

Officer Report

Case Reference: 25/00556/FUL
Location: 28 War Office Road Rochdale OL11 5HR
Proposal: Erection of 1 No. semi-detached residential dwelling -
Retrospective
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Sam Yuen

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a vacant site to the north of no. 26 War Office Road, a terraced dwelling in a run of three such properties in the Bamford area of Rochdale. The site formerly comprises a fourth dwelling in the terrace, understood to be no. 28 War Office Road, which was demolished circa 8 years ago. The site backs onto a parcel of land spanning the rears of all the terraces and the application site, providing separation from dwellings on Winston Avenue further east of the site.

PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

Retrospective planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey, end terrace dwelling. The proposed dwelling would run flush with the front and rear elevations of the site, extending to the northern boundary. The dwelling would feature a lower-ground floor, in addition to providing accommodation in the roof void.

The application follows the approval of 21/01648/FUL for the same dwelling. Beyond alterations to the rear elevation fenestration, the submitted plans indicate the addition of 1no. roof light to the rear roof slope, 1no. basement window to the side elevation wall and 1no. solar panel to the front roof slope.

The proposed property also occupies a larger curtilage than the one previously permitted, extending up to the boundaries no. 32 War Office Road to the north and no. 33 Winston Avenue to the east.

A paved garden area is provided to the rear. No off-street parking is provided.

The proposals are to be constructed from brick and slate with uPVC fenestration.

POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage

P3 Improving Design of New Development

G8 Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk

G9 Reducing the Impact of Pollution, Contamination and Land Instability

DM1 General Development Requirements

T2 Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016)

RELEVANT HISTORY

23/00546/VRCON - Application to vary conditions 3 (Preliminary Risk Assessment), 4 (Drainage), 5 (Materials), 6 (Window and Door Reveals) and 8 (Landscaping) of planning permission 21/01648/FUL (Erection of one dwelling with associated boundary treatments to front, side and rear boundaries) including revised elevation plans to reflect retrospective wording and alterations to rear elevation windows. - Withdrawn

21/01648/FUL - Erection of one dwelling with associated boundary treatments to front, side and rear boundaries - Grant subject to conditions

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No drainage information has been submitted and are required prior to determination. Given the minor scale of the scheme, the acceptability of the drainage arrangements can be controlled via conditions.

Highways And Engineering

Highways recommend the refusal of this proposal on highway safety grounds.

The dwelling replaces a house which previously stood at this location. The traffic generation associated with usage is the same as the previous usage.

The applicant has provided a driveway without any dropped crossing and the inability to turn within the curtilage. The applicant should replace the wall which stood at this location previously and remove the driveway. Highways would not permit a driveway of this size at this location as it forces the driver to reverse off or onto the highway which is a dangerous manoeuvre Highways cannot encourage.

Were the wall replaced there would be no objection to this proposal.

Environmental Control

The submitted details in relation to the remedial measures for ground soil is acceptable and therefore there is no need for further work.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted within the vicinity of the application site. Two objection letters were received with the following representations:

- The land subject to the proposed dwelling is used as access for the adjoining properties which would be blocked under the proposed plans.
- The erection of a new dwelling would block light into the adjacent properties.

Officer's Comment

- The submitted representations appear to have misinterpreted the proposal to relate to another new dwelling within the rear curtilage of the application site, rather than a retrospective application for the dwelling as built. In any case, matters relating to access are covered under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

ANALYSIS

The application follows 21/01648/FUL for the same dwelling with an enlarged curtilage boundary than the previous. The principle of development has already been accepted in the previous application, therefore the assessment of this application would relate to the amended details and outstanding reserved details as set out in the conditions for 21/01648/FUL.

The changes shown on the submitted plans indicate the addition of 1no. roof light to the rear roof slope, 1no. basement window to the side elevation wall and 1no. solar panel to the front roof slope. The amended changes are not considered to have a material impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would be acceptable.

No concerns are had regarding the details of the external material finish, fenestration arrangements, boundary treatments, hard and soft landscaping, bin store and bird boxes which are acceptable. The proposal would accord with Policy P3 of the Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE, the SPD and the NPPF.

No amenity impacts have been identified in relation to the amended window openings, thus the residential amenity impact to neighbouring occupiers would be acceptable.

It is noted the constructed dwelling has built a block paving hardstanding as opposed to the previously approved front garden arrangement. It is acknowledged the arrangement is similar to the front curtilages of neighbouring properties and as such would not amount to unacceptable visual harm. The Highways Officer was consulted on the plans and objected on the grounds of unsafe manoeuvres out of this hardstanding. Notwithstanding, it is accepted that this hardstanding is unlikely to function as a suitable driveway and on-street parking would remain the predominant arrangement. Considering this would not differ from the parking arrangements of the approved scheme and the surrounding area, it is considered impact of the proposal on highway and public safety would not be so severe as to warrant refusal. As such, it is considered that the proposal would accord with Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

The applicant has supplied Phase I and II report, alongside the verification report which has been reviewed and accepted by the Environmental Control Officer. Consequently, no additional works are required and the requirements of Policies G8 and G9 of the Core Strategy would be met.

The applicant has also submitted additional information in relation to the proposed drainage plan, which indicates a connection to an existing combined drain to the rear of the dwelling. Considering the proposed dwelling has utilised much of the existing drainage infrastructure, it is considered the proposed arrangements would be acceptable in terms of flood risk, in accordance with Policy G8 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (1)

- 1 The development relates to the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Location Plan - received 29/09/2025
- Proposed Site Plan - drawing no. 20.2275.28 received 29/09/2025
- Proposed Floor Plans - drawing no. 20.2275.11C received 29/09/2025
- Proposed Elevations - drawing no. 20.2275.23C received 29/05/2025
- Proposed Boundary Treatments - drawing no. 20.2275.10D received 26/11/2025

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.