

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01195/HOUS**

|                                         |                                           |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b>              | 24/01195/HOUS                             |
| <b>Location:</b>                        | 82 Bellshill Crescent, Rochdale, OL16 2TU |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                        | First floor rear extension                |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                       | Mohammad Shahban                          |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>                    | Sam Yuen                                  |
| <b>DETERMINATION DATE</b><br>06.02.2025 | <b>EXT OF TIME</b><br><b>10.02.2025</b>   |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                  | <b>Refuse</b>                             |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>N</b> |

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

**Location**

The application relates to no. 82 Bellshill Crescent, a two-storey terraced property in a residential estate in Belfield. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 80 Bellshill Crescent to the east, adjoined by no. 84 Bellshill Crescent to the west, and faces the highway to the south. The rear curtilage boundary backs onto an access road which serves properties along Bellshill Crescent, Blackstone Avenue and Albert Royds Street.

**Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor rear extension which projects 2.97m from the rear elevation of the dwelling to accommodate two bedrooms, above an existing 6m single-storey rear extension. The extension is characterised by a hipped roof form and would be set down 1.14m from the ridge of the host dwelling with matching height to eaves.

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

**Relevant History**

20/01337/HH42 - Prior approval for a single storey extension measuring 6m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 2.9m and height to eaves at 2.9m) - Prior Approval Not Required

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

#### **Highways and Engineering**

The proposal will not impact upon the highway. Highways have no objections to the proposal.

### **Representations**

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

### **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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>P3</b>         | Improving Design of New Development |
| <b>DM1</b>        | General Development Requirements    |
| <b>T2</b>         | Improving Accessibility             |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | Schedule of Parking Standards       |

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

### **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 Policies 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.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor rear extension would be set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling and would be subservient. The use of a hipped roof form would appear in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ 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. 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. Notwithstanding, in the event the application is acceptable against all other material considerations, the applicant would be expected to incorporate a hipped roof on the single-storey rear extension to reduce its dominance.
- ☐ 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.

- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable on balance and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PpE 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.”*
- ☐ With reference to Section 5.9 of the SPD, the proposed first-floor rear extension would project circa 0.2m beyond a 30 degree line drawn 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjoining nos. 80 and 84. However, this projection is marginal and is not considered to amount to undue levels of overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the adjoining occupiers.
- ☐ Taking into account of Section 4.1 of the SPD, the proposed rear bedroom windows would be sited in excess of 39m and 22m from the directly-facing rear habitable room window and curtilage boundary of no. 16 Blackstone Avenue and would be acceptable in this regard.
- ☐ Notwithstanding, the proposed extension would create two additional bedrooms with an internal floor space of 4.45m<sup>2</sup> and 6.27m<sup>2</sup> respectively, both of which falls short of the minimum floor area of the *“Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard”*. Whilst it is acknowledged the dwelling comprises an existing front-facing bedroom with a floor space of 5.97m<sup>2</sup>, the additional bedrooms would nonetheless intensify the available living space and would fail to ensure a satisfactory standard of residential amenity for the host occupants.
- ☐ Concerns are also had with the amenity impacts of the existing rear-facing bedroom, which would see the size of its principal window reduced and moved to the side of the proposed 2.97m rear projection, significantly restricting its outlook and access to natural light.
- ☐ It is noted there are multiple discrepancies in the submitted proposed plans, including the absence of the rear-facing bedroom window on the proposed elevations and the chamfered corner of the proposed first floor plan. The applicant is advised to correct the proposed plans prior to resubmission.
- ☐ The proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the host occupants and would fail to accord with Policy 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 existing parking arrangements comprises of on-street parking on Bellshill Crescent, as well as parking to the rear access road, which would remain unchanged under the proposed plans.

- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

**Recommendation: Refuse**

1. The proposed first-floor rear extension would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling by means of inadequate provision of natural light and outlook to the existing rear-facing bedroom and insufficient internal floor areas to the proposed rear-facing bedrooms. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 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.

**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 | 07/02/2025 | Signed: SY |
| Authorisation    | 10/02/2025 | Signed: RK |

**INFORMATIVES**

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

- Location Plan – received 02/12/2024
- Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 2235/1 received 02/12/2024
- Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 2235/2 received 02/12/2024
- Proposed Elevations – Drawing no. 2235/3 received 02/12/2024

Report Author Sam Yuen