

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01363/HOUS

Application Number:	23/01363/HOUS
Location:	280 Middleton Road, Heywood, OL10 2LG
Proposal:	Single storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr Darren Webb
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 15.02.2024	EXT OF TIME
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 280 Middleton Road, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling fronting the A6046 and located within land designated as Green Belt. The dwelling is located approximately 100m south of the Heywood Interchange and lies amid a run of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying building ages and styles. The dwelling faces the highway to the east, is adjacent to no. 278 Middleton Road to the north and no. 282 Middleton Road to the south with agricultural fields located to the east and west. The subject property benefits from an existing single-storey rear extension and a single-storey detached garage.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey side extension which would project 1.91m from the existing side elevation with a depth of 4.71m. It would be characterised by a dual-pitched roof with a maximum height 3.40m and a height to eaves of 2.58m. The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match existing.

Relevant History

78/D07902 Extension To Living Room And Kitchen And Moving Existing Garage Back Approximately 6FT To Accommodate Extension
Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

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
G/D/2 Green Belt

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Policies 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 proposed side extension would be single-storey in height and would appear subservient. The use of a dual-pitched roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration is sized and positioned appropriately.
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”*
- ☐ In particular, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - o *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);”*
- ☐ The proposed extension would comply with the above guidance and is not considered to result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ All habitable rooms would receive sufficient natural light and a sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ 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 retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces on the driveway, therefore the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Principle of Development – Green Belt: G4

- ☐ The application site is allocated as Green Belt under saved Policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (2006). Policy G/D/2 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in order to maintain the framework of open land separating and surrounding the urban areas of the borough. Core Strategy policy G4 seeks to restrict development within the Green Belt to the limited types of development which are deemed appropriate by national planning policies unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
- ☐ Paragraph 152 of the NPPF establishes that, as with previous Green Belt policy, *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”*. Paragraph 153 adds *“local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*
- ☐ Paragraph 154 of the NPPF establishes that *“a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:*
- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
 - b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
 - c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;***
 - d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
 - e) limited infilling in villages;*
 - f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
 - g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:*
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.”*

- ② Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed scheme constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.
- ② In respect of the above policy guidance, section 5.20 of the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) Supplementary Planning Document states that *"normally, in principle, extensions that result in up to a 35% increase in floor space or volume over and above the original dwelling would normally be considered appropriate and not disproportionate (this calculation would include previous extensions to the original dwelling, which is defined as the dwelling as it was first built or as it stood on 1 July 1948). However, the guidance goes on to state that the characteristics of properties and proposals will vary significantly and there may be instances when a 35% increase would be considered disproportionate and other occasions when a greater than 35% increase may be considered proportionate."*
- ② The proposal seeks to extend the dwelling to the side elevation. Planning history indicates the original dwelling was granted planning permission for a single-storey rear extension including the relocation of an existing garage (application ref: 78/D07902).
- ② The application property also has a single-storey garage to the rear of the host dwelling, which has been present from at least 1978 based on the planning history for the site. However, it appears that this garage has recently been re-built. As such, the single-storey extension and garage are not considered to be part of the original dwelling.
- ② The calculations submitted as part of the proposed plans indicate the proposed extension to constitute a 21% increase in volume over and above the original dwelling. No floor space calculations have been provided. It is noted, however, that the calculations include the single-storey extension as part of the original dwelling measurements and have not taken into account the detached garage. Whilst elevations for the garage have not been provided, it was noted on site that the garage height was 2.5m. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that to constitute permitted development, an outbuilding within 2m of the boundary must not exceed 2.5m in height.
- ② Based on the submitted plans, the original dwelling has a volume of 334 cubic metres. The existing single-storey extension and garage have a combined volume of approx. 93 cubic metres, which constitutes an existing volume increase of approx. 27.84%.
- ② The proposed extension has a volume of approx. 26 cubic metres. Taking into account of the previous extensions, the total volume of all extensions is approx. 119 cubic metres, which constitutes a total **35.6%** increase of volume over the original building.
- ② The original dwelling has a floor space of approx. 90 square metres. The existing single-storey extension and garage have a combined floor space of approx. 27.5 square metres, which constitutes an existing floor space increase of approx. 30.55%.
- ② The proposed extension has a floor space of approx. 6.6 square metres. Taking into account of the previous extensions, the total floor space of all

extensions is approx. 34 square metres, which constitutes a total **37.77%** increase of floor space over the original building.

- ☐ Both the increase in volume and floor space of the extensions would exceed the 35% allowance stated in the SPD. However, given the siting of the proposed extension to the side of the host dwelling and the adjacent dwelling, its impact on openness would be limited. Furthermore, if the LPA were to insist upon a reduction of 0.6% volume, it is not considered that this would appear materially different. Moreover, the applicant has evidenced personal circumstances that may mean a further reduction in floor space would not provide an adequate functional internal layout for its occupants. As such, given the specific circumstances of the site and the proposed development, it is considered that the exceedance of the SPD guidance is acceptable on balance and the proposed development is considered to constitute a proportionate addition and would not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt

Openness

- ☐ Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that *“the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”*
- ☐ “Openness”, for the purpose of Green Belt policy is not formally defined within Planning Policy or legislation but is taken to mean the absence of built development. The term “openness”, comprises a spatial and visual component which should be assessed in considering whether a proposal preserves the openness of the Green Belt.
- ☐ The host dwelling is situated amid a row of residential development and the proposed extension would be single-storey in height and set back some 5.27m from the main front wall of the host dwelling. It would also be substantially screened to the rear by the existing detached garage. On this basis, the proposal would not be readily apparent from the public highway, nor would it read as an intrusive feature within the context of the open land to the front and rear. As such, it is considered the proposal would not significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

- ☐ In light of the above assessment, it is considered the proposed development would meet inappropriate development exception (c) which would allow for the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No harm through inappropriateness has been identified and no additional harm with regard to the openness of the Green Belt has been identified. The proposal therefore accords with policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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. Dated 15/12/2023
- Existing Site, Block And Location Plan. Drg no. 796-01
- Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 796-02
- Existing Roof Plan. Drg no. 796-03
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 796-04
- Proposed Site, Block And Location Plan. Drg no. 796-05A
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 796-06B
- Proposed Roof Plan. Drg no. 796-07
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 796-08

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 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	08/02/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	15/02/2024	Signed: RK

