

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0242
Location: FIELDWAY, ROCHDALE, OL16 4PX
Proposal: Single storey front extension, single storey rear extension, addition of render to rear elevation, alterations to fenestration, installation of external stair canopy and railing, installation of boundary treatment and associated works including landscaping
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Majid Mir

SITE

The application site relates to Fieldway; a sheltered housing complex in Rochdale. Fieldway is accessed from Broad Lane. Within the complex there are multiple terraces of bungalows, a two storey 'L' shaped building which consists of communal areas and flats.

To the northeast is Springhill Nursing Home; to the southeast, south and southwest is greenfield land. The land to the west is identified as Protected Open Land under policy G3 of the UDP. To the north and northwest, and on the opposite side of Broad Lane there are rows of terrace properties used as dwellings. This includes nine listed buildings (numbers 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75 and 77 Broad Lane).

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the following:

- A single storey front extension that would extend the refuse store and the entrance area. The proposed extension would be located by the main entrance to the building. The proposed extension would have gable roof facing the front and will consist of white render and vertical cladding.
- A single storey rear extension that will be used as a scooter shed. The proposed extension would infill an open area between the kitchen and flat. The proposed extension would use matching materials as the proposed front extension with white render and vertical cladding.
- Render to existing single storey outrigger to the rear. The render will be white. The application also proposes to remove the existing door and window and replace with glazed bifolding doors.

- Installation of canopy and railings to two existing external staircases.
- Various boundary treatment and railings around the site.
- Landscaping of the private garden area to the rear consisting of new patio area and soft landscaping area.

The application proposes to install lighting columns, highway signs and road traffic calming measures. These elements of the proposal will require permission for the highways department.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 - Sustainable Places

JP-S1 - Sustainable Development

JP-P2 - Heritage

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS)

SD1 - Delivering sustainable development

DM1 - General Development Requirements

SO3 - Improving design, image and quality of place

P1 - Improving image

P2 - Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

P3 - Improving design of new development

SO4 - Promoting a greener environment

G6 - Enhancing green infrastructure

G7 - Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

G9 - Reducing the impact of pollution

SO5 - Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

T2 - Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 - Schedule of Parking Standards

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

G/D/1 - Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

11/D54354 - Conversion of warden's house to form two one-bedroom flats. Decision: Approve with Conditions.

03/D41245 - Extensions to existing building to provide an eight person lift to sheltered housing accommodation. Decision: Approve with Conditions.

94/D30313 - Provision of pitched roofs to existing flat roofed areas. Decision: Approve with Conditions.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation

Summary: The proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of these designated heritage assets. No objections.

Highways And Engineering

Summary: No new concerns regarding emergency access or servicing of this location. No highways safety concerns as a result of these minor amendments to the building. We have no highways objections to these proposals.

Env Health - Noise/Odours

No comments received.

Tree Officer

Based on the information provided I would raise no objections to the proposals. The proposed works have negligible potential to disturb bats and would not appear to have any substantive impact on trees.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties, and site notices were placed in the vicinity of the site. No representations were received.

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside. The application proposes extensions to the communal areas of the building within the sheltered housing complex and small scale works that do not impact on the use of the sheltered housing complex. The proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Design, Visual Amenity and Heritage

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and policy JP-P1 of the PfE 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.

In addition, policy HE6 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone states that Development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets and/or their settings will be considered having regard to national planning policy. Policy P2 of the Core Strategy promotes the protection and enhancement of key heritage assets and their visual amenity.

To the northwest, Fieldway lies across from a terrace of grade II listed buildings (61 to 77 Broad Lane). Built in the late 18th century as weavers' cottages, they are typical of the Rochdale area. The heritage assets are identifiable by their distinctive runs of mullioned windows at upper floors. Additionally, the buildings are built in coursed watershot stone with stone slate roofs. The heritage assets are considered to be of special architectural and historic interest, as recognised by their listing at grade II.

Fieldway itself is a late 20th century development of sheltered housing and is not of any particular historic or architectural interest or value. The complex is set back from Broad Lane with mature landscaping along the boundaries which creates a buffer between the heritage assets and the complex.

The proposed single storey extensions to the front and rear would be subservient additions. The form of the proposed extension to the front with its gable roof is considered to be acceptable. The proposed extension to the rear would have a flat roof and would differ in form, when compared to the form of the complex. However, it is noted that the rear extension would be a small extension and would be an infill extension. The use of render and vertical cladding would differ from the material

palette of the rest of the complex and would appear prominent due to the use of materials. However, the extensions would be relatively small and would not lead to an unsatisfactory relationship between the existing and the proposed extensions. Additionally, the proposed extensions would be viewed within the wider complex, which consists of a relatively modern buildings with no architectural value or distinction.

Further to the above, as noted in the supporting statement, bins are stored externally and by the existing bin store. The supporting statement has noted that the existing bin store is inadequate. The extension of the bin store will allow for bins to be stored away from view on the highway would have positive visual impact on the streetscene.

The proposed rendering and alterations to the fenestration on the outrigger to the rear would be more in keeping with the overall design of the proposed extensions and would tie in well with the proposed extensions. As with the proposed extensions, the proposal would not lead to an unsatisfactory appearance would be viewed with context of the modern complex. The proposed alterations are considered to be acceptable.

Overall, the proposed extensions with the proposed alterations to the rear outrigger are considered to be of an acceptable standard of design that would have a neutral impact on the significance of the heritage assets.

The remaining works are relatively minor works and of a standard design that would be in keeping with a relatively modern complex. The proposed works are considered to have an acceptable visual amenity impact. It is considered that the proposed works would not materially alter the relationship between Fieldway and the heritage assets. The proposed works are relatively minor in nature and would be seen in the context of the existing late 20th century development.

In conclusion, the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the designated heritage assets and would be of an acceptable design standard. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and accords with the relevant policies with the Core Strategy, the PfE, the SPD and the NPPF.

Trees and Biodiversity

The application proposes to install boundary treatment and railings within close vicinity of the trees on site. The Tree Officer raised no object to the work, concluding that the proposed would not have any substantive impact on trees. Additionally, the Tree Officer also concluded the that the proposed works would have negligible potential to disturb bats.

The location of the proposed extensions presently consists of hardstanding, therefore, there is no or limited ecological or biodiversity value. The application does propose some landscaping to the rear external private garden area. This would include a soft landscaping area that will incorporate a planting area and an overall landscaping area that covers a larger area than the existing arrangement. The

proposal will therefore see an increase in biodiversity value within the site. The proposal as whole would meet the exemption criteria.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and would accord with the relevant policies within the Core Strategy, the PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity

The proposed extensions would be set a considerable distance from neighbouring residential properties, as such, it is considered that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the neighbouring residential properties.

In regard to the other elements of the proposal, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable amenity impact and would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the neighbouring residential properties.

It is considered that the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the relevant policies within the Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Highways

The proposed extensions would not impact on the existing highway arrangement and would have no impact on the parking supply within the complex. The proposed bin store would lead to the removal of bins from the highway and therefore would have a positive impact. The highways department concluded that they do not expect the proposal to lead to any additional traffic or increased demands on parking. The highways department added that they have no new concerns regarding emergency access or servicing of this location, and there are no highways safety concerns.

The highways did note that the proposed alterations proposed would likely to of benefit of all users of the complex.

As such, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in regard to highway safety and would accord with the relevant policies within the Core Strategy, the PfE and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 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 development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:
- Location plan.
 - Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drawing number: 01. Issue: P2
 - Existing First Floor Plan. Drawing number: 02. Issue: P2
 - Existing Elevations. Drawing number: 03. Issue: P1
 - Existing Site Plan. Drawing number: 04. Issue: P3
 - Proposed Site Plan. Drawing number: 04. Issue: P3
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Drawing number: 05. Issue: P1
 - Proposed First Floor Plan. Drawing number: 06. Issue: P1
 - Proposed Part Ground Floor Plan - Central Area. Drawing number: 07. Issue: P1
 - Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 of 2. Drawing number: 09. Issue: P3
 - Proposed Elevations sheet 2 of 2. Drawing number: 10. Issue: P3
 - Proposed Stair Canopy, Signage and Fencing. Drawing number: 11. Issue: P1

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, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 No above ground works to the hereby approved extensions shall take place until such time as a detailed specification and/or samples of materials to be used externally in the construction of the extensions have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the duly approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.