

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

25/00001/HOUS

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 31.03.2025 **EXT OF TIME** 11.04.2025

Address: 2 Botanical Close Hollins Middleton M24 6FA

Proposal: Two storey side and single storey rear extensions

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	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?	Y

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: TH

DATE: 11/04/2025

SITE

The site is located at 2 Botanical Close, Middleton and is a two storey detached dwelling. The house forms part of a recently completed residential estate, with neighbouring houses sharing similar forms and character. The property is accessed

via a driveway off Satin Drive and has an off-street parking area to the side measuring approximately 11m in length.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The two-storey side extension will provide a garage and an additional bedroom on the first floor. The single storey rear extension will provide additional lounge space. The proposed arrangement will leave one external parking space in front of the garage, approximately 5m in length.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub – Regional

Places For Everyone PfE

JP-P 1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:
G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

15/01183/OUT - Outline application (including access) for up to 205 residential units (Use Class C3) with associated landscaping, open space, access arrangements and car parking (Resubmission of 14/00849/OUT) – Approved

16/01556/REM - Submission of reserved matters following outline approval
15/01183/OUT relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 103 no. dwellings. - Approved

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representation have been sent out and a site notice displayed. Two objections were received and raised the following issues:

- Structural Integrity

- Need consent of the developer
- Easements being blocked
- Waste transfer – placement of skips
- Increase in noise and disturbance
- Access to neighbouring private driveways

Only planning matters have been taken into consideration.

ANALYSIS

Principle of development

The property is on land designated as Protected Open Land however the site has been developed with a large housing estate. In principle further alterations to houses built as part of the estate are considered acceptable.

Design

Policies P1, P3 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policies P1, P3 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, in addition to requiring a number of other basic planning considerations. Development that is not well designed should be refused.

The single storey rear extension would be a proportionate addition in keeping with the appearance of the existing house and is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

However, the proposed two-storey extension would be 2.8m wide and take up the full width of the driveway, extending fully to the boundary with the adjacent property at no 44 Satin Drive. The adjacent house is placed very close to the boundary and the proposed arrangement would leave little space between the two houses. Surrounding dwellings on the estate are spaced evenly with regular gaps between units, and this spacing is considered to be characteristic of the estate. The proposed extension, particularly given it's two-storey height, would essentially fill the visual space between the two houses and would diminish the spaciousness of this part of the development and would appear at odds with the otherwise consistent character and density of the estate. As such, the proposed side extension is not considered to achieve an acceptable standard of design. It would therefore not accord with with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

It is noted that no side extensions can be undertaken under permitted development at this property due to restrictions placed on the entire development by condition of the original planning permission (at reserved matters stage) and as such there is no 'fallback' potential to be considered in design terms.

Impact on 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 will not have a negative impact on neighbour amenity, there are no windows proposed on the side elevation. The proposed window on the front elevation will be further away from the dwellings opposite than existing windows. This will not result in a loss of privacy.

The proposed bedroom on the first floor will have sufficient light and outlook for existing and future occupants. There will be a sufficient amount of garden space remaining for existing and future occupants.

The proposed single storey rear extension will project approx. 1.8m from the rear elevation, this complies with the standards set out in the SPD and is considered acceptable. The development is not considered to be overbearing for surrounding occupants.

As such, it is considered that the proposals would comprise an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupants and accord with the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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. Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The proposal will result in a smaller driveway to the side of the home, sufficient to provide one parking space, compared to the existing space which is sufficient to accommodate two cars. The proposed garage would have internal dimensions of 2.4m in width and 4.5m in length, significantly below the minimum length set out in the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. It is considered unlikely that a garage of these dimensions would be usable by typical modern cars. This will effectively mean that the property would be left with only one off-street parking space of usable dimensions. It is considered likely that the proposed arrangement would likely result in residents and visitors parking on the access drive and on streets around the development, potentially causing access issues for neighbouring residents. The Residential Development SPD notes that *"It is important that car parking areas are designed in such a way to prevent parked cars dominating the street scene and to prevent cars overhanging the public highways"*. It is considered that the outcome of the proposed arrangement would be contrary to these design objectives.

It is noted that a planning condition was imposed on the reserved matters approval for the planning permission for the estate which prevents side extensions without planning permission - which may otherwise comprise permitted development - in order to ensure that adequate provision for off-street parking is retained. Approval of the proposed side extension and the resulting reduction of usable parking spaces would be contrary to the conditions under which the property was approved.

As such it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to the Residential Development SPD and would potentially have an adverse impact on public and

highway safety contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. Due to the substantial loss of visual separation between the application property and the adjacent house, the proposed two-storey side extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such the proposal would not comply with policies DM1, P1, P2, P3 and C3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016) SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policies in Places for Everyone.
2. The proposed development would result in the property being provided with insufficient off-street parking contrary to the adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016) SPD and potentially giving rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework and Places For Everyone.

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:

For avoidance of doubt this decision related to the following plans:

- Proposed Block Plan 104
- Proposed Front Elevation 501
- Proposed Rear Elevation 502
- Proposed East Elevation 503
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan 401
- Proposed Second Floor Plan 402

Report Author Aimee Bovaird