

Application Number:	22/01092/HOUS
Location:	167 Wardle Road, Wardle, Rochdale, OL12 9JA
Proposal:	Two storey side and single storey rear extension including an additional window opening on existing rear elevation at first floor
Applicant:	Katy Thompson
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. 167 Wardle Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Wardle. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 165 Wardle Road to the south, adjacent to no. 169 Wardle Road to the north and faces the highway to the east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders open land. In its immediate locality, the building line along the host dwelling is characterised by a row of semi-detached dwellings. The site property is situated within the Green Belt and faces open land to the front and rear of the property.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part-two storey, part-single storey side extension, to be partly built above the existing single-storey garage, projecting 2.68m from the side elevation of the host dwelling, with a 0.7m set-back on the front elevation of the first-floor extension. The proposed side extension is characterised by a hipped roof form with a ridge height of approx. 7.71m and an eaves height of approx. 5.22m.

A single-storey rear extension is also proposed to project 2.7m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling along the common boundary of adjoining no. 165, effectively infilling the recessed area of the existing rear extension. It is characterised by a lean-to roof with two rooflights over the proposed kitchen and dining area. It has a ridge height of approx. 3.25m and an eaves height of approx. 2.4m.

An additional window is proposed for the existing first-floor bathroom on the rear elevation.

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

Relevant History

81/D12180 - Single storey extension to dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

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

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

Amendments

Amendments were initially requested for the front elevation of the proposed first-floor extension to be set back by 1m and for the ridge height of the proposed roof to be reduced accordingly. Following discussions with the agent, amendments of a 0.7m set-back and a reduction to the ridge height were agreed.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ② Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires 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”*.
- ② The proposed side extension consists of a hipped roof form which is sited below the ridge line of the host dwelling roof. The proposed rear extension is of a single-storey form with a lean-to roof. It is considered the roof forms of the proposed extensions would be subservient to the host dwelling.
- ② Amendments were made for the front elevation of the proposed first-floor extension to be set back by 0.7m. It is considered the set-back would create a visual break and would maintain a balanced appearance of semi-detached dwellings on the street scene and therefore be acceptable.
- ② The proposed side extension has the potential to result in a ‘terracing effect’ with the neighbouring property as it would be sited within a metre of the boundary at the front corner. However, it is noted that the adjacent pair of semi-detached dwellings, no. 169 and no. 171, are sited on a higher level and at an angle to the host dwelling. Therefore, on balance, it is considered the proposal would not harm the visual appearance of the area in respect of terracing.
- ② The materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ② It is considered the proposed windows, doors and French doors are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ② 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 4.1 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”*.
- ❑ The proposed extension faces open land to the front and rear of the dwelling and does not directly face any properties, hence there are no concerns over undue overlooking and overshadowing.
- ❑ Furthermore, Section 5.6 of the SPD states 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 rear extension would not project beyond the existing 2.7m rear extension and would not project beyond the approx. 2.88m rear extension of the adjoined no. 165, in accordance with the maximum standard for both attached and detached properties. Moreover, as mentioned previously, the adjacent no. 169 is angled away from the host dwellin.
- ❑ The proposed windows and rooflights would provide adequate natural light into the proposed bedrooms and dining area, in accordance with Section 4.1 of SPD.
- ❑ The proposed development would retain sufficient garden space with a functional layout for its occupiers, in accordance with Section 5.4 of the SPD.
- ❑ 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 increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4 and would require a maximum standard of 2 parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ❑ The proposal would retain the two existing parking spaces to the front driveway, therefore the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Principle of Development – Green Belt: G4

- ② 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.
- ② 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”*.
- ② 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 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 proposed development seeks to extend the dwelling to the side and rear elevation of the host dwelling. Planning history indicates the application site was previously granted planning permission for a single-storey rear extension (application reference: 81/D12180). The application property also has a single-storey garage to the side of the host dwelling, which has been present from at least 2006, based on available aerial photographs. The submitted Green Belt assessment suggests the garage was built at the same time as the host dwelling. However, inconsistencies in the materials of the brickwork and roof materials between the garage and the original property indicate the garage was constructed at a later period to the host dwelling. It is also noted that other identical dwellings in the row do not have the same attached garage. For this reason, both the existing single-storey rear extension and single-storey garage would not be considered to be a part of the original dwelling.

☐ The submitted Green Belt assessment includes the garage as part of the original property measurements. In spite of this, the volume calculations suggest the volume of the existing rear extension and proposed extensions to constitute a 38% increase over the original property, exceeding the 35% threshold.

☐ Taking into account of the volume of the garage, the total extension volume would result in a 52.75% increase over the original property.

☐ The Green Belt assessment did not provide floor space calculations. Nevertheless, based on calculations from the proposed floor plans, the original dwelling has a floor space of approx. 50.21 square metres. The

existing rear extension and single-storey garage has a combined floor space of approx. 24.40 square metres, which constitutes an existing floor space increase of approx. 48.60%.

- ☐ The proposed extensions have a total floor space of approx. 20.95 square metres. Taking into account of the previous extensions, the total floor space of the extensions is approx. 45.39 square metres, which constitutes a total 90.40% increase of floor space over the original property.
- ☐ Both the increase in volume and floor space of the extensions significantly exceeds the 35% increase allowance and would not accord with Section 5.20 of the SPD.

Openness

- ☐ 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”*.
- ☐ “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.
- ☐ Given the proposed development, on top of the existing extensions, would constitute a disproportionate increase in volume and floor space, it is considered the proposal would significantly harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor side extension would obscure the view into open land to the rear of the curtilage when viewed from Wardle Road. However, given the present context of the street scene as a predominantly residential area of semi-detached dwellings, it is considered the proposal would not significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

- ☐ 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.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. 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:

- ☐ Site Plans - 22.2886.3A
- ☐ Location Plan
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations - 22.2886.1C
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations - 22.2886.2C

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	15/11/2022	Signed: SY
Authorisation	16/11/2022	Signed: AT

Report Author Sam Yuen