

Application Number:	23/00516/HOUS
Location:	26 Bellshill Crescent Rochdale OL16 2TT
Proposal:	Part-single, part-two storey rear extension and alteration to side elevation fenestration
Applicant:	Mr Mohammad Hussain
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 26 Bellshill Crescent, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a late 20th century residential estate in Belfield. The dwelling is sited on a corner plot and is characterised by attractive architectural features such as a gable-fronted front projection, bay windows and decorative quoins. It is adjoined by no. 24 Bellshill Crescent to the west, adjacent to no. 28 Bellshill Crescent to the south-east, and faces the highway to the north. The property benefits from a front driveway and a garden space to the front curtilage.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-single, part-two storey rear extension which projects 3m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The rear extension is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form and is set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling by 0.69m with matching height to eaves. The two-storey element is set away from the common boundary of adjoined no. 24. The single-storey element is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.97m and a height to eaves of 2.92m.

The proposed plans also indicate the alteration of the fenestration on the existing east-facing side elevation.

The proposal would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The application would not appear to have any impact on the adopted highway network and the existing parking arrangements would appear to remain unchanged.

The servicing arrangements for the building would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

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

The following amendments were made to the proposal:

- ☐ The removal of the previously proposed two-storey side extension;
- ☐ The increase in the projection of the proposed two-storey rear extension by 0.49m;
- ☐ The alteration in the internal layouts of the first floor;
- ☐ The alteration of fenestration on the existing east-facing side elevation.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring they are “*sympathetic to local character.*”
- ☐ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be “*of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area*” and to “*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, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be “*in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.*”
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension is set down below the ridge line which would be subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a gable-fronted roof for the two-storey extension and lean-to roof form for the single-storey element also appear in-keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.”*
- ❑ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (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.”*
- ❑ The proposed two-storey rear extension does not directly face any habitable room windows and thus no concerns are had with the amenity impacts in this regard. It is acknowledged the proposed first-floor rear bedroom windows would only retain a minimum 3.72m separation distance from the curtilage boundary of adjacent no. 28. However, it is noted that by virtue of its siting and layout, no. 28 comprise a limited and exposed rear garden space that is already subjected to some degree of overlooking from the host dwelling. With this in mind, the additional overlooking impact of the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the occupiers of no. 28 and would be acceptable on balance.
- ❑ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:
 - ❑ *“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).”*
- ❑ Additionally, Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey rear extensions projecting *“beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ❑ The proposed single-storey rear extension projects 3m along the common boundary of adjoined no. 24 and does not project beyond the rear elevation of adjacent no. 28.
- ❑ The proposed two-storey rear extension is set away from the common boundary of adjoined no. 24 and does not project beyond a 30 degree line drawn 2.4m along the common boundary from its rear elevation.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to its neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ The proposed extension would result in a substantial reduction of the rear garden space of the host property. Notwithstanding, sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained in the front curtilage. The submitted plans also indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms,

thereby ensuring a satisfactory standard of living for existing and future occupants.

- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ☐ The proposed development would not impact on the existing provision of parking spaces for the host property. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

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 permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 18/05/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – received 18/05/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Rev. 1 received 26/10/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 1 dated 05/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 2 Rev. 3 received 27/10/2023

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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 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 order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	27/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	02/11/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen