

Application Number:	25/00049/HOUS
Location:	849 Rochdale Road, Middleton, M24 2RA
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension, raised platform, flue and insertion of window within existing side elevation.
Applicant:	Mr John Kilroy
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 27.03.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
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. 849 Rochdale Road, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in Slattocks. The dwelling faces the highway to the east, is adjoined by no. 851 Rochdale Road to the north and is adjacent to no. 847 Rochdale Road to the south. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders open farmland. The application site is designated Green Belt.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension with a depth of 4m. It would be characterised by a lean-to roof, large bi-fold doors and three roof lights. It would also include a flue for the proposed log burner and there would be a raised platform to the rear of the extension to provide level amenity access.

Relevant History

24/01194/HH42 Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 4m from the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 4m and height to eaves to 3m).
Withdrawn (January 2025)

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)

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:

JP-P1	Sustainable Development
JP-G9	The Green Belt

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
-------	--------------------

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

Principle of Development – 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 153 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. '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 development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:
 - 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), including buildings, 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 (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.*
 - h) *Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:*
 - i. *mineral extraction;*
 - ii. *engineering operations;*
 - iii. *local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
 - iv. *the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;*
 - v. *material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and*
 - vi. *development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.*

- ☐ 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 proposal seeks to extend the dwelling to the rear elevation following the demolition of an existing raised platform.
- ☐ The submitted calculations indicate that the proposed extension (including the raised platform) would represent a **27%** increase in volume over and above the original dwelling.
- ☐ No calculation was provided for the increase in floor space, however an approximate calculation indicates an increase of circa **25%**.
- ☐ As such, 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 to the rear of the host dwelling. 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.

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 rear extension would be single-storey in height and would appear subservient. The use of a mono-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.
- ❑ While the proposed flue would be a somewhat unsightly addition, this would be located to the rear of the property with limited public visibility. Moreover, flues can usually be installed without planning permission.
- ❑ 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 projection limit outlined above and is not considered to have an overbearing impact on nos. 847 and 851 Rochdale Road.
- ❑ Although privacy screens are not proposed to the sides of the raised platform, it is not considered that the platform would detract from the general levels of privacy currently experienced by neighbouring residents. The rear gardens along this section of Rochdale Road are generally characterised by low level boundary treatments and raised decking areas, with the primary outlook being towards the open fields to the west.
- ❑ Moreover, it is not considered that the insertion of a new window within the existing side elevation to serve the utility room would detract from the privacy enjoyed by no. 847 Rochdale Road.

- ☐ 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.

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 153 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 JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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. Dwg no. A200. Rev 001.

Existing Floor Plans and Elevations with Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. A01. Rev 004.

Proposed Floor Plan & Cross Section. Dwg no. A01.1. Rev 003.

Existing Site Plan. Dwg no. A100. Rev 001.

Proposed Site Plan. Dwg no. A100.1. Rev 002.

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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 development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with drawing A01 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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	28/02/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	27/03/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling