

Application Number:	23/01212/HOUS
Location:	26 Belton Avenue, Rochdale, OL16 2TY
Proposal:	Two storey side, first floor rear extension and front porch.
Applicant:	Mr Tahir Mahmood
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 26 Belton Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a mid-20th century housing development in Belfield. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 24 Belton Avenue to the north-west, adjacent to nos. 28-30 Belton Avenue to the south-east, and faces the highways to the north-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders an access road which serves properties along Belton Avenue, Blackstone Avenue, Albert Royds Street and Bellshill Crescent.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought a two-storey side extension which projects 1.5m from the side elevation of the dwelling and an existing single-storey rear extension. The extension is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with matching ridge and eaves height. This is joined by a front porch extension which projects 0.7m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.09m and a height to eaves of 2.42m.

The proposal also seeks to construct a first-floor rear extension which projects 2.4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form and is set down from the ridge by 0.79m with matching height to eaves.

The submitted plans also indicate an alteration of the flat roof form of the existing rear extension to a lean-to roof form, as well as alteration to the rear elevation fenestration.

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

Relevant History

14/00962/HOUS - Two storey side and rear extension including loft conversion, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension. – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

1. The proposed extension would have a rearward projection of 4 metres at ground floor and 3 metres at first floor along the shared boundary with no. 24 Belton Avenue and in close proximity to no. 28. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' requires that, in such circumstances, extensions project no more than 3 metres at ground floor and 2.4 metres at first floor, in order to protect the amenity of adjoining residents. The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, layout, massing and proximity to the shared boundary with both adjoining properties (including the presence of habitable room windows close to the shared boundary), would have an unacceptable and harmful impact on the amenity of adjoining residents through overshadowing and loss of outlook. The impact on no. 28 would be further exacerbated by virtue of its staggered relationship (set forward) in relation to the application dwelling. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the requirements of Unitary Development Plan policy H/11 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note – Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development.

14/01215/HOUS - Two storey side and rear extension including loft conversion, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension (Resubmission of 14/00962/HOUS) - Grant subject to conditions

23/00358/HH42 - Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 6.00m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.60m and height to eaves to 2.40m) - Prior Approval Not Required

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Vehicle access into the property is via an unadopted access to its rear where some internal parking already exists. From the submitted plans the rear extension appears to extend into the parking area, although the application form indicates that there would be no impact on parking provision. For the size of the extended property Highways would expect the provision of two viable off street parking spaces to meet Council standards.

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

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

Highways would raise no objection to this application subject to the provision of two off street parking spaces, and request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One supporting letter was 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 were made to alter the roof form of the single-storey rear extension from a lean-to roof form to a hipped roof form.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 135 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 application dwelling is characterised by a prominent front-projecting gable wall and bay windows. The main section of the dwelling is marginally set back from the gable wall and is already understood to be subordinate to the front gable feature. The proposed two-storey side extension would extend the ridge line of the dwelling by 1.5m. Given the existing built forms and the insubstantial projection, the proposed extension would not be viewed to dominate the host dwelling and would be acceptable in this context.
- ❑ Likewise, no concerns are had with any potential harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’, owing to the massing of the dwelling and its distinct built forms to the adjacent terraced dwellings.
- ❑ The proposed first-floor rear extension is set below the ridge line and would be subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a gable-fronted roof form would also appear in keeping.
- ❑ It is noted the cumulative impacts of the proposed first-floor rear extension with the existing single-storey rear extension would add substantial massing to the rear elevation of the dwelling which would be visible from the rear curtilages of neighbouring properties. However, the housing estate in question has been designed in such a way that the rear curtilage space is primarily used as off-street parking spaces, with vehicular entry specifically designed to be accessed from the access road. The rear curtilage spaces are also separated by low boundary treatments, with little in the way of privacy between properties. As such, the rear amenity spaces of the properties are generally considered to be of low recreational value and of little visual merit in the context of the access road. Notwithstanding, the applicant has agreed to amend the single-storey rear extension roof from a lean-to roof to a hipped roof form which would reduce its dominance to the rear. Given this and taking into account of the site context, it is considered the proposal would not result in adverse visual harm to the surrounding area and would be acceptable on balance.

- ☐ The proposal also seeks to construct a front porch extension which would join the proposed side extension. Whilst it is noted front porches are not original features of dwellings within the locality, the proposed front porch is of a modest scale which is set back 5.71m from the highway. The use of a lean-to roof would also be consistent with the form of the existing front porch canopies of the dwellings. Taken as a whole, it is considered the proposed porch would not appear an overly obtrusive feature to the dwelling and would not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene, which would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ It is acknowledged the proposed side extension would sever access for refuse bin to be stored away from public view. However, it is noted the storage of refuse bins to the front of dwellings has been an established arrangements along neighbouring properties. On this basis, it is considered the proposed arrangements would not result in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and would be acceptable.
- ☐ 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 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey or first-floor rear 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. However, Section 5.10 notes *“where there is a single storey extension at the rear of the neighbouring property which is close to the common boundary, the 2.4m distance will be taken from a point 3m along the common boundary from the nearest point of the first floor of the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposed side extension does not project beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling. A separation distance of 32.5m from the rear habitable room windows of no. 269 Albert Royds Street and 19.5m from its rear curtilage boundary would be maintained. As such, the amenity impacts to the front and rear facing occupiers would be acceptable.

- ☐ As it stands, adjacent nos. 28-30 Belton Avenue comprises a part-two, part-single storey rear extension which projects 5m on the ground floor and 2.4m on the first-floor. The proposed first-floor rear extension and two-storey side extension projects an additional 1m from the rear elevation of the existing first-floor extension of nos. 28-30. As such, the amenity impacts of the proposed development would be acceptable.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 5.6 of the SPD, the proposed front porch extension is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to the adjoining occupiers and would be acceptable.
- ☐ 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 three to four and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The constructed single-storey rear extension has reduced the existing parking spaces to the rear curtilage space. Notwithstanding, sufficient space is retained for two off-street parking spaces, on top of the existing on and off-street parking spaces along Belton Avenue and the unadopted access road.
- ☐ 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 and Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 1 Rev. B received 16/04/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 2 Rev. A received 16/04/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 3 Rev. B received 16/04/2024

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 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 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	01/05/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	02/05/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen