

Application Number:	23/00559/HOUS
Location:	221 Albert Royds Street Rochdale OL16 2TJ
Proposal:	Part single ground and first floor rear extension - Resubmission of 23/00009/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr Manawar Khan
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. 221 Albert Royds Street, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Belfield. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 219 Albert Royds Street to the north-west and faces the highway to the south-west. The side and rear boundary of the curtilage borders an access road which serves the rear of properties fronting Albert Royds Street, Eafield Road, Clover Hall Crescent and Beal Crescent. The property faces the A664, a prominent thoroughfare in Rochdale, to the south-west.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-single storey, part-first floor extension which projects approx. 2.89m from the rear elevation of the original dwelling. The resulting development is characterised by a hipped roof and has a ridge height of approx. 6.05m and an eaves height of approx. 5.48m. This is accompanied by the addition of a window and door to the existing rear extension wall and the alteration of the window to the first-floor rear facing bedroom.

The application is a resubmission of a previous application 23/00009/HOUS with amendments made to omit the previously proposed rear dormer and front roof light.

The proposed rear extension roof would be constructed from tiles, whilst the proposed walls and fenestration would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

23/00009/HOUS - Part single ground and first floor rear extension with rear dormer and 1no window to front elevation and alteration to rear fenestration – Refuse

Officer's Comment

1. By virtue of its elevated siting, scale, bulky massing and design, which sees the hipped roof of the first floor extension adjoin its rear elevation, the proposed rear dormer would constitute a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the host dwelling roof slope which would not be well-designed and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Given the arrangement of dwellings to the rear and the existence of a shared alleyway, the dormer would sit in a prominent location and would cause significant visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would not be well-designed and therefore fails to 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. The proposals would result in undue amenity harm to the occupants of the host dwelling by means of an inadequate provision of natural light and outlook to the first-floor rear bedroom and the front-facing attic bedroom. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies 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.

23/00560/CPL - Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed rear dormer and roof light to front roof slope - Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Having reviewed the submitted plans, the changes made from the previous application 23/00009/HOUS would require no changes to Highway's previous comments which were;

It would appear that the existing dwelling does not have any off-street parking provision and relies on on-street parking. As this dwelling has operated without off-street parking it would be difficult to sustain an objection to the proposed extension on this basis.

The current servicing arrangements would remain unchanged as a result of the development.

Highways do not expect there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the proposed development.

Highways raise no objection to this application or ask for any specific planning conditions.

Representations

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

- ☐ The proposed works may cause damage to the adjacent property;
- ☐ Concerns over potential noise and air pollution from construction;
- ☐ Concerns over loss of privacy to the adjacent rear garden;
- ☐ Concerns over lack of maintenance of space following construction, including blockage of drainage;
- ☐ Safety concerns over the outdoor use of the garden as a result of the proposal.

Officer's Comment:

- ☐ Concerns over overlooking impacts are addressed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns over property damage, maintenance and noise and air pollution are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

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 have been made to rearrange the internal layouts of the first floor, including the replacement of the proposed bedrooms to the rear elevation, and to amend the width of the rear-facing bedrooms.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ 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 proposal seeks to construct a rear extension to the ground floor and first floor. Whilst two-storey rear extensions are not common in the immediate locality, given the use of a hipped roof set down from the ridge which would be subservient and the 2.89m rear projection which would not be overly prominent from the highway, on balance, the proposed rear extension is considered to be acceptable.
- ❑ Materials of the proposed walls and fenestration would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ❑ It is considered the proposed rear extension fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ❑ 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 states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:

☐ *“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.”*

- ☐ Given the approx. 26m distance between the principal window of the proposed first-floor bedroom and the directly-facing habitable room window of rear-facing no. 16 Clover Hall Crescent, and the approx. 16m distance from the rear curtilage boundary of no. 16, it is considered the proposed development would not cause significant amenity harm in this respect.
- ☐ Section 5.9 of the SPD states two storey extensions to semi-detached dwellings 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.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension does not project beyond the existing approx. 2.89m rear extension. It also does not exceed a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjoining no. 219. As such, the overbearing and overshadowing impacts of the proposed development would be acceptable.
- ☐ Amendments to the internal layouts have been accepted to ensure adequate levels of natural light to the rear bedroom windows which would ensure an acceptable standard of living for its occupants. It is acknowledged the bedroom to the eastern corner of the dwelling would comprise an internal floor area of 6.03m², which falls short of the minimum space standard set out in the *“Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard”*. It is noted however, the local planning authority has worked with the applicant to amend the bedroom to meet the minimum width set out in the space standards. Regard has also been had to the existing front bedroom which comprises a floor area of 5.96m². On this basis, given the limited existing floor area, it is considered the proposal would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ It is also considered the proposed development would retain sufficient garden space with a functional layout for its occupiers.
- ☐ 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 five and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The current parking arrangements for the host property comprise of one off-street parking space to the front driveway and another to the rear curtilage space. It is also noted that on-street parking on Albert Royds Street and its associated access road is common for occupiers within the locality. On this basis, the proposed development would retain sufficient parking space for its occupants.

- ☐ 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 – received 25/05/2023
☐ Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. A1977/1 received 25/05/2023
☐ Proposed Site Plan and Floor Plans – Drawing No. A1977/2 received 02/10/2023
☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. A1977/3 received 02/10/2023

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	04/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	06/10/2023	Signed: RK

