

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01234/HOUS

Application Number:	23/01234/HOUS
Location:	191 Wardle Road, Wardle, Rochdale, OL12 9JB
Proposal:	Two Storey Side/single storey rear extension and alteration to rear fenestration.
Applicant:	Adam Wright
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 08.01.2024	EXT OF TIME 26.04.2024
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. 191 Wardle Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Wardle. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 193 Wardle Road to the north-east, adjacent to no. 189 Wardle Road to the south-west, and faces the highway to the south-east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders open land to the north-west, whilst the front elevation of the dwelling faces the rear curtilage of Birar Dene to the south-east. The dwelling is sited on a significantly higher level than the highway and benefits from a front driveway bounded by brick retaining walls. It is situated within a ribbon development of semi-detached, detached dwellings and bungalows in the Green Belt.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 3.5m from the side elevation of the dwelling and an adjoining single-storey rear extension which project 1.94m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the partial

demolition of the existing rear and side extensions. The proposed side extension is characterised by a hipped roof form, set back 2.1m from the main front wall of the dwelling and set down 0.6m from the ridge line with matching eaves. The front elevation of the proposed side extension features a roof canopy over the ground floor.

The proposed rear extension is characterised by a lean-to roof form with a ridge height of 3.09m and a height to eaves of 2.57m.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The application follows two previously refused applications 23/00080/HOUS and 23/00494/HOUS, which amendments made to the extent of the proposed rear projections.

As noted in the submitted Planning Statement, the applicant has expressed interest in removing the existing front retaining walls to make way for a graded driveway. However, in the absence of relevant section plans, such engineering works would not be assessed under this current application.

Relevant History

23/00080/HOUS - Two storey side and single storey rear extensions – Refuse

Officer's Comment

1. The proposed extension represents a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Additional harm has been identified in terms of the adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been identified that would outweigh the harm, and the proposal therefore fails to accord with policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

23/00494/HOUS - Two storey side and single storey rear extensions - Resubmission of 23/00080/HOUS – Refuse

Officer's Comment

1. The proposed extension represents a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Additional harm has been identified in terms of the adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been identified that would outweigh the harm, and the proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core

Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways' main concern regarding this application is the proposed driveway.

Highways have been consistent in their comments for vehicular access onto this section of Wardle Road which is a classified road in that vehicles must be able to enter and leave the carriageway in forward gear. From the submitted plans it would appear that the new driveway would not have the required internal turning facility. Although a garage may have existed on this site Highways could not support formalization of the access via this planning application.

Highways also have concerns regarding the visibility at the driveway entrance onto Wardle Road as the view of both pedestrians and drivers is obstructed by stone walls and vegetation on either side of the driveway.

It is also evident that the existing "driveway" is also used as a bin storage area so it is not likely to be able to accommodate the two parking spaces the extended dwelling would require to meet Council standards.

At this stage Highways are unlikely to support this application.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

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:

Policy JP-G9: The Green Belt
Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places

Local

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

Following discussions with the applicant, considerable amendments were made to the proposal, including the following:

- ☐ Removal the previously proposed front and rear dormer windows;
- ☐ Raising of the ridge height of the proposed side extension; and
- ☐ Reduction of the rear lean-to projection by 1m.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires new development to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*” in addition to ensuring they are “*sympathetic to local character.*”
- ☐ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.
- ☐ 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.*”
- ☐ Notwithstanding the bulk of the side projection, which would have a width greater than half the width of the host dwelling, the proposed side extension

would be set down 0.6m below the ridge line of the host dwelling. Given the elevated position of the dwelling, the substantial set-back of the extension, and the substantial separation distance between the host dwelling and adjacent no. 189, on balance, it is considered the proposed extension would not dominate the host dwelling and would be acceptable. The use of a hipped roof would also appear in keeping and raises no concern.

- ☐ The proposed side extension would be sited 2.56m away from the common boundary with adjacent no. 189 and would be set back 2.1m from the front main wall of the host dwelling. Given this site context, there are no concerns over any harm arising from potential 'terracing effect'.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a lean-to roof 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 noted the proposed front elevation windows appears proportionally smaller than the existing fenestration, largely due to the windows serving non-habitable rooms. Whilst the design of this arrangement is less than ideal, it is considered the visual harm of the proposed windows on the appearance of the host dwelling and street scene as a whole would not be so significant as to warrant refusal.
- ☐ Likewise, the proposed ground floor roof canopy, whilst not characteristic of the street scene, is not considered to comprise a form of development that would inflict undue harm to the surrounding area and would be acceptable.
- ☐ Due to the elevated position of the host dwelling and the steps-only access to the property, refuse bins are currently stored to the back of the front driveway. The proposals would not affect the current arrangements and notwithstanding the prominence of the refuse bins from the highway, a refusal on this basis could not be reasonably substantiated.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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."*
- ☐ The proposed side extension do not directly face any properties to the front and rear, and retains substantial intervening distance of 22.89m between the proposal and the directly facing rear curtilage of Birar Dene.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension comprises an overall reduced projection to the existing rear outrigger and lean-to extension. As such, there are no concerns regarding the amenity impacts on the neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample 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 result in the addition of bedrooms from three to four 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 comprise of one off-street parking space in the front driveway. Considering the existing limited driveway space by virtue of the site curtilage being sited at a higher level than the highway, a refusal on highway grounds could not be reasonably substantiated.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Principle of Development – Green Belt: G4

- ☐ The application site is allocated as Green Belt under Policy JP-G9 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, which supersedes Policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and Policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. Policy JP-G9 establishes a revised Green Belt in the Borough. Policy JP-G9 does not set out specific requirements for development proposals within the Green Belt and as such the provisions of the NPPF apply.
- ☐ 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."*

☐ 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.

☐ In respect of the above policy guidance and the recently adopted PfE, the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) Supplementary Planning Document remains relevant with regard to the Council's considerations for house extensions within the Green Belt given that the overall consideration of development within the Green Belt remains in accordance with that set out in the NPPF. In particular, Section 5.20 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 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.*"

☐ The proposal seeks to construct a wraparound extension comprising of a two-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension. As noted in the

original officer's report, available aerial photographs indicate a single-storey dual-pitched garage was present on the front driveway until 2016 but has since been replaced with brick retaining walls. Planning history indicates an application for a flat-roof garage was approved in 1963 (application reference: 14/3/651) and as such, the now-demolished garage is not taken to be part of the original dwelling for the purpose of floor space and volume calculations.

- ② Following the determination of 23/00494/HOUS, the applicant has supplied additional evidence indicating the rearward projection of the existing outrigger to form part of the original dwelling owing to the drainage and patio not having been altered from its original arrangements. Consequently, the existing side projection of the rear outrigger has been excluded from the original dwelling calculations.
- ② The amended scheme has made reductions in the volume and floor area of the original dwelling to accommodate additional enlargements to the proposed extensions. In particular, the proposal has removed the original lean-to rear extension, the side bay window and reduced 1m of the rear outrigger. This has been reflected in the submitted Green Belt calculations, where 16.22m² of volume would be removed from the original dwelling volume of 357.26m³. The volume of the proposed extensions constitutes a volume of 150.74m³, resulting in a total dwelling volume of 491.78m³ and representing an increase of 134.52m³, or 38% over and above the original dwelling. The original dwelling comprises a floor space of 62.5m² and the proposal would result in an additional 22.3m² in floor area, constituting a 36% increase.
- ② The resultant volume and floor space increase would exceed the 35% allowance stated in the SPD. Notwithstanding, it is noted the exceedance in volume and floor space would be equivalent to a small projection to the rear of the proposed side extension, which would not appear materially different if the LPA were to insist on a 3% reduction in volume. Moreover, it is acknowledged the applicant has engaged with the LPA and accepted amendments to substantially reduce the scale of the proposed extension from its original iteration. Given the specific circumstances of the site context and the proposed development, it is considered the exceedance of the SPD guidance would be acceptable on balance and the proposed development would constitute a proportionate addition and would not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Openness

- ② 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.”*
- ② “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.

- ☐ No harm has been identified in terms of the spatial component of openness where the proposal is considered to constitute a proportionate addition and an appropriate development.
- ☐ The dwelling is substantially elevated from the highway insofar as views to open land to the rear of the property are mostly obscured from Wardle Road. Given this, whilst the proposed side extension would be visible from the highway, it is not considered to 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 the PfE 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 – received 13/11/2023
- ☐ Site Plan – Drawing No. 22.2983.2D received 26/04/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2983.1C received 13/11/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2983.SC4.1H received 12/04/2024

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	25/04/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	26/04/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen