



Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

## **PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED**

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 22/00785/HOUS

|                                                                                                                             |                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Name and address for correspondence:                                                                                        | Applicant name: |
| Miss Nixie Edwards<br>HAD & Co Property Consultants Ltd<br>Unit 3 Salisbury House<br>St Stephen Street<br>Salford<br>M3 6AX | Ms Khan         |

### Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 21 September 2022

|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Proposal:</b> | <b>Single storey side/rear extension to dwelling including provision of additional hardstanding and alterations to boundary treatments to include new wall/railing and new access gates - part retrospective</b> |
| <b>Location:</b> | <b>33 Hillcrest Road, Rochdale, OL11 2QB,</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 siting, size and design, the rendered piers, railings and gates would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of both the Castleton (South) Conservation Area and Castleton Primary School, which has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset. The harm is not justified or mitigated. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed rear extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the rear facing windows of no.23 Melville Street to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The proposed development would provide insufficient off-street parking provision and would therefore likely result in an increase in on-street parking in an area where on street parking is limited due to the existing parking needs of local residents. Additionally, the property is located at the junction of Hillcrest Road and Melville Street where on street parking would likely increase the risk to the safety of other road users and pedestrians through a reduction in visibility. Furthermore, the columns either side of the driveway would restrict visibility for vehicles when entering or leaving the driveway, especially when those vehicles are reversing out directly onto the junction, and this would result in an unacceptable risk to pedestrian and highway safety. The proposal is therefore detrimental to highway safety, contrary to policies DM1 and T2 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                      15 November 2022

Daniela Ripa  
Interim 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.

**Informative:**

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following drawings:-

- Proposed Attic and Roof Plans drg no. HAD3324-04
- Proposed Floor Plans drg no. HAD3324-03
- Proposed Elevations drg no. HAD3324-05. Rev A
- Proposed Street Scenes drg no. HAD3324-07. Rev A
- Pre-Existing Elevations drg no. HAD3324-08
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations drg no. HAD3324-02. Rev A
- Site Plans drg no. HAD3324-06. Rev B
- Location Plan drg no. HAD3324-01. Rev A