

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00449/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00449/HOUS
Location:	2 Field View Lane, Rochdale, OL12 7TS
Proposal:	Front porch extension.
Applicant:	Karen Wood
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 01.08.2024	EXT OF TIME 06.08.2024
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in by Ward Member?	N

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national, sub-regional and local policies and the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document, the Planning Officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Policy**National**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

JP-G9 The Green Belt

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

Summary of comments from neighbours, consultees and Planning Panel

1 objection was received in response to the proposed development. The letter raised concerns about the impact on the Green Belt. This is assessed in the report below.

Assessment

Principle of Development – The Green Belt

- ❑ The application site is allocated within the Green Belt under Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE). Policy JP-G9 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.”

- ☐ 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 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.”*
- ☐ The submitted Green Belt statement sets out that the proposal would result in a 3.31% increase in floor space over and above the original dwelling. Whilst no volume calculations have been provided, the Officer has calculated that the proposal would result in an approximate 3.66% increase in volume over and above the original dwelling.
- ☐ On this basis the proposed development is considered to constitute a proportionate addition and would not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line	✓
Height and massing	✓
Facing materials and detailing	✓
Roof style	✓
Window proportions	✓
Bin storage	✓
Impact on trees	✓

The design of the proposal is acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity: Are the following acceptable?

Impact on privacy, light & outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	✓
Light and outlook of application property	✓

Remaining garden space of application property	✓
--	---

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF.

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. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan and Block Plans. Dwg no. 16 A
- Existing Plans – Proposed Front Porch. Dwg no. 50
- Existing Elevations – Proposed Front Porch. Dwg no. 51
- Proposed Plans – Proposed Front Porch. Dwg no. 52
- Proposed Elevations – Proposed Front Porch. Dwg no. 53

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	12/07/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	05.08.24	Signed: LA

Report Author Bob Melling