

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00462/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00462/HOUS
Location:	3 Beechfield, Rochdale, OL11 5PA
Proposal:	Part double part single front extension, part double part single side extension, single storey rear extension, rear conservatory and alterations to fenestration. Resubmission of 23/01035/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr Manzoor Ahmed
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 18.07.2024	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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 3 Beechfield, a two-storey detached dwelling located in the Bamford. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 5 Beechfield to the east, adjacent to no. 50 Norden Road to the west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The rear curtilage boundary borders no. 54 Norden Road to the north-west, and nos. 33, 35 and 37 Porritt Close to the north-east. The property benefits from a 23m long front driveway and comprises a single-storey flat roof side extension with a white clad horizontal board above.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of enlargements to the dwelling as follows:

- ☐ A part-single, part-two storey front extension which projects a 2m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a front gable projection set down 0.44m from the ridge line and a lean-to roof form from the existing side extension.
- ☐ A first-floor side extension which projects 3.35m from the side elevation of the dwelling. The extension continues from the dual-pitched roof form of the dwelling with matching ridge and eaves height.
- ☐ A single-storey rear extension which projects 4.71m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a flat roof form and has a ridge height of 3.04m.
- ☐ A further conservatory extension projecting 3.5m from the existing rear extension, following the removal of the existing canopy.

The submitted plans also indicate alterations to the rear elevation fenestration.

The application is a resubmission of a previous application 23/01035/HOUS, with amendments made to reduce the extent of the side extension and the omission of the two-storey rear extension.

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

Relevant History

23/01035/HOUS - Part single / part two storey side and rear extension – Refuse

Officer's Comments:

1. By virtue of its design, scale and siting, the proposed works are considered discordant to the existing massing of the dwelling and would lack visual subservience. The development is also not considered sympathetic to the existing scale and would present an unacceptable degree of visual harm by virtue of disproportionate additions. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed first floor side extension would result in an unacceptable overbearing and loss of light impact to the rear garden of no.50 Norden Road. The rear facing window located on the proposed first floor side extension would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking to the rear garden of no.54 Norden Road due to its close proximity to the shared boundary. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the residential amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have no objection to this proposal which is unlikely to have any noticeable impact upon the highway.

Tree Officer

No comments received at the time of writing.

Representations

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

- ☐ The extension will reduce access to natural light to neighbouring property.
- ☐ The increased height and scale of the extension will compromise privacy of neighbouring properties.

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ Concerns relating to overshadowing and overlooking impacts are addressed 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 Policy 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 application follows a previous refused application (ref: 23/01035/HOUS), where the previous plans comprised non-subservient and disproportionate additions to the dwelling. The revised plans has reduced the width of the side extension which appears more symmetrical and proportionate in appearance and would not dominate the host dwelling.
- ☐ The proposal comprises a front gable projection which differs from the appearance of the residential dwellings of the same house type design in the vicinity. However, due to its isolated siting at an angle away from the building line, the host dwelling is not commonly read with these dwellings. As such, it is considered the front extension would not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable.
- ☐ It is also noted the front portico detailing would be retained in the front projection, which would reflect the architectural features of the surrounding dwellings.
- ☐ Notwithstanding the considerable rear projection, the proposed rear extensions are single-storey forms which would be subservient. The use of a flat roof continues the form of the existing side extension, though due to its siting at the rear away from public views, would not constitute undue visual harm.

- ☐ 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, the 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 side and front extension does not directly face any habitable room windows to the south-west and does not project beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling. Thus no adverse overlooking impacts has been identified in this respect.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor side extension wall would be sited 13.37m from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 50, which marginally falls short of the 14m requirement of Section 4.1 (ii). However, it is noted the affected window serves the landing area of no. 50 and is therefore not a habitable room window. On this basis, it is considered the extension would not result in significant overbearing and overshadowing impact in this regard.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.6 and 5.7 of the SPD, the proposed single-storey rear extensions would comply with the space requirements outlined which would be acceptable.
- ☐ In light of the approval of application for the enlargement of no. 54 (ref: 23/00190/HOUS), on the balance of probability, the proposed first-floor rear bedroom window of no. 54 would be sited 9.25m from the proposed conservatory. It is noted, however, due to the lightweight form of the conservatory, and its siting abutting the existing boundary fencing which screens much of the extension, it is considered the conservatory would not result in significant overshadowing impacts to the occupiers of no. 54.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ 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 proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from four to five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy. The submitted plans indicate retention of sufficient space for at least two off-street parking space to the front driveway.
- ☐ 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 23/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – received 16/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – received 16/05/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. A06 received 16/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. A02 received 16/05/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. A03 received 16/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. A04 received 16/05/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. A05 received 18/06/2024

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 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	17/07/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	18/07/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen