

## Officer Report

**Case Reference:** PL/2026/0088  
**Location:** 22 HAWTHORN ROAD, ROCHDALE, OL11 5JQ  
**Proposal:** Proposed single-storey rear extension and first floor infill extension  
**Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Officer:** Luke Rigby

### SITE

The application site consists of a two-storey detached residential dwelling located to the south of Hawthorn Road in a predominantly residential area of Rochdale. The existing dwelling is constructed of facing brick with a pitched roof. The dwelling benefits from an existing two-storey side extension.

### PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single storey rear extension and first floor side infill extension and replacement of conservatory roof.

### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

78/D07138 – Carport. Approve

92/D28569 – Two storey side extension to dwellinghouse. Approve subject to Conditions

98/D35978 – Rear conservatory. Approve subject to Conditions

### RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1                      Sustainable Places

Local Guidance

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)

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: In accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, notification letters were sent to immediate neighbours.

ASSESSMENT

Design, character and appearance

The application proposes the construction of a 2.8m single-storey rear extension, a first-floor infill extension, and alterations to the existing conservatory roof.

In principle, the scale and form of the proposed single-storey rear extension and first-floor infill extension appear to be subordinate and proportionate to the host dwelling.

However, this Local Planning Authority is prevented from making an accurate and robust assessment of the proposal due to significant and unresolved inconsistencies between the floor and elevation plans. In particular:

- The floor plans and site plan indicate the existing conservatory footprint would be retained, whereas the elevations depict a continuous rear extension with a single building line;
- The relationship between the proposed extension and the existing conservatory is unclear;
- The building line of the conservatory is omitted from drawing 'A-07';
- The plans are scaled in imperial measurements, and the stated conversion to metric does not match when scaled from the scale bar, therefore the Local Planning Authority cannot be sure which measurements are correct;

- The overall form, scale and massing of the combined built form cannot be definitively understood.

The Local Planning Authority has tried to engage proactively with the applicant on amendments to the submitted plans, however the revisions have not adequately resolved these discrepancies.

As a result, the Local Planning Authority is unable to fully assess the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. This lack of clarity prevents a proper assessment against Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the design provisions of the Housing SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Residential amenity

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies and decisions should create places that promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is echoed in Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy which states that development proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring dwellings through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing, or loss of privacy.

The Council's Housing SPD sets out guidance in relation to the scale and positioning of extensions. In general:

- Single-storey rear extensions to detached dwellings are typically supported where they project no more than 4m from the rear elevation of a neighbouring dwelling along the common boundary, subject to the 45-degree rule;
- Two-storey extensions should not intrude when measured 2.4m from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling along the common boundary.

Based on the information provided, there is no clear in-principle objection to the proposal in terms of residential amenity. The extensions appear to be positioned at sufficient distance from neighbouring properties such that significant impacts in terms of overbearing, overshadowing, or loss of outlook are unlikely.

However, the inconsistencies identified within the submitted plans prevent the Local Planning Authority from undertaking a robust assessment of these impacts. In particular, discrepancies in scale and the conflicting depiction of the built form across the site plan, floor plans, and elevation drawings mean that the precise extent of the development and its relationship with neighbouring properties cannot be confidently established.

For example, the site plan is indicated as being drawn at a scale of 1:300 and identifies a projection of 2.8m for the single storey rear extension, consistent with the floor plans. However, when measured against the scale bar, this distance appears to be significantly less. This raises uncertainty as to whether the drawings accurately represent the proposal.

In the absence of accurate and consistent plans, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. As such, the proposal is considered to conflict with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## Highways and parking

The application property would retain two off-street parking spaces, and would have no unacceptable impacts upon highway safety in accordance with CS Policy T2 and CS Appendix 5.

## Conclusion

The application has not been supported by a consistent and accurate set of drawings that clearly define the development proposed. This lack of clarity prevents the Local Planning Authority from properly assessing the proposal against relevant planning policies. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

## SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

## SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received.

## PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

### Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Significant additional time has been afforded to the applicant to provide accurate drawings to resolve the identified issues. However, the submitted information has still not satisfactorily addressed these concerns and, as such, it has not been possible to approve the application.

### Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

## **Recommendation: Refuse**

### **Refusal(s) (1)**

- 1 The application is not supported by accurate and consistent plans, with discrepancies between the site plan, floor plans and elevations. As a result, the Local Planning Authority cannot clearly establish the development proposed or adequately assess its impacts. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision is based on the following plans/documents:

- 1
  - Application Form
  - Site Plan
  - DWG No. A-03 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan)
  - DWG No. A-04 (Proposed First Floor Plan)
  - DWG No. A-05 (Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation)
  - DWG No. A-06 (Existing and Proposed Front Elevation)
  - DWG No. A-07 (Existing and Proposed Right Elevation)
- 2 Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Significant additional time has been afforded to the applicant to provide accurate drawings to resolve identified issues. However, the submitted information has still not satisfactorily addressed these concerns and, as such, it has not been possible to approve the application.