

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00373/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00373/HOUS
Location:	4 Heald Close Rochdale OL12 7HJ
Proposal:	Part single storey, part two storey rear extensions, first floor/two storey side extensions and alterations to fenestration on the rear first floor elevation
Applicant:	Miss Ikra Hussain _ Miss Anam Hussain
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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

Location

The application relates to 4 Heald Close, a two-storey detached property on a cul-de-sac in Healey. Heald Close forms part of a residential estate comprising houses of a similar design and material palette. The area is typically suburban with medium density housing, quiet roads, and a patchwork of greenspace.

The property falls on a corner plot and faces west, overlooking a large front garden. It sits adjacent to no.6 to the north and is flanked by the public highway to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces east, bordering the rear garden of no. 5 Heald Drive.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the following works:

- A first-floor side extension above the existing single-storey side extension, including a hipped roof, additional fenestration to the front and side, and to be constructed from matching brick and concrete roof tiles. The maximum height

would measure approx. 7m, the eaves height approx. 5m. The total width would measure approx. 3m and the depth approx. 11m.

- A two-storey side extension, including a hipped roof and additional fenestration to the front. The maximum height would measure approx. 7m, the eaves height approx. 5m. The total width would measure approx. 3m and the depth approx. 11m.
- Both side extensions would be set back approx. 0.6m from the principal elevation.
- A part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension, with the two-storey element adjacent to the boundary with no. 6, and the single-storey aspect spanning the remaining width of the host property. The total width of the rear extension would measure 13m, the maximum height 6m, and the eaves height 4.9m. The entire rear extension would project approx. 3.4m from the rear elevation. It would include additional fenestration, roof lights, and be constructed from matching brick and roof tiles.

Relevant History

95/D32713- Two-storey side extension and erection of front canopy – Refuse

96/D33171 – Single-storey side extension and erection of front canopy- Grant STC

16/00037/HOUS- Single-storey side extension and alterations to rear elevation including ramped access- Grant STC

17/00410/HOUS- Single-storey side extension and alterations to rear elevation including ramped access- Resubmission of 16/00037/HOUS – Grant STC

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Highways 21/06/2024:

The proposed development would create a five bedroom plot at 4 Heald Close, the maximum dedicated car parking standard for 2+ Bedroomed Houses outside Town Centres is 2 spaces per dwelling, (not including a garage).

As part of the proposed development the off street dedicated parking fronting the plot would remain and meets the standard set out above – therefore there are no concerns in relation to any intensification of parking upon the surrounding residential streets as part of the proposed development.

The proposed development will not impact any existing refuse collection arrangements.

There are no new sections of Highway as part of the proposed development/amendments to the existing Highway network.

A development of this size and nature will not impact the capacity of the local Highway network/create road safety issues.

The proposed development does not impact any existing Public Rights of Way.

There are no Highway objections to the proposed development.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 02/05/2024. 5 objections were received relating to the following issues:

1. Loss of privacy to neighboring properties posed by the additional windows, particularly in relation to the windows not being obscurely glazed.
2. Insufficient off-street parking to accommodate the potential increase in occupants, therefore creating a build-up of on-street parking and negatively impacting on highways safety.
3. The proposed changes being out of keeping with the surrounding houses.
4. Reduced outlook from no. 5 Drive and 19 Heald Close.
5. Impact on overshadowing towards no.6 Heald Close.
6. Insufficient detail on the plans.
7. The site plan incorrectly displaying the outline of no. 6.
8. Concern regarding the proposed use of the property, with reference to the additional rooms being privately rented.
9. Impact on drainage.
10. Impact on depreciating the value of no.6

Officer's response:

- Points 1-5 will be addressed later in the design, amenity, and highways sections of this report.
- Re. points 6&7 the officer is satisfied that the plans are sufficient and correct in order to make a comprehensive and fair assessment.
- Re. point 8, we are unable to speculate as to the future use of the property, and will only respond to the nature of the application made. If the applicant

wishes to rent rooms within the property they will need make a separate application.

- Re. point 9, this is an issue for building regulations.
- Re. point 10, this is not a material planning consideration.

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

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

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

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P3 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 139 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Permission is sought for a part single-storey- part two-storey- rear extension, a two storey side extension, and a first-floor side extension.

In view of the above policy, the combined aspects of the proposal would not be considered subservient. The proposed development would excessively increase the scale of the host dwelling and inherently alter its form. The width of the property would almost double at first-floor level, increasing from 7.7m to 13.7m.

In addition, the proposed works would have a negative impact on the existing street scene and character of the area. The surrounding houses on Heald Close and Heald Drive follow a homogenous design and are all of a similar scale. Any additions are modest thus protecting and maintaining the coherence between properties. The proposed extensions would result in a property which is much larger than, and out of keeping with, the surrounding houses, and set a precedent for overdevelopment within the area.

The proposed side extensions are particularly problematic as they would be visually prominent from public vantage points and significantly increase the form of the property.

In principle, a part two-storey – part single-storey rear extension could be acceptable as it would be more obscured from public vantage points. However, as the rear extensions have been designed to integrate with the proposed side extensions, they contribute to the overall excessive nature of development.

It is noted that the proposed materials to match the host dwelling would be acceptable. Moreover, the proposed fenestration vertically aligns with the existing fenestration and is suitably proportioned and arranged.

Overall, the cumulative effect of the proposed works are considered excessive and overbearing. The development would be not subservient to the host or in keeping with the surrounding properties, and therefore fails to accord 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.

Separation distances:

An objection was raised regarding the proposed first-floor side windows potentially undermining the privacy of neighbouring residents at no. 11 Heald Close. The proposed windows would serve two en-suite bathrooms and a bedroom. Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD requires 21m between directly facing principal windows to habitable rooms, including bedroom windows. The proposed windows would not directly face no. 11, regardless there is a separation distance of approx. 24m. Furthermore there is a separation distance of 27m to no. 9. The subject windows are therefore compliant with the SPD.

However, the plans indicate an additional first-floor window serving the en-suite bedroom adjacent to the boundary with no. 6. This would reduce the existing separation distance towards the rear windows of no. 5 Heald Drive from 18m to 15m. Whilst the existing separation distance doesn't comply with the SPD, a further reduction would not be considered acceptable. The proposed bedroom window would adversely reduce the privacy levels of occupants at no. 5 Heald Drive, and would significantly overlook the gardens of no. 6 Heald Close and no. 7 Heald Drive.

Reduced outlook, overbearing impact and overshadowing:

Objections were raised regarding reduced outlook from no. 6 and no. 19 Heald Close, and no. 5 Heald Drive. Overshadowing was also considered an issue in relation to no. 6.

Regarding no. 5 and no. 19, the proposed extensions are not considered to be within close enough proximity to significantly reduce their outlook, and are unlikely to have a harmful impact on their existing amenity levels.

However, the proposed works are likely to adversely affect the amenity of residents at no. 6 through reduced outlook, overbearing impact, and overshadowing. The plans indicate a two-storey side extension and rear extension which meet the boundary with no. 6, spanning 11.1m. The rear elevation of no.6 is level with the front of no. 4, therefore the proposed extensions would be in immediate proximity to no. 6's rear windows and garden. As such, no. 6's outlook to the south would be entirely obscured. Furthermore, owing to the orientation of no. 4 to the south of no. 6, the adjacent extensions would cause significant overshadowing,

Overall, the proposal would unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in contradiction with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The existing and proposed floor plans indicate that the house would remain a 5 bedroom property, although it is noted that the middle ground floor room could be used as an additional bedroom. Together with the overall increase in the size of the property, there would potentially be an increase in the number of cars. The potential rise in on-street parking was a cause for concern in several of the objections received.

As such, the council's highways officer was consulted yet raised no objection to the proposal based on the fact that the plans indicate the provision of 2 on-site parking spaces, in line with the maximum dedicated parking standard for a property of this size. Furthermore, the highways officer saw no potential impacts on highways safety.

It should also be noted that the proposed driveway would be able to accommodate up to 4 cars and would therefore be able to support the increase in the size of the property.

As such, the proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation:

Refuse based on the following reasons:

1. By virtue of its design. The proposed development is not considered to be subservient to the host dwelling or in keeping with the surrounding properties, and together this causes harm to the character of the street scene. The proposed side extensions would almost double the width of the property, increasing its scale to excess. This contradicts with policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, JP-P1 of Places for Everyone, and the NPPF.
2. A lack of compliance with the separation distances established in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD. The proposed window serving the rear en-suite bedroom would reduce the separation distance to the rear windows of no. 5 Heald Drive from 18m to 15m. Whilst the existing separation distance fails to comply with the SPD, a further reduction would not be considered acceptable and would undermine the privacy of occupants of no. 5 Heald Drive, in contradiction with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy. Overall the proposed development conflicts with policies DM1 of the Core Strategy and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (June 2016).
3. By virtue of overbearing impact, reduced outlook, and overshadowing, particularly in relation to no. 6 Heald Close. The two-storey side extension along the common boundary with no. 6 would be in close proximity to the neighbours, and considering its scale, would have an adverse impact on neighbouring occupants, particularly in relation to overshadowing and reduced outlook. This is in direct contradiction with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone, and the NPPF.

Procedure 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.

Informative

This application relates to the following plans:

- Parking arrangement: 2133/3
- Proposed floor plans and site plan: 2133/3
- Proposed elevation: 2133/4
- Location plan

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	21/06/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	24.06.24	Signed: LA

Report Author Hamish Rigg