

## Officer Report

**Case Reference:** PL/2026/0519  
**Location:** 2 MINORCA CLOSE, ROCHDALE, OL11 5RP  
**Proposal:** Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension with the application of render to existing rear elevation following demolition of existing garage and conservatory  
**Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Officer:** Luke Rigby

### SITE

The application site consists of a two-storey detached residential dwelling located on the corner of Minorca Close at the junction with Newhouse Crescent. The existing dwelling is constructed of white render with a pitched roof and benefits from a single storey garage with a flat roof to the side elevation.

### PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of existing garage and conservatory, and construction of a two-storey side extension projecting 4.5m from the side elevation of the existing dwelling and part single, part two-storey rear extension projecting 3m from the rear elevation and having a width of 13.425m.

### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

### 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.

### **SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS**

1No. objection which can be summarised as follows:

- The number of rooms proposes suggests that the property is not a family home
- Concerns regarding the use of the dwelling as a HMO
- Car parking would be an issue as a result of the development, including hinderance for emergency vehicles

### **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

None received.

### **ASSESSMENT**

#### **Design, character and appearance**

Paragraphs 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth, the Framework) 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 goes onto state 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, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Paragraph 139 of the Framework makes clear that development, which is not well designed, particularly where it fails to raise the standard of design more generally within the area, should be refused.

There is a strong sense of visual character and uniformity along Minorca Close, particularly in the size of the dwellings in relation to their plot. This creates a sense of spaciousness and each dwelling along the street is of similar built form and character, although it is acknowledged that most have been extended previously, a strong sense of uniformity exists. No. 2 occupies a prominent corner plot location in the street scene, being at the head of the cul-de-sac and is readily visible from the adjacent Newhouse Crescent. The location and siting benefits from an elevated position with long open views towards the south where levels drop and mature trees line the vistas.

The application proposes the construction of a part single storey, part two-storey side extension. The two-storey element would project 4.5m from the side elevation of the dwelling and have a pitched roof before dropping to single storey and extending a further 1.5m, for a total projection of 6m. The proposed single storey extension would have a mono-pitched roof.

The proposed side extension in this instance would appear as an incongruous, overly dominant addition to the existing dwelling which fails to appear as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling, which itself has a total width of approximately 9m. The proposed extension would lack a set down from the ridge or set back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling which would have increased subservience to some degree. Notwithstanding, a set down or back would be insufficient in this instance to overcome the visual harm caused by the overall massing and built form of the development.

The size of the two-storey side extension would be notably out of keeping with the other dwellings along Minorca Close and would be readily visible from the surrounding and adjacent street scene by virtue of the prominent siting of the application site.

The proposed two-storey extension would project approximately 3m to the rear and have a gabled roof. with a width of approximately 4.8m before becoming single storey and extending across the entire width of the dwelling. Whilst there is no in-principal objection on design terms to a well-designed rear extension – and Officers consider the principle of a single storey extension in this location acceptable – the proposed single storey extensions cumulatively would similarly fail to appear as subservient and in proportion additions to the existing dwelling.

Taken together, the proposed extensions fail to respect the built form of the existing dwelling and would appear as incongruous, overly dominant, and out of character additions. The proposed developments would read as obtuse and visually dominant additions to the dwelling when viewed from the surrounding street scene and dwellings.

Having regard to the above, the proposed developments are considered contrary to Policies DM1, P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Housing SPD. The proposal fails to take the opportunity to raise the standard of

design more generally within the area and is therefore contrary to Paragraphs 135 and 139(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Residential amenity**

Paragraph 135 of the Framework requires development to achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to avoid adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Paragraph 5.6 of the Housing SPD gives general guidance relating to the rear projection of single storey extensions; for a detached dwelling, it states that a single storey extension should not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The single storey extension in this instance would project 3m and is therefore in accordance with this guidance.

For two-storey extensions, the SPD states, at Paragraphs 5.9 - 5.10, that permission will not generally be granted for a two-storey extension which intrudes into a 30-degree visibility zone when measured at a point 2.4m along the common boundary.

The proposed projection of the two-storey extension in this instance, having regard to the siting of the application site in relation to its neighbours, is not considered significantly overbearing or overshadowing. It is not considered that the proposed two-storey extension would give rise to a loss of light.

Paragraph 4.1 of the Housing SPD further gives guidance in relation to separation distances. It states that the Council will seek:

- i) 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage (Figure 2);
- ii) 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 3);
- iii) 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room (Figure 4).

The submitted site plan does not appear to be drawn at the 1:250 scale indicated on the plan, and therefore it is not possible for the Local Planning Authority to fully assess the impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings in relation to overlooking. Notwithstanding, the application dwelling is splayed in its plot such that the proposed two-storey extension is likely to directly overlook the private amenity spaces of No. 4 Minorca Close. This would give rise to an unacceptable sense of overlooking which would be detrimental to the amenity that No. 4 could reasonably expect to enjoy.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is considered contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, and Paragraph 135 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.

Concerns have been raised regarding traffic, parking issues, and hinderance for emergency vehicles. The quantum of development is not such that it is considered there would be any significant or detrimental impact on highway safety, parking, or access for emergency vehicles.

### **Other Matters**

Concerns have been raised regarding the size of the dwelling and potential use of the dwelling as an HMO. As discussed above, Officers consider the proposed development disproportionate and out of character for the area.

Notwithstanding, the application is submitted on the basis that the dwelling is a single-family dwelling, and this is the basis the Council must assess the application on. It is noted, however, that planning permission would not be required for use of the dwelling as an HMO for 6No. people.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission is refused subject to the below reasons.

### **PROCEDURAL STATEMENT**

#### **Article 35 Declaration**

The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.

#### **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) (2)**

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of the siting, scale, massing and design, would appear as incongruous, overly dominant additions to the existing dwelling which would fail to appear subservient. The proposed two-storey side extension would be readily visible from the surrounding street scene and would read as a dominant and unsympathetic addition which fails to respect the character of its surroundings. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the design guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed two-storey rear extension, by virtue of its scale, orientation of the existing dwelling, and close proximity to the common boundary with No. 4 Minorca Close, would give rise to an unacceptable sense of overlooking towards the rear private amenity space of No. 4. The proposed development would therefore be detrimental to the amenity that No. 4 Minorca Close can reasonably expect to enjoy, and the proposal is considered contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 The Local Planning Authority offered solutions to the applicant in order to make the development acceptable. The applicant was however unwilling to amend the plans. Without these amendments the development would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and therefore does not comprise sustainable development.