

Application Number:	23/00027/HOUS
Location:	Mount Pleasant Farm, Church Road, Heywood BL9 6XA
Proposal:	Erection of detached garage and external staircase with home office in roof space
Applicant:	Mrs Dawn Makin
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

Location

The site is located off Church Lane, an unmetalled rural road linking Birtle Road and Castle Hill Road, to the north of the B6222 (Rochdale Old Road), between Bury and Rochdale.

Originally, the development on the site consisted of a stone and slate dwelling along with attached outbuildings and detached barns. The existing property is a replacement dwelling approved under application reference 20/00770/FUL and is now substantially complete.

The location of the existing buildings is broadly level - following the contour of the land which runs on a south-west/north-east axis - with just a moderate slope down from west to east in this area. Behind the building area to the north, the ground slopes at first steeply and then more gently upwards, and to the south the ground has a more gradual slope down towards Church Lane across the adjacent field.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a detached garage with an office, brew and WC in the roof space with access to the roof space via an external staircase. The building would be located in the northeast part of the site and occupy a footprint of approximately 12.2m by 6.4m with a height to eaves of 2.43m and a maximum height of 5.86m. It is to be constructed in stone walls, oak posts and timber cladding with a slate-topped,

dual-pitched roof. The front roof slope includes three front-facing cuckoo dormers with pitched roof forms, each 2.4m in width, and the rear roof slope includes three roof lights.

Relevant History

14/00672/FUL - APP/P4225/W/15/3005416 Approved on appeal - July 2015 (implemented and therefore extant)

19/00945/FUL - Demolition of existing barns and outbuilding and erection of new dwelling with detached garage/store including new vehicular access – Withdrawn

20/00770/FUL - Demolition of existing barns and outbuilding and erection of new dwelling including new vehicular access - Resubmission of 19/00945/FUL - Approved

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways And Engineering

The driveway and access to the proposed garage appear to be acceptable. Parking provision is adequate for the proposed development however we would ask that the development is used for its intended purpose with a restriction on any future conversion to a residential use as this may impact on parking provision for the overall site.

The development is remote from the adopted highway network along an established access, we would not expect any detrimental impact on the wider highway network.

The servicing of the existing and proposed properties would remain unchanged.

We would not expect any detrimental impact on road safety as a result of the development

Highways raise no objection to this application.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

The Applicant wants to increase the hard-standing areas, to my understanding. I suggest that you ask for a Drainage Condition along the following lines:-

Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme for the garage area and parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A designed soakaway would be an appropriate solution. Details shall include a scaled drawing.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. To prevent an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development and to ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved Policy EM/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Drainage infrastructure will need to be implemented prior to commencement of above ground works and a scheme therefore needs to be agreed in advance of the same.

Representations

Letters were sent to neighbouring properties and a general site notice was displayed at the junction of Birtle Road and Church Lane for wider publicity. No representations have been 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/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
G4	Protecting Green Belt

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

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.

Paragraphs 147 and 148 of the NPPF state 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. When considering any planning application, 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 149 of the NPPF indicates that "a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt", subject to the following exceptions:

- 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, Section 5.20 of the 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 floorspace 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.

Exception c) is considered relevant to the assessment of the proposed outbuilding. Whilst the structure is not physically attached to the dwelling, it was established under *Warwick District Council v Secretary of State* (Eyre J, 12 August 2022) that an extension can include structures which are physically detached from the building of which they are an extension. The outbuilding is located in close proximity to the dwelling and is to be used for purposes clearly related to the occupation of the dwelling.

The total volume of the replacement dwelling, which is now substantially complete, is 1671m³ and the total floor space is 489.1m². The volume of the proposed outbuilding is 355m³, which equates to an increase of 21%, and the total floor space of the outbuilding is 121.5m², which equates to an increase of 25%. The proposed outbuilding cannot, therefore, be considered disproportionate in relation to the replacement dwelling.

On this basis, the scale of the development complies with the SPD guidance. It is considered that the proposed development meets inappropriate development exemption 'c', which allows 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.

Design: DM1 and P3

The site is located within an area of open countryside within the Green Belt and, as a result of the surrounding topography, this being on the rise of a moderately steep slope running in a northerly direction, the location would be considered as a potentially highly visible and sensitive site within the landscape.

In such a location it is important to ensure that any built development does not result in an overt addition within the landscape. Other such buildings in reasonable proximity to the site are set well within the existing landscape and do not appear to break above the surrounding vistas. Instead they are set against the backdrop of the surrounding topography and it is considered that this arrangement shall also be replicated for this scheme.

In this regard the applicant has opted for a location which, although set on the rise of a hill, is nestled within an existing basin set within the rise. This provides a shielded backdrop to the scheme wherein much of the building and the associated curtilage would be set against. This mitigating factor provides support for the proposal and officers raise no objection based on the impact of the proposal upon the wider landscape.

The proposed outbuilding is an appropriate scale, footprint and massing that sits appropriately within the context and the size/extent of the host site. The bulk of the proposed outbuilding is broken-up through the use of three front-facing cuckoo dormers with pitched roof forms which create a depth to the main elevation and visual interest. Whilst the SPD considers that front dormers will not usually be permitted, it is noted that the dormers comply with Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD and will not be visually prominent from the public highway. The proposed use of stone,

and slate to match existing is welcomed and would be appropriate when looking at the local vernacular.

Timber-framed structures are not a particular feature of properties within Birtle, however, the proposed use of oak posts and timber cladding, as shown on the proposals, is not considered to detract from the quality of the proposals and would sit comfortably against the proposed stonework.

Therefore, the design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable and would accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The site is well separated from neighbouring properties and therefore would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers and the occupiers of existing surrounding dwellings. Furthermore, the site would retain a sufficient amount of private, outdoor amenity space.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires that all development proposals provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring and servicing arrangements, taking into account the proposed use and location.

The existing drive and parking area will be retained and the dwelling will retain its existing off-street parking provision, which is ample for a dwelling of this size.

It was suggested by the Council's Highway Authority that the proposed garage is retained for its intended use. This would usually be controlled via planning condition.

Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum, and only used where they satisfy the following tests:

- 1) necessary;
- 2) relevant to planning;
- 3) relevant to the development to be permitted;
- 4) enforceable;
- 5) precise; and
- 6) reasonable in all other respects.

Appendix 5, which sets out the Council's parking standards provides a maximum standard of 2 spaces, not including a garage, for 2+ bedroom houses outside town centres. Therefore, it would not seem reasonable to condition the use of the garage in such a way.

Furthermore, it would be difficult for the Council to enforce the use of the garage for its intended purpose and not for the storage of domestic materials, for example.

Finally, given that the proposed parking arrangements are in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 it would not be necessary to request that the garage is retained for its intended use.

In light of the above, the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable and are in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 and the relevant policies contained within the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The application submitted seeks to extend the area of hardstanding and as such the Drainage team were consulted.

Their advice states that no development shall take place until a sustainable surface water drainage scheme for the garage area and parking has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Officers concur with this position and offer no objections in this regard.

Planning Balance

It is considered that in light of the above assessment, the proposed garage would qualify as an exemption to inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Paragraphs 149 and 150 of the NPPF state 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. No harm through inappropriateness has been identified and no additional harm to the Green Belt has been identified. The application proposal therefore accords with policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the protection of Green Belt / Protected Open Land. As such, the proposed development is acceptable in principle and matters of detail and the application is accordingly recommended for approval.

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. Drg no. EAD_169_P_01. Rev S1
 - Existing Site Plan. Drg no. EAD_169_P_02. Rev S1
 - Proposed Site Plan. Drg no. EAD_169_P_03. Rev S1
 - Proposed Plans & Elevations. Drg no. EAD_169_P_04

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. No development shall take place until such time as a scheme for the drainage of surface water for the garage area and parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. To prevent an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development and to ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved Policy EM/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Drainage infrastructure will need to be implemented prior to commencement of above ground works and a scheme therefore needs to be agreed in advance of the same.

4. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall, except for the timber cladding shown on drawing no. EAD_169_P_04, 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.

5. The timber cladding as shown on drawing no. EAD_169_P_04 shall be first installed as 25x150mm solid oak feather edge cladding board, character grade with fine sawn finish treated with translucent Osmo Natural Oil Woodstain and retained thereafter.

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	16/03/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	30/03/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Bob Melling