

Application Number:	24/01164/HOUS
Location:	10 Heald Close Rochdale OL12 7HJ
Proposal:	2NO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION
Applicant:	RUMA BEGUM
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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. 10 Heald Close; a two-storey detached property in Healey, Rochdale. Heald Close forms part of a wider residential estate, comprising detached houses of a similar design and material palette. The character of the area is typically suburban, consisting of medium density housing, soft landscaping and trees, and quiet streets.

No. 10 faces west, overlooking a front garden and the adopted highway. It is elevated above no. 8 to the south and is flanked by the adopted public highway to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces east, bordering the rear garden of no. 11.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for an adjoining two-storey side and rear extension, situated on the north side of the dwelling and bound by a 0.9m high brick retaining wall, together with a front porch extension.

The side extension comprises a dual-pitched roof, a front window at each floor level, and a first-floor side window. It would be set back by approximately 0.6m from the front elevation, measuring 3.9m (width) X 4.8m (eaves height) X 6.4m (maximum height).

The rear extension comprises a gable roof and rear ground floor double doors. Projecting approximately 3.3m from the host dwelling, it would sit flush with the

existing single-storey rear extension. It would measure 4m (width) X 4.9m (eaves height) X 6.3m (maximum height).

The porch extension comprises a gable roof and a front access door. It projects approximately 1.4m, measuring 3m (width) X 2.3m (eaves height) X 3.2m (maximum height).

Proposed materials include: off-white render to the front elevations, whilst retaining exposed brick piers; red brick to the side and rear elevations; UPVC windows and doors; and concrete roof tiles.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. Two objections were received in relation to the following matters:

<u>Objection</u>	<u>Officer's response</u>
Increased pressure on street parking due to loss of on-site parking.	See highways section of this report.
Overshadowing impact towards no. 8 Heald Close and nos. 9 & 11 Heald Drive.	Subsequent amendments have been made, significantly reducing the massing of the first-floor rear extension. Matters relating to overshadowing will be addressed in the 'amenity' section of this report.
Possible conversion to an HMO under a future application.	This matter is beyond the scope of this application and therefore does not comprise a material consideration.

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:

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

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

Amendments

The original proposal included a first-floor rear extension above the existing single-storey rear extension. Its omission was advised due to the impact on the amenity occupants at no. 11 Heald Drive.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD also states that housing extensions should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The houses on Heald Close and Heald Drive have a corresponding design, comprising a two storey gable form with a single storey side extension. The front elevations feature contrasting brickwork, with a darker colour used for the brick piers on the corners. As such, the proposed two-storey side extension and application of render would be a noticeable departure from the corresponding design of the surrounding houses.

However, the proposal retains key design features to ensure that the development is in keeping with the houses on Heald Close. The gable end would remain the predominant architectural form due to the side extension's 0.6m set back and subordinate roof height, whilst the retention of the brick piers would offer visual harmony with the surrounding houses. It is recognised that render is a less common

material on Heald Close. However, using the example of no. 4 Heald Drive, the proposed render would offer a contemporary alternative to the existing design. Overall, the design of the front of the house would be in keeping with the surrounding houses and is considered to be an improved version of the dwelling's existing design.

It is acknowledged that the proposed extensions would result in a significant increase in massing towards the property's northern boundary along Heald Close. This massing includes a considerable amount of continuous brickwork. Whilst the existing hedgerow offers some visual screening, this cannot be relied upon in the long term if the hedges were removed. Nonetheless, there is limited concern that the additional massing would appear overbearing from the street, as the side extension would be set 6.3m away from the pavement and at a lower gradient. In addition, an amendment has been made to include a side window serving the en-suite bathroom to help break-up the brickwork. On balance, the proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the scale and density of the surrounding built environment.

The proposed porch is considered to be a modest addition, with a dual-pitched roof and brick piers to match the design of the host dwelling.

The site plan indicates that there is scope to store the bins to the rear of the property, preventing any visual harm to the street.

Overall, 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

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The original proposal included a first floor rear extension with two bedroom windows on the rear elevation. Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires 21m between directly facing habitable room windows at an upper floor level, and 10m between a habitable room window and a directly facing curtilage boundary. The previously proposed first floor rear extension would have failed to comply with paragraph 4.1 based on the separation distances towards the curtilage boundary and upper floor windows of no. 11 Heald Drive. The proposal was therefore amended to discount the first floor rear extension and concentrate the development to the north side of the house. As such, the amended scheme complies with paragraph 4.1, and also removes any concern regarding overshadowing or overbearing impact towards no. 8 Heald Close or no. 11 Heald Drive.

In all other aspects, the proposed scheme complies with the SPD and would not be considered to cause undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

There is sufficient outdoor amenity space to support the additional bedrooms.

All habitable rooms would have sufficient outlook and access to natural light.

Overall, the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of future of neighbouring the occupants, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Policy T2 of the Core Strategy sets out that development and infrastructure proposals are required to satisfy the Council's accessibility hierarchy and in all circumstances, the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area will have priority, while providing reliable journey times for those travelling through. Developments are required to provide parking in compliance with the Council's Maximum Car Parking Standards as set out in Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.

The proposed development would result in the loss of one on-site parking space, with one one-site parking space remaining. It is possible that the development and additional bedrooms may result in an increased parking demand. However, traffic congestion and parking demand are considered to be reasons for refusal only if they pose a risk to highways safety. Heald Close is not considered to be a busy access route and it is typical for cars to be parked on the roadside. As such, the proposed parking arrangements are considered to be consistent with the existing uses and would not result in a greater level of harm to highways safety.

The Council's Highways Officer was consulted and, in corroboration with the above, raised no objections to the development.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Existing and proposed block plan: 24.3431.3B
- Proposed elevations and floor plans: 24.3431.SC4.1D
- Location plan

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 saved

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, 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, except as otherwise specified in the application and approved drawings.

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 proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	04/06/2025	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	05/06/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Hamish Rigg