

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00141/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00141/HOUS
Location:	65 Bellshill Crescent, Rochdale, OL16 2TT
Proposal:	First floor rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Mohammed Ismail
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 11.04.2025	EXT OF TIME
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 65 Bellshill Crescent, a two-storey end terrace dwelling located in a late-20th century housing estate in Belfield. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 67 Bellshill Crescent to the south-east, adjacent to no. 63 Bellshill Crescent to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto Protected Open Land to the north-east.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension which projects between 2.6m from the rear elevation of the dwelling along the common boundary with no. 67, and 4m along the common boundary with no. 63, above the existing 6m single-storey rear extension. It is characterised by a cross hipped roof form and is set down from the ridge line by 0.48m with matching height to eaves.

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

Relevant History

24/00881/HOUS - First floor rear extension - Withdrawn

20/01160/HH42 - Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 6m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 2.9m and height to eaves 2.9m) - Prior Approval Not Required

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received with the following representations:

- ☐ Loss of privacy if windows are proposed to the side elevation of the extension.
- ☐ The extension may block sunlight to the adjacent garden and kitchen window.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ The proposed plans do not indicate any openings to the side elevation of the extension.
- ☐ Concerns relating to overshadowing impacts are assessed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.

Policy

National

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

Sub-Regional

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

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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 first-floor rear extension is set below the ridge line and would be subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a cross-hipped roof form would also appear in keeping.
- ☐ It is noted the cumulative impacts of the proposed first-floor rear extension with the existing 6m single-storey rear extension would add substantial massing to the rear elevation of the dwelling which would be visible from the rear curtilages of neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding, owing to its rear siting, the extension would not be readily visible from the street scene. It also faces open land to the north-east with the nearest directly-facing public right of way sited well in excess of 300m away. Given this context, it is considered the visual impact to the street scene would be limited.
- ☐ 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 CS, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”
- ☐ The proposed extension does not face any properties and would accord with the requirements of Section 4.1 of the SPD.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.9 of the SPD, the proposed first-floor rear extension does not project beyond a 30 degree line drawn 2.4m along the common boundaries of nos. 63 and 67 respectively. As such, the extension is not considered to amount to unacceptable levels of overshadowing and overbearing harm to the neighbouring properties.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable 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

- ☐ The proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property and are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted CS.

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 12/02/2025
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – received 12/02/2025
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 1 received 12/02/2025
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 2 received 12/02/2025

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, 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 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, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/03/2025	Signed: SY
Authorisation	19/03/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen