

Application Number:	23/01035/HOUS
Location:	3 Beechfield Rochdale OL11 5PA
Proposal:	Part first floor / part single storey side and rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Manzoor Ahmed
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	NO

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

3 Beechfield is a two storey detached residential dwelling located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale.

The property's frontage faces onto the highway and sits perpendicular to the house to the west, no.50 Norden Road. On-site parking is accommodated to the front of the dwelling by virtue of a 23m driveway and the curtilage borders 48-54 Norden Road, 5 Beechfield and 33-37 Porritt Close.

The dwelling to the immediate east, no.5 Beechfield previously obtained planning permission in 1994 for the addition of a two-storey side extension constructed up to the common boundary and retaining a gap from the side elevation of the application property of around 0.8m.

The property also hosts a single storey flat roof side extension with a white clad horizontal board above.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a part first floor / part single storey side and rear extension projecting up to the common boundary shared with 50 Norden Road and acting as a continuation of the existing dwelling, matching the roof ridge and pitched roof style.

The first floor rear portion of the extension would also host a pitched roof perpendicular to that on the main dwellinghouse and project 2.3m from the rear of the main house. The single storey rear extension would be of conservatory style and design and project 3.4m from the newly formed two storey rear extension with a

hipped roof style. Materials, aside from those for the conservatory, are to match those on the existing house.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

No comments received at time of writing

Highways and Engineering

The proposed extension would seem to have no impact on current parking provision and arrangements for this property, which are in line with Council parking standards.

The current servicing arrangements for this dwelling would be unaffected by the proposed extensions.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

In conclusion, Highways would raise no objection to this application, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No public 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:

G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

As required by policy P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016), all development proposals are expected to demonstrate that where relevant they will adhere to outlined design principals such as “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;”

The overall development is considered to significantly increase the visual massing of the existing dwellinghouse and in addition, together with the lack of subservience, is not considered to present an acceptable standard of design for this dwelling.

The first floor portion of the extension projects a proportionate distance from the rear of the house, however, the single storey conservatory addition is not considered to respect the scale of the existing dwelling given the projection of the conservatory alone is over half the depth of the extended dwelling therefore appears disproportionate in length.

In reference to the overall street scene, 3 Beechfield is sited on an estate characterized by residential properties featuring a variation of forms. The overall design is considered to follow the character of those along Beechfield Close therefore the proposed development is considered to visually respect the overall street scene.

It is noted the adjacent dwelling, no.5 Beechfield Close obtained permission for a two storey side extension which is considered large in its overall scale. By virtue of the siting of the adjacent side extension up to the common boundary and forward of the parent dwellings principal elevation, this together with the siting of both original dwelling houses is considered to disrupt the overall form of the siting’s. To add a side extension at the scale proposed and over half the width of the existing dwelling would therefore give further rise to disproportionate additions in relation to the plots on nos. 3 and 5 and disrupt the form of the original dwelling.

Where appropriate, the development has utilized the existing material palette to remain in keeping with the visual amenity of the host dwelling.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy which states “proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents through overshadowing or loss of privacy and that extensions should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties”.

The SPD does not explicitly set out guidance for first floor side extensions however, in assessing the impact to surrounding properties, it is clear that where the first floor addition extends up to the common boundary, there is to be an overbearing impact to the rear garden of the dwelling perpendicular to the application property, no.50 Norden Road. The rear elevation of no.50 hosts a separation distance of approx.10m from the common boundary shared with no.3 Beechfield Close. Whilst it is noted an approx. 2m fence as well as foliage runs along the common boundary to provide a degree of screening, the height of the extension from ground floor is proposed to match the existing dwelling at 4m therefore exceeds the presence of any boundary treatment. Further to this, no.50 faces south therefore receives maximum sunlight to the rear garden, if the extension were to be approved, any addition close to the boundary is considered to negatively impact upon this.

The first floor extension would be in relatively close proximity to windows located on the rear elevation of no.50 Norden Road. It has not been possible to establish whether these are principal windows to habitable rooms, but if this was the case then the impact of the proposal upon these in terms of visual intrusion would likely be unacceptable.

There is not considered to be any unacceptable impact to the adjacent dwelling, no.5 Beechfield Close, nor those which share common boundaries at the rear, nos. 33-37 Porrit Close.

With reference to the adjacent property along the southern boundary, 54 Norden Road, the first floor window close to the common boundary is considered to present a degree of overlooking to the rear garden. Whilst this window would be perpendicular to the garden, the close proximity to the common boundary therefore makes the overlooking unacceptable.

Where appropriate, all principal windows to habitable rooms are considered to comply with Section 4 separation distances. It is noted there is a proposed window to the first floor side elevation of the first floor extension which directly faces the side elevation of the extension at no.5 Beechfield however, whilst this is a habitable room, it hosts two windows of the same size therefore although the separation distance would only be 10m, short 4m of that required for principal windows directly facing a blank two storey elevation, it is not considered to be so harmful given another window is located on the upper floor elevation which receives both adequate light and outlook.

The proposed works ensures the provision of a suitably sized rear garden would be retained post-development. The works would also not pose any detrimental impact to the provision of adequate light and outlook to existing internal rooms of the host property.

In view of the above assessment, the development is considered to result in an unacceptable negative impact upon the amenity of nos. 50 and 54 Norden Road and would therefore not be in accordance with policy DM1, the SPD and NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Aforementioned above, the plot hosts an approx. 23m driveway to the front of the dwelling sufficient for 2+ car parking spaces therefore in exceedance of Appendix 5 Schedule of Car Parking Standards.

The development is also not considered to impact upon road or pedestrian safety.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Trees: G7

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states "Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change".

No comments were received from the tree officer at time of writing however, the two protected trees to the rear of the rear garden are considered a sufficient distance away from development therefore does not raise any substantial concern.

Recommendation: Refuse

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.

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	29.11.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	07.12.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for the Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, the above decision relates to the following plans;

- Location Plan
- A02 Proposed Plans
- A03 Proposed Elevations
- A06 Proposed Block Plan
- Proposed Site Plan

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo