please note the granting of this planning permission does not assume a permit will be automatically forthcoming. The applicant is advised to consult the Environmental Agency at the earliest opportunity.

Report Author Sam Yuen