

Application Number:	24/01150/HOUS
Location:	64 Birchfield Drive Rochdale OL11 4NY
Proposal:	First floor roof extension to side and rear
Applicant:	Mrs Shabnam Ahmed
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

Location

This application relates to no. 64 Birchfield Drive, a link detached bungalow. The property has a catslide roof and a flat roof attached garage. The property faces west, with the rear garden area on the eastern side of the property. Beyond the garden area is an area of land known as Marland Mill Farm. A public right of way (RocFFp13) is located north east of the site

The application property benefits from an existing single storey rear extension.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a first floor roof extension atop the existing flat roof garage and single storey rear extension. A dormer window would be erected to the front elevation, and the first floor extension to the rear would have a pitched roof at two storey. The extensions would be constructed in brickwork and slate to match the existing materials.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:
G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:
P3 Improving Design of New Development
DM1 General Development Requirements

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

N/A

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

No formal objection letters received.

Assessment

Design and Visual Amenity:

CS Policies P3 and DM1 require development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraph 131 of NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF explains that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The proposals would constitute a substantial volumetric increase in roof space, transforming the modest bungalow into a much larger, and more dominant, building that would have a substantial, box-like structure to the rear, particularly when viewed from the neighbouring garden space. The resultant dwelling would have an unusual built form and appear cramped and unbalanced by comparison to the adjoining property.

The design of the rear and front dormers would bear little relation to the proportions and simple design of the existing property and would appear imbalanced from the front, particularly when read with 62 Birchfield Drive. The proposed front dormer is boxed in design (albeit with a pitched roof), and bears little resemblance to the proportions of the windows across the front fenestration, which further emphasizes the incongruous nature of the proposal.

The flat roof first floor rear extension would have a substantial scale, extending above the existing single storey, with an eaves height of 5.6m adjacent to the adjoining neighbour. This eaves height adjacent to the neighbour is significantly higher than the existing eaves height of 2.45m, and would add an additional storey onto the existing 2.25m rear extension. From the rear, the original design of the property would be lost due to the unsympathetic addition of the two storey projection and the first floor rear roof extension. The proposed rear elevation would also be highly visible from the public right of way which runs north east of the site, which further would exaggerate the size of the extension when compared to the adjoining property.



Photo 1: 64 Birchfield Drive (left) and the adjoining neighbour at No 62 Birchfield Drive. Source: Case Officer Site Photos.

Overall, the design of the proposal is considered to be unacceptable through its incongruous design relative to the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposal fails to accord with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policies JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

It is acknowledged that within the streetscene, some detached properties have extensions similar to the works proposed within this application. However, the differences in the context of a detached property when compared to this link-detached property is relevant, as the proposal would be built along the shared boundary line, with no distance away from the adjoining neighbouring property. As a result, the proposal would visually imbalance the properties, which are read together as a pair, form an incongruous addition with an overbearing impact upon the streetscene. This is in addition to the unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property, discussed below.

Residential Amenity:

Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, 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. This is reflected in both the NPPF and PfE, which establish the importance of achieving high standards of residential amenity.

The flat roof first floor rear extension would have a substantial scale, extending above the existing single storey, with an eaves height of 5.6m adjacent to the boundary with the adjoining neighbour. This eaves height adjacent to the neighbour is significantly higher than the existing eaves height of 2.45m, and would add an additional storey onto the existing rear extension, which projects 2.25m from the original rear elevation of the property along the shared boundary line.

The area to be extended at first floor would result in a two storey massing immediately adjacent to a habitable room window of the adjoining property at No 62. As such, this would result in an unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing impact on the occupant of this dwelling. While this may be a room served by

additional windows – it is unreasonable to disregard the over dominating appearance a two storey wall flush with the adjoined boundary would have upon this neighbour. The impact of loss of light to this room would be exacerbated at various times throughout the day, with many hours of the day this room would be in darkness.

It is also considered that the extension, again due to it's proximity to the boundary and eaves height, would result in an unacceptable overbearing effect on the rear garden of the same neighbouring property.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in conflict with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on highway safety	✓
Parking provision	✓

The proposed scheme would remove the existing garage door and replace with a side hung door which would not accommodate vehicle storage. Additionally the proposal would add 2 bedrooms to the property, it is considered there is sufficient parking on the property including room retained to the side, to accommodate the required number of vehicles in this instance. These proposals would not result in any unacceptable parking arrangements or unacceptable impact upon road safety. The proposal would have no unacceptable impact on the existing off-street parking arrangements and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of their size, scale, and design, the proposed extensions to the host dwelling would constitute incongruous and poorly designed additions that would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the streetscene and the appearance of the dwelling when read with the adjoined property at No 62. The proposal does not therefore accord with policies DM1, P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed rear first floor extension would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of occupiers of 62 Birchfield Drive, due to the very close proximity a 5.6m high wall, along the shared boundary, would have upon the light provided into the ground floor habitable room window of No 62. Additionally, the proposal would result in an unduly overbearing impact upon the rear amenity space of the neighbouring property, by way of its size and scale. The proposed extension will result in a poor level of amenity upon the users of No 62 Birchfield Drive. As such it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies G9, P1 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not

comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	04/02/2025	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	06/02/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Rosalind Gralton