

Application Number:	25/00634/HOUS
Location:	93 Charlotte Street Rochdale OL16 4TN
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension following excavation work, installation of retaining wall and staircase leading to the rear garden
Applicant:	MR SAJID LOHDI
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

Location

This application relates to no. 93 Charlotte Street, a semi-detached two storey property. The property has two storey outrigger and an existing single storey rear extension behind.

The site has a varied topography with land levels increasing to the rear. Properties on this side of Charlotte Street have a typically higher land level, almost the height of single storey, at the rear of their amenity space. To the rear of the property, the property is covered in pebble dash render. The existing extensions appear to be constructed in brick without the use of render.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension, including excavation work to the rear garden area. The proposals include work to the retaining wall and a staircase up to the higher part of the rear garden area. The application form states the extension would be constructed in a Civic Multi style brick or similar, with Grey Marley tiles. Windows and doors would be UPVC to match the existing property.

PROCEDURAL NOTE

An email was sent to the agent on two occasions requesting access to the property in order to complete a full site visit. This was following the rear amenity area's gate was locked on the officer's first visit. In addition, the neighbouring objections and the little information on the submitted plans pertaining to the land levels and relationship with adjoining properties raised concerns. No response was received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024
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:

JP-P1 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).

Amendments

N/A

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

Objection neighbours were received from both No 91 and 95 Charlotte Street. Concerns raised were the following:

- Impact of overlooking due to impact of ground floor windows
- Loss of light and overshadowing due to the scale and massing of the proposed development
- Noise, damage and disruption caused during construction
- Concern over ground stability
- Concern over the proposed flat roof design from a visual perspective
- Concern over impact of excavation works

Officer response: Any concerns relating to noise, damage and disruption caused during the construction of the proposal is subject to separate legislation and is not a material planning consideration.

Assessment

Design and Visual Amenity:

CS Policies P3 and DM1 require development proposals to adhere to high quality design and enhance the borough's identity and sense of place by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. In addition, paragraph 131 of NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF explains that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and

add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The proposals would constitute a single storey rear extension which would project 6m beyond the rear of the existing property. The proposed extension would be a mono-pitch roof, which follows the height of the existing ridge on the existing extension, with the 3.3m high wall facing the adjoined property.

The adjoined property at No 91 has a similarly designed existing extension, which the current projection is the same. The proposed extension would increase the applicant's extension 6m in projection along the shared boundary.

The staircase to the rear leads to an area 2.3m above ground level of the property, to the higher rear end of the garden. No details are submitted of the design of the proposed retaining wall.

While visually, it is likely there are no concerns with the proposed extension, with materials subject to a planning condition, the proposed height and limited information on site levels on the adjoined property, I am unable to conclude on the proposal not having a detrimental visual impact, due to the possibility of the height of the wall resulting in an overbearing, enclosing experience upon the adjoined neighbour.

Accordingly, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the site levels, and conclude that the proposed development will not cause undue harm upon the visual amenity.

Residential Amenity:

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, 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. This is reflected in both the NPPF and PfE, which establish the importance of achieving high standards of residential amenity.

The proposals would constitute a single storey rear extension which would project 6m beyond the rear of the existing property. The proposed extension would have a mono-pitch roof, which follows the height of the existing ridge on the existing extension, with the 3.3m high blank wall adjacent to the boundary and facing the adjoined property.

Without the benefit of a site visit to confirm, I am reliant on the commentary within representations and the aerial imagery available to me to clarify the relationship with the adjoined property at No 91.

Single Storey Rear Extensions

Section 5.5-5.7 including Figures 5 and 6 of the Residential Guidance SPD outlines the maximum projection for a single storey rear extension.

'5.5 It is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers, bearing in

mind that detached properties normally have more space around the property than attached properties, such as terraced and semi-detached dwellings.

- 5.6 *The following maximum standard will apply for single storey extensions:*
- *For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).*
- 5.7 *The distances referred to above will be measured externally from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent property and will be taken from the rear of any extension if one exists close to the common boundary. If the new extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased by the amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary providing the extension does not project beyond a 45 degree line measured from the point along the common boundary. This is illustrated in figures 5 and 6'*

The projection would be 3m above the acceptable projection and would project beyond a 45 degree measured from the point along the common boundary.

Looking at the officer photos from the restricted site visit, it is challenging to conclude on the impact of the extension given the increase in land height and the plans not reflective of the existing fencing between the properties on site. It is assumed based on aerial imagery that it is unlikely a rear window is located on the rear elevation of the adjoined property at No 91, as the land appears to increase steeply to the rear and is then terraced upwards. As such, there is a possibility the proposal, despite exceeding guidance within the SPD, may be acceptable, as the proposed 3.3m high wall adjacent to the boundary, would effectively act as the retaining boundary wall, masked by the increase of land mass to the rear garden area of No 91. As such, the 3.3m high wall would not read as a 3.3m high wall, and comparatively, as high as the existing fencing between the properties.

However, there is minimal information on the submitted plans to determine what would happen to the intervening wall and the resulting impact of the extension upon the adjoined neighbour. In conclusion, without the benefit of a full site visit, there is insufficient evidence the proposal is acceptable.

Additionally, while the upper level of the garden accessed via the staircase is likely to be acceptable, based on aerial imagery of the garden, without the benefit of a site plan showing existing and proposed levels of the application site and neighbouring properties, it is inconclusive the impact of the terraced garden area and staircase won't have any undue overlooking impact upon neighbouring properties.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in conflict with CS Policy G9, DM1, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	✓
Parking provision	✓

The proposed scheme would add an additional bedroom to the property at ground floor. The site does not benefit from any off street parking due to the walled front garden. Given the small scale of the extension however, it is not considered the proposed extension would increase demand for parking. In conclusion, the proposals would not result in any unacceptable parking arrangements or unacceptable impact upon road safety.

The proposal would have no unacceptable impact on the existing parking arrangements and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area or upon the residential amenity of no.91 Charlotte Street. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the Rochdale Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 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	Officer
Report Completed	11/11/2025	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	11/11/2025	Signed: RK