

Application Number:	23/00080/HOUS
Location:	191 Wardle Road Wardle OL12 9JB
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extensions
Applicant:	Adam Wright
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

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 extension which projects 3.5m from the side elevation of the host dwelling. It is characterised by a hipped roof and is set down approx. 0.63m from the ridge line of the host dwelling with matching eaves height. The front elevation of the proposed side extension features a roof canopy over the ground floor.

The application also proposes a single-storey extension which projects approx. 2.3m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, flush with the existing outrigger. It is characterised by a lean-to roof and has a ridge height of approx. 3.61m and an eaves height of approx. 2.83m.

The proposed rear projection would join the proposed side projection to form a wraparound extension.

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

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The application appears to have no impact on the current parking arrangements however we would ask that the applicant identifies two viable off street parking spaces as part of the development proposals so the extended dwelling meets current parking standards.

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

It is not expected that there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of the development.

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)

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:

G4	Protecting Green Belt
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: 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.
- ☐ Paragraph 147 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 148 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 149 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 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. The submitted Green Belt statement states that historic photographs indicate an original garage previously stood on the front driveway of the property. 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. However, no evidence has been submitted alongside the statement to demonstrate the garage is original as defined by NPPF. 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 floorspace and volume calculations.

- ② The submitted Green Belt statement also notes the property includes a single-storey rear extension which would not form part of the original dwelling.
- ② Calculations from the Green Belt statement indicates the total extensions have a volume of 114 cubic metres and a floor space of 28 square metres, which constitutes a 25.61% volume increase and 25.22% floor space increase. However, the calculations include the previously built garage as part of its original volume and floor space.
- ② Based on the existing and proposed floor plans, the original dwelling (excluding the demolished garage and existing extensions) had a gross external floor space of approx. 104 square metres. Following the proposed development, alongside the previous extensions the house would have a gross floor space of approximately 174sqm, resulting in a circa 67% increase in scale. This would significantly exceed the 35% allowance, failing to accord with the SPD.

Openness

- ② Paragraph 137 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.
- ② Given the proposed development constitutes a disproportionate increase in volume and floor space, it is considered the proposal would harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt.
- ② The dwelling is substantially elevated from the highway to a degree of which views to open land to the rear of the property are mostly obscured from Wardle Road. 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. Notwithstanding, by virtue of the disproportionate additions to the original dwelling, the proposal would constitute harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

- ② In light of the above assessment, the proposal fails to meet inappropriate development exemption (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 and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, additional harm has been identified in terms of the adverse impact on the spatial openness of the Green Belt. No other harm has been identified in terms of design or neighbour amenity. However, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been identified that would outweigh the harm caused. The application is therefore contrary to policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ 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 approx. 0.63m 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 appear somewhat subservient in this regard. The use of a hipped roof would also appear in keeping.
- ❑ The proposed side extension would be sited approx. 2.56m away from the common boundary with adjacent no. 189 and would be set back approx. 2.2m from the front main wall of the host dwelling. As such, 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 fenestration appears proportionally smaller than the existing fenestration. However, it is considered the harm of the fenestration on the appearance of the host dwelling would not be significant enough to recommend refusal in this regard.
- ❑ 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 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.”*
- ❑ In particular, section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - ❑ *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*
- ❑ Additionally, section 5.5 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.”* Section 5.6 notes the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:
 - ❑ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
 - ❑ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ❑ The proposed side extension do not directly face any properties to the front and rear, and would retain a substantial intervening distance of approx. 22.89m between the proposal and the directly facing rear curtilage of Birar Dene.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension projects approx. 2.3m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjoined no. 193 and is flush with both the existing outrigger of the host dwelling and the existing rear conservatory of adjoined no. 193.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension is sited approx. 7.48m from adjacent no. 189, and would not project beyond the existing rear conservatory of no. 189.
- ❑ The proposed plans indicate a window to the first-floor master bedroom on the south-west side elevation, facing the side elevation wall of adjacent no. 189. Obscure glazing can be secured via condition as to not cause undue amenity harm to the adjacent property.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the amenity of 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.

Recommendation: Refuse

- ❑ 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.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ❑ Location Plan
- ❑ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 22.2983.2
- ❑ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2983.1A
- ❑ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2983.SC2.1B

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	13/04/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	14/04/2023	Signed: RG