

Application Number:	22/01302/HOUS
Location:	The Sett Badger Lane Rochdale OL16 4RQ
Proposal:	Two-storey front extension, alteration to existing rear window into bi-folding door, render to all elevations, alteration to fenestration and insertion of 2no roof lights to front roof elevation
Applicant:	Mr Michael Instone
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to an individual detached bungalow with a central roof section higher than the roof either side. The bungalow benefits from a generous front and rear garden to which the front is well concealed by (30ft+) large trees from public viewpoints and is set back from surrounding dwellings. The bungalow borders a new build development to the rear, to which it is well concealed by fences. The site is situated within designated protected open space and the access road to the South-West of the property is a shared road with Dean Farm.

Description of Proposal

The application is sought for a large two storey front extension with alteration to the existing rear window into bi-folding doors. There will be alteration to fenestration to replace white PVC windows with black powder coated aluminum. There will be insertion of two roof lights and render from facing brickwork to stonework cladding clips for the front two-storey extension. The applications seeks a white rendered finish to all existing exterior walls. The additional roof tiles for the front two storey extension will match the existing concrete interlocking roof tiles.

Relevant History

D16800 - Detached bungalow and garage. APPROVED July 1984

22/00555/HOUS – Front dormer extension including porch to front elevation.

REFUSED July 2022.

By virtue of siting, scale and design, the proposed front dormer would constitute an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the bungalow, to the detriment of its character. The proposed development therefore constitutes poor design, contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

16 surrounding neighbours were consulted regarding this development.

1 comment received 26/10/22 in support of the planning application.

- Impact of vehicles required for development (transportation) posing damage to neighboring fences

Officer response: N/A

- Drainage on land sits close to surface. Potentially damaged by heavy transportation vehicles during construction

Officer response: N/A

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

D/10 Protected Open Land

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

G4	Managing Protected Open Land
G5	Protecting Green Belt Land
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

None Applicable

Assessment

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as Protected Open Land under saved Policy D/10 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (2006). Policy D/10 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that development proposals will be permitted that fall within several categories including development which would be acceptable were it in the Green Belt. Furthermore, Core Strategy policy G5 seeks to protect open land outside the urban area and not in the green belt.

Part 2(a) of policy G5 states that: "Development on open land outside the urban area and not in the green belt will be resisted unless: it is limited development that would be acceptable were it in the green belt." Therefore, the application will be considered against guidance relating to development in the Green Belt to determine whether it would constitute acceptable development.

Paragraph 147 of the NPPF establishes that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 that continues in stating that 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 establishes that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. There are however listed exceptions to this which 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;** [officer's emphasis]
- 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:
 - i. – not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - ii. – 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 were it 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 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 construct a two-storey front extensions. Taking into account the existing garage which does not form part of the original dwelling, the submitted plans indicate that the proposed extension would lead to a volume increase of approximately 16.8%. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not be disproportionate and would meet exception requirements of sub-section (c).

It is considered that in light of the above assessment, the proposed development would qualify as an exception to inappropriate development within Protected Open Land. The application therefore accords with policy G4 and G5 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and that National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the protection of Green Belt / Protected Open Land.

Design: DM1 and P3

DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (Adopted 2016) states developments must be "of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area". Policy P3 of the Core Strategy states development design must "enhance the boroughs 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". The SPD states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The proposed extension will be visually prominent to the front of the property and cannot be described as subservient. However, considering this proposal is not situated in a prominent location, is not easily seen from public viewpoints and the unique character of the bungalow, it is acceptable for the bungalow to be considered as its own individual design and to not be designed in accordance to match the character, scale or design of any surrounding dwellings. The materials used in the proposed development are of a high quality, although full details will be required by condition.

The existing dwelling hosts featureless brickwork to the front, rear and side elevations of the property as well as the garage extension. Therefore, the proposal would seek a modern and unique design that, although not entirely in keeping with the design of surrounding dwellings, would make for a distinct and up-to-date addition to the current bungalow.

Summary

In accordance with policy DM1 and policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF, in line with the above assessment, the design of the overall proposal is therefore acceptable and sufficient for design standards.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Sett is heavily shielded by on-site large trees (approx. 30ft+) situated approx.14m from the host dwelling in the front garden. The shielding protects the amenity of surrounding neighbours and poses no significant loss of privacy to the applicants or neighbours and the existing front windows are not in any public view points. Following Paragraph 4.1 of Space Standards set out in the SPD to which there must be a requirement of “21m between directly facing principle windows of habitable rooms”, the distance between the bungalow and the dwellings adjacent on Craiglands is approx.40m.

The rear of the property faces a new housing development however, the property is shielded by fences to the rear of the garden therefore the proposed development would not have any impact on neighbours or result in unacceptable harm through loss of privacy or visual intrusion.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, CS Appendix 5

The proposed development would not impact the existing provision of off road parking available at the property. It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

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:

- 883-21-01A_Existing Plans
- 883-21-10A_Proposed Plans
- 883-21-11A_Existing and Proposed Site Plan
- 883-21-12A_3D View – Front Elevation

And the development must be carried out in accordance with the 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy 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	30.11.22	Signed: C.Petrillo
Authorisation	07.12.22	Signed: A.Truman

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo