

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0327
Location: 80 Queensway, Rochdale, OL11 1TJ
Proposal: Single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey rear extension
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Majid Mir

SITE

The application relates to a red brick two-storey detached property of 80 Queensway which is presently unoccupied. The application property was most recently used as a deli. The property is distinct from the properties on either side with a car salesroom located to the east. The car salesroom consist of two main buildings with the one nearest the application property set considerable further back. The design of the car sales room of typical of the type. To the west is a row of two storey semi-detached properties. The properties closest to the application property is set on slightly higher ground, with the properties located further west set on higher ground. The site faces onto the A664 Queensway (Rochdale Bypass) and is a busy road characterised by on street parking. To the front and rear of the site, there are commercial properties.

The existing deli occupies the ground floor with first floor used as storage. To the front of the deli is hardstanding which appears to be used as informal off-street parking.

The site is not located in any town or local centre. The site is designated as Defined Urban area. according to the saved UDP Proposals Map.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes to construct a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing extension. The proposed extension would have a mono pitched roof. The proposed extension would project out by 3.5m and would be approximately 8.1m wide. The ridge height would be 4.1m and the height to eaves would be 2.9m.

The application form states that the proposed extension would constructed out of brick to match the existing and tiles.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 - Sustainable Places

JP-S1 - Sustainable Development

JP-G8 – A net enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS)

SD1 - Delivering sustainable development

DM1 - General Development Requirements

SO1 - Delivering a more prosperous economy

E1 - Establishing thriving town, district and local centres

E2 - Increasing jobs and prosperity

SO2 - Creating successful and healthy communities

C6 - Improving health and well-being

C8 - Improving community, sport, leisure and community facilities

SO3 - Improving design, image and quality of place

P1 - Improving image

P3 - Improving design of new development

SO4 - Promoting a greener environment

G6 - Enhancing green infrastructure

G7 - Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

G9 - Reducing the impact of pollution

SO5 - Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

T2 - Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 - Schedule of Parking Standards

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

G/D/1 - Defined Urban Area

S/6 - District Centre, Local Centres and Linear Commercial Areas

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

PL/2025/1328 - Change of use from mixed use comprising of Café (Use Class E) and flat (Use Class C3) to single use Café (Use Class E), single storey front and side extension, alteration to the fenestration on the front elevation. Decision: pending decision.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Env Health - Noise/Odours

No comments received.

Highways And Engineering

No comment.

GMEU

Bats: No surveys have been undertaken, but due to the size of the extension to be demolished, and the lack of roof/loft/eaves to be affected, it is unlikely that bats would be roosting in the area of the building to be affected by the demolition. I would however recommend that an informative along the following lines is attached to any permission, if granted:

Whilst the works to the existing building have been assessed as very low risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s). Natural England should also be informed.

Nesting birds: There is habitat suitable for nesting birds present on the site within the garden. Work that will impact on habitats where nesting birds may be present (for example building work near vegetation/trees), should not be undertaken in the main bird nesting season (March – August) unless suitable checks for active bird nests have been undertaken.

Wherever possible, measures to enhance the site for biodiversity should be secured as part of this planning application and should include integration of a bird box onto the building, prior to habitation of the extension, which should be secured via condition, to provide biodiversity enhancements.

Other Protected Species: Protected species can turn up in unexpected places, and the granting of planning permission does not negate the need to abide by the laws which are in place to safeguard biodiversity. An informative should be used so that the applicant is aware that they

must seek ecological advice should they find or suspect that the proposals will impact on protected species.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG): The application is likely exempt from a BNG assessment under the de minimis rule (less than 25m² of habitat to be removed). Rochdale Borough Council must be satisfied that this is accurate.

It should be noted, that if any trees or vegetation are to be removed for the development, then the application would not be exempt from BNG assessment, and an excel metric including the baseline and predicted post development biodiversity value of the site is submitted, along with a statement or report that provides adequate information for the LPA to be satisfied that a 10% net gain in biodiversity units is achievable, either on or off-site.

It should also be noted that an application for the same site (PL/2025/1328) includes an increased area of modified grassland in the area that the rear extension is to be built. This would mean that the BNG strategy for PL/2025/1328 would need to be reviewed, as the rear extension would result in a decrease of modified grassland post-development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice was placed in the vicinity of the site. No representations were received.

Principle of Development

The application relates to a proposed extension to an existing deli/café (Class E). Policy E2 is relevant and this establishes that the Council will support the creation and retention of successful businesses and increase the number and quality of jobs to create a more prosperous lower carbon economy.

Policy E1 establishes that retail and leisure facilities should be focused in town and local centres in order to promote the vitality and viability of these centres. Paragraph 91 of the National Planning Policy Framework also establishes that local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan.

Policy TC3 of the NPPF states ‘when considering edge of centre and out of centre locations, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre by sustainable transport modes.’ Policy TC3 adds that ‘a sequential test should be applied to proposals for main town centre uses for which planning permission is required, where these are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an allocation for that purpose in an up-to-date development plan.’ Additionally, policy TC3 adds that ‘applicants and local planning authorities should exercise flexibility when considering issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable town centre or edge of centre sites are fully explored.’

The application proposes to increase the kitchen area and retain the existing floorspace of the shopfront. As such the proposal would not see any increase in the shopfront. As such, considering there would be no change in the shopfront and the existing lawful use of the premises as a Class E use, this mitigates the requirement for a sequential test to be submitted in this instance. Therefore, despite the site being located in an out of centre location, the principle of Class E use is established and acceptable.

Design and Visual Amenity

The application site is a detached property located on the busy Queensway. The property differs from the properties on either side. To the east is a modern car showroom with one building set further back and one set closer to the highway. The design of the showroom consists of cladding and glazing; typical of car showrooms throughout the borough and country. To the west, and the opposite side of Greenfield Lane, is no. 1 Greenfield Lane. No. 1 is a relatively modern looking two storey brick dwelling. No. 1 has been designed to mimic the more traditional two storey bricked dwellings sited immediately to the west of no. 1. Access to no.1 is via the side facing east and from the rear. The principal windows are located on the elevations facing towards Queensway and towards the brownfield site.

The application proposes to demolish the existing single storey extension and construct a mono-pitched extension constructed using matching materials. The proposed extension is of a standard design that would not appear at odds with the host property. The proposed extension is considered to represent a subservient addition to the host property.

The design and position of the fenestration is limited and would benefit from additional fenestration to add articulation. However, it is noted that the extension is located to the rear and the rear of the property would not be clearly visible. As such, it is considered to be acceptable.

Overall, it is considered that proposed development is of a satisfactory standard of design and is considered to be acceptable subject to the inclusion of the condition in regards to matching materials. The proposed development therefore would accord with the policy DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Ecology and Biodiversity

GMEU noted that although no surveys have been undertaken, due to the size of the extension to be demolished, and the lack of roof/loft/eaves to be affected, it is unlikely that bats would be roosting in the area of the building to be affected by the demolition. However, GMEU recommended the addition of an informative. In regard to birds, GMEU noted that there is habitat suitable for nesting birds within the garden of the site. GMEU have advised that work that will impact on habitats where nesting birds may be present should not be undertaken in the main bird nesting season (March – August) unless suitable checks for active bird nests have been undertaken. It is noted that the application is part retrospective application and remaining work on the proposed extension is unlikely to impact on the vegetation on site. As such, an informative is appropriate.

In regard to BNG, the proposal would see the demolition of the existing extension and replaced with a larger extension. The area covered by the proposed extension is predominantly hardstanding and therefore the proposed extension would meet the ‘de minimis’ exemption criteria for BNG. Nevertheless, this does not negate the requirements as set out in policy G7 of the Core Strategy and policy JP-G8 of the PfE which require developments to promote biodiversity enhancement within developments. GMEU have advised that measures to enhance the site for biodiversity should include integration of a bird box onto the building. It is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring biodiversity enhancement on site prior to first occupation.

Subject to the addition of the relevant condition, it is considered that the proposed development would accord with the relevant policies in regard to ecology and biodiversity as set out in the Core Strategy, PfE and NPPF.

Neighbour Amenity

The application does not propose to include a flue or extraction system as a part of this application. It is noted that there are no visible signs of a flue or extraction system on the exterior of the property. If the applicant seeks to install a flue or extraction system at a later date, a separate planning application will be required. The increase in the size of the kitchen will lead to an increase in activity owing to the increase in the size. However, the increase in activity is unlikely to lead to a substantial increase in noise that would warrant a refusal. Furthermore, the properties that are most likely to be affected by the proposal are those to the west on Queensway. The increase in activity is likely to be masked by the prevailing acoustic conditions dominated by road traffic on Queensway. Additionally, Environmental Health legislation would manage unreasonable noise levels.

In regard to the proposed extension, the application property does not adjoin to any property. To the west is a car showroom. To the rear the land drops away, however, the land is a brownfield land. To the west is the residential dwelling of no. 1 Greenfield Lane which is sited on the opposite side of Greenfield Lane. The front of the property faces directly towards the application site with the garden sited to the north of the curtilage. The property has been designed to have similar appearance and arrangement as the neighbouring dwellings on Queensway with the front facing towards Queensway and the rear garden being located to the north of the curtilage.

The proposed extension would not project beyond the side elevation of the host property and would be approximately 20m from the boundary of no. 1. When assessed against paragraphs 4.1 and 5.6 of the SPD, the proposed development adheres to the standards set out in each paragraph. As such, it is considered that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 1 Greenfield Lane. The proposed extension would not conceivably impact on the amenity of any of the other neighbour residential properties.

It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the relevant policies with the Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Highway Safety

The application does not propose to increase its capacity and does not propose any alterations to the parking arrangements on the site. The highways department had no comments to make in regard to the application.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in regard to highway safety and the proposal accords with policies DM1 and T2 of the Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (4)

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Location Plan
- Existing Elevations. Drawing number: 2419/1
- Existing Site Plan and Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drawing number: 2419/2
- Proposed Site Plan and Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Drawing number: 2419/3
- Proposed Elevations. Drawing number: 2419/4

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.

- 3 The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, a minimum of two bird boxes, bird bricks, bat boxes and/or bat bricks to be integrated to the fabric of the buildings shall be installed on the building and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of enhancing biodiversity and habitat provision within the site in accordance with Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G8 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

Informatives (1)

- 1 The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended, it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. If a bird's nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).
- 2 Protected species can turn up in unexpected places, and the granting of planning permission does not negate the need to abide by the laws which are in place to safeguard biodiversity. If at any time any protected species are found or are suspected of being present on the site and adversely affected by the development, work should cease immediately and an ecologist/LPA should be contacted.
- 3 All bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981; the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006; and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010). Should bats or evidence of bats be found prior to or during development, work must stop immediately and Natural England contacted for further advice. This is a legal requirement under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and applies to whoever carries out the work. All contractors on site should be made aware of this requirement.