

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00485/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00485/HOUS
Location:	14 Ginnell Farm Avenue, Rochdale, OL16 4GG
Proposal:	Two Storey Side Extension
Applicant:	Mrs Melissa Chrisham
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 08.07.2025	EXT OF TIME
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. 14 Ginnell Farm Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a newbuild residential development in Balderstone. It is adjoined by no. 12 Ginnell Farm Avenue to the east, adjacent to no. 16 Ginnell Farm Avenue to the west and faces the highway and no. 2 Strawberry Close to the south. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto the rear curtilages of nos. 13 & 15 Apple Tree Way to the north.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 2.47m from the side elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form and is set down 0.45m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves. The extension is set 1.44m from the main front wall of the dwelling.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

No changes to the transport network are proposed as a result of this development. Highways have no objections to the proposal.

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-P1 Sustainable Places

Policy JP-G9 The Green Belt

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

D/10 Protected Open Land

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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Principle of Development

- ☐ The application site is located within an area designated as Protected Open Land and formed part of an approved residential development (ref: 12/55581/OUT). As established in 12/55581/OUT, the policies relating to the management of housing land and protection of open land contained within the UDP are out of date in the absence of a five year housing land supply and the principle of the release of the land for residential development was accepted. The area in question has since been subject to substantial urban development and has materially changed from its previous designation as Protected Open Land which is now no longer considered relevant. In light of the extensive urbanisation of the site and its surroundings, saved UDP Policy G/D/1 is considered to be more appropriate to the consideration of this application and thus the principle of development is acceptable.

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 side extension is set back 1.44m from the main front wall of the host dwelling and would satisfy the requirements of Section 5.12 of the SPD relating to the 'terracing effect', where no harm to the building line has been identified.
- ☐ The extension is also set down 0.45m from the ridge line of the host dwelling and would represent a subservient addition. The use of a dual-pitched roof would also appear in keeping.
- ☐ 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 proposal would result in a residual space of approx. 0.51m between the extension wall and the side curtilage boundary, which falls short of the recommended floor space requirement for refuse bin to be stored out from public view, as per Appendix 1 of the SPD. Whilst it is noted the applicant intended to reserve space for refuse bins to be stored to the rear of the property, the space indicated would nonetheless be severely restricted. Notwithstanding, it is acknowledged the existing storage of refuse bins, as with other dwellings of the same house type, is already somewhat visible from the street scene. As such, the potential storage of refuse bins to the front of the extension would not constitute a drastic visual change. In any case, the visual impact arising from refuse bins alone would not amount to harm which warrants refusal and therefore the proposed arrangements would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted CS, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted 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.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey extension does not directly face any dwellings to the rear and does not comprise any habitable room windows to the front. It also does not project beyond the front elevation of adjacent no. 16. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts in this regard.
- ☐ 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, 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 side extension would sever the existing driveway and reduce the number of off-street parking space from two to one. Whilst the proliferation of on-street parking on an already restricted highway is less than ideal, it is acknowledged the highway is a low-trafficked road in an established residential setting. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that

development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. With this in mind, the addition of one vehicle to the highway is not considered to amount to unacceptable harm to highway safety as to warrant refusal. It is also noted the Council's Highways Officer was consulted and raised no objection to the proposal.

- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted CS.

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, Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. 01 Rev. 03 received 13/05/2025

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	07/07/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	08/07/2025	Signed:

Report Author Sam Yuen