APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01295/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01295/HOUS
Location:	160 Belfield Road Rochdale OL16 2XT
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension and alteration to fenestration on front elevation
Applicant:	Mr Riaz Hussain
Case Officer:	Ryan Killeen
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?	**N**

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

Location

The application site is a two-storey terraced house set within a run of eight such properties along the southern side of Belfield Road east of Rochdale's Town Centre. The site has a rear access road, beyond which stands a further run of terraced houses on Belfield Old Road. The property has a small rear yard area of 4.0 metres in depth and spanning the width of the property at 6.1 metres. The site lies within the defined urban area.

Description of Proposal

The application proposes to add a two-storey extension to the rear of the property to provide a kitchen/dining room to the ground floor and two additional bedrooms to the first floor.

The extension would project 2.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, spanning the full 6.1m of the rear elevation. The extension would be complete with a hipped roof with a slightly set down (0.3m) eaves, and ridge height. The resultant rear yard would be 1.2m x 6.1m.

The proposal is to be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling.

Relevant History

14/00320/HOUS Two Storey Rear Extension

Refused – 16 April 2014

Reasons:

1. The proposed extension would result in rear facing windows across the alleyway between principal elevations being separated by only 8.8 metres when the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance requires a distance of 21 metres to be achieved. Whilst it is recognised that the existing distance between the properties is already less that the SPG distance at 11.6 metres, the lowering of this already sub-standard distance would lead to an overbearing impact on the occupiers of the houses on Belfield Old Road and a consequent loss of privacy and amenity. Accordingly, the proposed development is unacceptable as it is contrary to Criterion c) of Policy H/11 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan UDP Policy H/11 and the guidance of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development'.

2. The area proposed to be covered by the extension would result in an overdevelopment of the site as it would leave a very small area of the rear yard as amenity space for future residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to criterion d) of Policy H/11 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the guidance of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development'.

3. The extension proposed would set an undesirable precedent for similar proposals of an unacceptable scale and footprint which would be cumulatively harmful to the area. The application is therefore contrary to Policies G/BE/1, BE/2 and H/11 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the guidance of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development'.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding dwellings, no responses have been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

The appearance of the extension is considered to be acceptable in visual terms. The use of a hipped roof and matching materials ensures a satisfactory appearance. Whilst the inclusion of differing height to eaves is considered a poor design choice, it can be considered acceptable by virtue of the siting of the extension at the rear of the dwelling out of the context of Belfield Road, and in an area with generally poor standards of visual amenity.

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 Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

As the proposal would extend 2.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, with the rear elevation flush with the rear elevation of extensions of adjacent dwellings,

the view is taken that the proposal would not result in undue overshadowing or overbearing impact on the windows of nos.158 and 162 Belfield Road.

However, by virtue of exceedance of the minimum distance standards of section 4.1, some concerns are raised over residential amenity.

The contents of section 4.1 of the SPD which are of particular relevance to this application are:

> *All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings. The following minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties:*
>
> *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;*
> *II. 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;*

In light of the above, the 8m distance left between the rear elevation of the resultant applicant dwelling and the directly facing neighbour is considered to contravene all three of the above standards, and would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and unacceptable level of overshadowing and overbearing impact for the occupants of nos. 29 & 31 Belfield Old Road.

Whilst it is recognised that the relationship between the dwellings is substandard at present with only 11.5m of spacing between the rear elevations of the two properties, reducing this distance further is only going to worsen the limited privacy and create an unacceptable overbearing impact.

When considering the residential amenity impacts of a development, it is important to consider the impacts on the current and future occupiers. In considering this, section 5.4 of the SPD states:

> *"It is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable."*

It is considered that the resulting 7.2m^2 rear garden with an elongated form would be unacceptable for a four bedroom dwelling as it would be unable to accommodate the reasonable needs of most occupiers of a four-bedroom dwelling. As such, it is considered that the proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the plot.

In light of the above analysis, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would fail to accord with the requirements of the Adopted Core Strategy, The Guidelines

and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, and would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and the occupants of the resultant applicant dwelling.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of the reduction in distance between the directly facing rear elevations of the applicant dwelling and properties to the rear, the proposed two-storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear windows and courtyards of No.29 and No.31 Belfield Old Road, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. This harm would be further compounded through an unacceptable level of overshadowing and overbearing impact on the ground floor rear windows and courtyards of these properties. The application therefore fails to accord with the policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposed two-storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable standard of residential amenity for the existing and future occupants of the resultant dwelling through the lack of provision of a suitably sized rear garden area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM1 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.

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan
- 1657/1 – Existing Elevations and Floor Plans
- 1657/2 – Proposed Site Plan and Floor Plans
- 1657/3 – Proposed Elevations

	Date	**Officer**
Report Completed	27/10/2020	Signed: RK
Authorisation	26/11/2020	Signed: KN

Report Author Ryan Killeen