

Application Number:	23/00634/HOUS
Location:	199 Belfield Lane, Rochdale, OL16 2XU
Proposal:	Two storey front, side and rear extension following demolition of detached garage
Applicant:	Monwara Begum
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

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. 199 Belfield Lane, a two-storey detached dwelling located in a late 20th century social housing development in Newbold. The dwelling is sited in a corner plot at the junction with Belfield Road and is adjacent to nos. 201 & 203 Belfield Road and no. 301 Belfield Lane to the north-east, adjacent to no. 197 Belfield Lane to the south-west, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the side curtilage of no. 182 Belfield Road to the north-west. The property is sited on an elevated position to the highway surrounded by grass verge and benefits from one off-street parking space and a single garage which forms part of three garages to north of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey front, side and rear wraparound extension following the demolition of the existing garage. The proposed extension projects 3.02m from the rear elevation, 3.88m from the side elevation, and 2.93m from the main front wall of the dwelling. The side extension continues the dual-pitched roof form and ridge line of the host dwelling, with the front and rear projections characterised by gable-fronted and hipped roof forms and set down up to 0.9m from the ridge with matching height to eaves.

The proposed plans also indicate the addition of a bay window with a 0.72m projection to the front elevation.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main concerns in regards to this planning application is parking provision, and these concerns relate to the applications site's position directly on the junction of Belfield Lane and Belfield Road. On-street parking in this location will increase accident potential and reduce junction capacity especially for larger service vehicles at this junction. The size of the extended dwelling would require two off-street parking spaces to be provided as part of the development proposals which Highways would require.

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 if the required off-street parking spaces can be provided. If permission was to be granted Highways would request no specific planning conditions.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. Six objection letters were received with the following concerns:

- ❑ The proposed extension is not in keeping with surrounding area.
- ❑ The proposal would spoil the view of existing greenery in the corner plot.
- ❑ The proposed extension would further restrict light to the adjacent properties.
- ❑ The proposal would result in loss of privacy to the adjacent property.
- ❑ The proposal would remove its existing off-street parking space and result in more traffic and parking problems.
- ❑ The property is located by a blind bend on the highway where vehicles travel at speed; the proposal would further restrict the view of ongoing traffic and cause harm to highway safety.

- ☐ Concerns the proposal would be converted into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).
- ☐ Concerns over the impact of the proposal on the attached garages.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating to the visual amenity impacts are addressed under the 'Design and Appearance' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to loss of light and privacy are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to highway safety and parking provisions are addressed under the 'Highways and Parking' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to conversion to HMO are addressed under the 'Other Considerations' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns over access to and/or damages to the neighbouring property relate to the provisions under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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:

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.
- ☐ Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states *“development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”*
- ☐ As it stands, the immediate street scene is characterised by modestly-sized semi-detached and detached dwellings that are uniform in their regular built forms and unbroken building line.
- ☐ The proposal would drastically overhaul the appearance of the host dwelling through substantial enlargements which result in a footprint of 115.68m², representing a 162% increase over the original floor space. The totality of the extensions would dominate the host dwelling and appear out of scale with the built form of the surrounding dwellings.
- ☐ Moreover, the proposed two-storey front extension and its front gable form would project forward of the established building line of nos. 191 to 199 and would constitute an intrusive and out of keeping addition to the street scene.
- ☐ By virtue of its siting on a corner plot, the host property benefits from a spacious garden space along the junction which contributes positively towards the character and appearance of the street scene. Section 5.14 of the SPD states that *“extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension.”* The proposed two-storey side extension would sever the existing garden space and result in only 1.45m of separation distance from the highway boundary, significantly compromising the sense of space and openness at this junction.

- ☐ Whilst there is no presence of a strong building line immediately along Belfield Road, the large expanse of brickwork of the proposed side extension measuring 13.95m wide would constitute an overbearing and oppressive feature onto the adjoining highway, further contributing to the visual harm already identified.
- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would constitute a wholly unsatisfactory standard of design and appearance and would inflict undue harm to the character of the surrounding street scene. The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, 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.”*
- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following relevant minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (ii) *“14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.”*
- ☐ Notwithstanding the proposed ground floor lounge window to the side extension wall, the front facing lounge window remains the larger window which serves the primary source for outlook and natural light for the occupants. Therefore, for the purposes of this assessment, the side window does not constitute a principal window and would be subject to the above space standard.
- ☐ The proposal would result in a two-storey side elevation wall measuring 13.95m in width and sited 12.58m from the front elevation windows of nos. 201 and 203 Belfield Road, which falls short of the standard set out in Section 4.1 (ii). Consequently, the proposed extension is likely to result in undue overbearing impacts and loss of outlook to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ With reference to Section 5.9 of the SPD, the proposed two-storey rear extension would project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjacent no. 197 by 0.3m. However, this exceedance is marginal and is not considered to amount to unacceptable levels of harm to the occupants of no. 197 which would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ Likewise, the proposed two-storey front extension has been assessed against Section 5.9, and is not considered to result in undue overshadowing impact to the proposed front bay window.
- ☐ For the avoidance of doubt, no amenity harm has been identified with regard to the proposed front and rear bedrooms, which do not directly face any habitable room windows and are sited in excess of 30m from the nearest property. The proposed front bay window would also accord with the requirements of Section 5.6 of the SPD and raises no concerns.

- ❑ Sufficient residual amenity space of a functional layout would be retained in the front and rear garden areas.
- ❑ Notwithstanding, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of nos. 201 and 203 Belfield Road and would fail to accord 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 five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ❑ As it stands, the current parking arrangement comprises a single attached garage with one off-street parking space. The proposed extension would result in the demolition of the existing garage and an encroachment into the existing parking space. The submitted plans have not demonstrated where off-street parking would be accommodated within the site and thus it is likely the occupants would rely on on-street parking arrangements. Given the location of the property close to the turning point with Belfield Road, it is considered that the displacement of vehicles onto the highway would reduce junction capacity and increase accident potential, to the detriment of the highway safety of road users and pedestrians.
- ❑ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore unacceptable and would fail to accord with Policies T2 and DM1.

Other Considerations

- ❑ With regard to concerns relating to the potential conversion of the dwelling into House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), each planning application must be considered on their individual merits; the current proposal does not propose the conversion into HMO and thus would not be assessed as such.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its excessive scale, massing, siting and design, the proposed extension constitutes a disproportionate and incongruous addition which would dominate the host dwelling and result in an overdevelopment of the plot. The proposal would not be well-designed and would inflict undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. The proposal therefore fails to accords with Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council’s ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal would result in an expanse of brickwork to the north-east side elevation and would give rise to undue amenity harm to the habitable room windows of nos. 201 and 203 Belfield Road by means of overbearing impacts

and loss of outlook. The proposal therefore fails to accord with 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.

3. The proposed extension would result in the loss of off-street parking space for the proposed five-bedroom property, and would result in the displacement of vehicles onto the section of the carriageway close to the junction between Belfield Lane and Belfield Road. The proposed parking arrangements would be detrimental to the safety of highway users and pedestrians and is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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	17/09/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/09/2024	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 12/06/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 1487/1 received 06/09/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan and Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1487/2 received 06/09/2023
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1487/3 received 06/09/2023
- ☐ Proposed Elevations and Section Plan – Drawing No. 1487/4 received 08/11/2023

Report Author Sam Yuen