

Application Number:	23/00490/HOUS
Location:	10 Belmont Way, Rochdale, OL12 6HR
Proposal:	Two-storey rear, single-storey front extension, alteration to fenestration on side elevation following demolition of existing rear conservatory
Applicant:	Miss Zaeema Khan
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. 10 Belmont Way, a two-storey detached dwelling in mock Tudor style located in a residential estate in Healey. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 8 Belmont Way to the east, adjacent to no. 12 Belmont Way to the west, and faces the highway to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 9 Dew Meadow Close to the north. The property benefits from a detached garage to the rear and substantial hardstanding to the side of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey front extension which projects 1.5m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.49m and a height to eaves of 2.77m.

The proposal also seeks to construct a two-storey rear extension which projects 4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory. It is characterised by a hipped roof form and is set down 0.2m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves.

Additionally, the submitted plans indicate the addition of two windows on the first floor west-facing side elevation to accommodate an en-suite and bathroom.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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

Amendments have been made to reduce the width of the proposed single-storey front extension by 3.77m.

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 sited below the ridge line of the host dwelling which would be subservient. The use of a hipped roof form would also appear in keeping.
- ❑ The proposed front extension would project beyond the currently unbroken building line of nos. 10, 12 and 14 Belmont Way. However, it is noted that single-storey front extensions have been constructed in numerous neighbouring dwellings of the same house type, with some benefiting from planning permission and others appearing extant. The effect of this is that a material change in the appearance of the street scene has occurred since the completion of the housing development, to such an extent that the proposed front extension would not constitute a wholly out of keeping and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling. Given this site context, and considering amendments have been accepted to reduce the width of the extension, the visual impact of the proposal on the street scene would be acceptable on balance.
- ❑ Additionally, the single-storey form of the proposed front extension and the lean-to roof form would constitute acceptable design.
- ❑ 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 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 detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*

- ☐ For the purpose of this assessment, the space standards outlined in Section 5.5 would also apply to extensions from the front elevation.
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey 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 front extension projects 1.5m from the front elevation of the host dwelling and would comply with Section 5.5.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension does not directly face any habitable room windows to the rear and complies with the requirements of Section 5.9 in terms of amenity impact to no. 12.
- ☐ Notwithstanding the limited 6m separation distance between the proposed rear extension and the west-facing side elevation of no. 8, it is noted the projection would not directly obstruct any habitable room windows to no. 8 and would mostly enclose the hardstanding between the properties. As such, the impacts to the outlook of no. 8 would be acceptable.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ 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 proposed development would not impact on the 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 09/05/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – received 09/05/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – received 09/05/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 2 dated 03/2023
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 1 dated 03/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 3 Rev. 1 received 06/11/2023
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 4 Rev. 1 received 06/11/2023

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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the west-facing side elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with Policy 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	02/01/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	03/01/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen