

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/01157/FUL

CASE OFFICER

Rosalind Gralton

DETERMINATION DATE 06.02.2025

Address: 2, 4 & 6 Sutcliffes Place Rochdale OL11 2ES

Proposal: Change of use of existing storage buildings to three no' 1 bedroom dwellinghouses

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	NA

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NA
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	NA
-----	--	----

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

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RG

DATE: 05/02/2025

SITE

The site is a terraced two storey building behind Oldham Road adjacent to Wareings Yard. The site is dominated by hard landscaping with multiple gated entrances, characterised by the paraphernalia that is associated with the rear of commercial buildings, including waste bins, air conditioning units and flues.

The planning application states the former use of the site was for storage, however no planning records indicate the last lawful use of the building. Street view imagery indicates the building appears to have been vacant for a significant number of time, including a roller shutter on the door of one of the properties.

To the west is a dental practice. To the east, the rear of properties facing onto Oldham Road, which include businesses at ground floor such as a cleaning services, optician, and a restaurant.

The site is adjacent to Oldham Road/Kingsway Local Centre. The site is not within the setting of any listed building or conservation area. The site does not include any tree protection orders.

The front elevation of the property faces south onto the rear outrigger of the property occupying Blue Diamond Chinese Restaurant, along Wareings Yard. The rear is partly adjoined to the side elevation of properties on Oldham Road.

To demonstrate the relationship between the adjacent buildings, an aerial image has been provided below:



Figure 1: Aerial image of the site location
Source: Google Maps (2024)

When the site visit was carried out, it is noted the works were retrospective.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of a storage unit to 3no 1 bedroom, 2 storey residential dwellinghouses.

Each property would have a living room/kitchen/diner downstairs, and bedroom and en-suite bathroom upstairs. All properties would have one single window opening at ground and first floor on the southern elevation.

The supporting planning statement states no external alterations have been carried out to facilitate the development, however street view imagery from September 2024 shows replacement doors, reinstated window openings, and application of render/ grey paint to the external of the building is present.

Bin storage is proposed at the front of the building, between the rear outrigger of No 222 Oldham Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places For Everyone

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-H3 Type, Size and Design of New Housing

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

DM1 - General Development Requirements

C1 - Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places

C3 - Delivering the Right Type of Housing

P3 - Improving design of new development

G9 - Reducing the impact of pollution

T2 - Improving Accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 – Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

None applicable

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

No objections, no concerns regarding highway safety. No concerns regarding servicing.

Env Health - Noise/Odours

Objection as a result of close proximity to nearby road and extraction units

Waste And Recycling Manager (Environmental Management)

No comments received to date

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by way of site notice and neighbour notification. Two responses were received objecting to the scheme with the concerns raised summarised below:

- The works have already been completed
- Concerns regarding parking and access and the impact on adjacent business
- Security concerns due to increased footfall and loss of access to premises
- Concern regarding compatibility of residential development adjacent to existing commercial and noisy premises
- Access and parking is not adequate for 3 dwellings.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The site is located within the defined urban area, with no other policy designations. The site is immediately to the rear/ west of the Oldham Road/Kingsway Local Centre. The property is situated in an area characterised by the rear of commercial buildings. It is presumed some first floors of the adjacent flats may be occupied by a residential use.

New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside. The site is an existing building and is within Kingsway Corridor, where under policy C2, the council will encourage the delivery of new housing to maximise opportunities with new residential development in and around the town centre.

In principle, given the site's sustainable location within the urban area, the proposal is to be considered in line with the aims of the NPPF, and relevant development plan policies for residential development. However, any development proposals on the site would also be assessed in terms of all other relevant material planning considerations, including technical assessment, to assess the suitability of the site for residential use and ensure it is compatible with surrounding land uses. The following paragraphs assess the relevant considerations as follows.

Residential Amenity and Design

Quality of Accommodation, Outlook and Daylight

In relation to the sizes of the dwellings, each unit would be 37.5sqm. This falls significantly short of the requirements within the Nationally Described Space Standards of 58sqm for a two storey, one bedroom dwelling. As such, all three dwellings would provide a poor level of accommodation with regards to internal space and would be contrary to the requirements of PfE Policy JP-H3.

The submitted Planning Statement states the distance between No 2 and No 4 Sutcliffe as being only 6m away from the side elevation of the outrigger of No 222 Oldham Road. However the distance is in fact approximately 4m directly south of the main elevation of the proposed homes. Given the relationship with the properties at a 90 degree angle to those situated on Oldham Road, the properties only benefit from outlook on the front (southern) elevation, with the only opening on the rear elevation a back door on No 6 Sutcliffe. The proposed outlook, especially that of Nos 2 and 4 Sutcliffe, would primarily be onto a two storey side elevation wall, with the fire escape of the neighbouring restaurant. Due to this relationship, the outlook of the proposed properties is entirely inappropriate and would result in a very poor quality of accommodation, which is also highly unlikely to receive suitable day and sunlight. The resulting experience of the occupants would be that of a dark, oppressive environment, with virtually no outlook for No 2 and No 4. Additionally, the bedroom window of No 2 is sited immediately adjacent to two air conditioning units, and the sole window into the downstairs living space would have outlook into a dark corner of

the properties, characterised by commercial paraphernalia associated with the back yard area of a restaurant use. The overall appearance and perception of the site was not residential in character, nor would it be a suitable use for the property given the relationship with the commercial uses and the living environment this would create.

The shortcomings of this arrangement is illustrated in Photo 1 below:



Photo 1: Photo of southern/front elevation of application site at 2, 4 and 6 Sutcliffe Place. Source: Case Officer Site Visit Photos.

The proposal would provide a wholly insufficient level of residential amenity for future occupants and would be to the detriment of any future residents. As such the proposal would not be in compliance with the requirements of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF or DM1 of the Core Strategy.

No details have been provided of the existing fencing that runs across the application site. Additionally, it has not been provided how the waste storage, and servicing arrangements of the restaurant (the access to which is sought from directly opposite the proposed dwellings) would coexist with the proposed residential dwellings. The proposed bin storage of the dwellings is proposed within this front yard area, which is within the red line boundary of the site. It is noted that regardless of the red line boundary, this area is likely to also be the area for storage of commercial waste for the restaurant. This relationship with the bin storage area would further exacerbate the extremely poor quality of outlook and amenity for residents.

The properties do not benefit from any external amenity space, with the only external space within the red line boundary dedicated to bin storage, which, if implemented as shown on plans exactly, will be located directly outside the entrance door to No 2 Sutcliffe Place and outside the ground floor habitable room window of No 4. In relation to occupier amenity and access to green outdoor space, the properties are located in a relatively urban environment behind a local centre, and approximately 300m east of a local playground and park. As such, it is not considered the lack of

outdoor amenity space included within the proposed site, would in isolation provide a poor level of amenity for the occupants, or result in a reason for refusal, however it would further exacerbate the aforementioned concerns with general residential amenity.

Noise

Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy requires that all development proposals are compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents.

Development should not affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and development should mitigate against any impacts due to noise, dust, light and odour pollution. Policy G9 also requires that sensitive new development such as housing, are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution such as roads and certain types of industry.

Paragraph 191 of the NPPF requires planning decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects on health, living conditions and natural environment, as well as the impacts that may arise from the development.

The NPPF requires planning decisions to firstly understand any potential adverse impacts resulting from noise, and secondly, where they are likely, for developments to mitigate and reduce them. In the absence of a noise assessment with the application, it is not known whether the proposal's location at the rear of multiple commercial uses, close to a busy road network and number of extraction units, will give rise to adverse impacts on noise to the occupiers of the properties. Accordingly, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed residential development is compatible with the surrounding land uses and location adjacent to a busy highway network.

In the instance the application were to be approved, a noise impact assessment would be requested from the applicant.

Design

The existing and proposed plans show virtually no external changes as a result of the proposals, it is clear windows and door openings have been reinstated to the building as a result of the works and UPVC windows and doors installed. In addition, it is indicated render or paint has been applied externally to the building in a dark grey colour.

The use of UPVC doors and windows is acceptable. While the grey paintwork/render is not desirable, in this location it is acceptable on balance.

Residential amenity of neighbours

The property is located in an area characterised by commercial uses. It is acknowledged, above the ground floor commercial use along Oldham Road, some first floor residential properties may be occupied. However, given the size of the dwellings it is not considered this would have an unacceptable impact on any potential neighbouring properties amenity. As such, it is not considered the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of nearby adjacent residential properties.

Highways

The development includes no off-street parking however the Council's Highways Officers have been consulted on the application and raise no objections to the proposed development in respect of parking and road safety given its location, nor raise any concerns about the servicing of the development.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1. The proposal would result in homes providing sub-standard living conditions as a result of extremely poor outlook, limited daylight, and a substantial shortfall in internal amenity space which fails to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. The homes would provide poor quality residential accommodation that would have a detrimental impact on the wellbeing of any future occupants. For these reasons the proposals are contrary to Policies JP-P1, JP-P6, and JP-H3 of Places for Everyone, Policies G9 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Insufficient information in the form of a noise assessment has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development is compatible with the surrounding uses, and will not harm the living conditions of occupiers from increased noise. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 and G9 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, the Decision Notice relates to the following drawings:

Location Plan
Proposed Floor plans – 2229/2
Proposed Elevations – 2229/3
Existing Elevations and Floor Plans – 2229/1