

Application Number:	22/01328/HOUS
Location:	Burnedge House Broad Lane Rochdale OL16 4QL
Proposal:	Single storey side extension including Juliet balcony on side elevation
Applicant:	Jocelyn Waterfall
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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

Location

The application site is located on the western side of a rough surfaced road leading north east from Broad Lane/Rochdale Road and giving access to a number of properties including Moorgate East Farm, Burnedge House and Burnedge Farm. These properties are all situated to the west of the access road and take the form of an isolated strip of development extending into the open countryside. To the north and south of the site is open countryside.

Burnedge House itself is an attractive 19th century house constructed of coursed sandstone with dressed ashlar details. The property is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset due to its architectural and historical values. The house adjoins Burnedge Farmhouse, an early 17th century Grade II listed building.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks planning permission to construct a single storey side extension. The proposed extension would be constructed out of natural stone and natural Slate to match existing.

Relevant History

12/55785/OUT - Outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of one bungalow with associated double garage – Refused – Appeal dismissed

1. The proposed dwellinghouse does not fall within any of the categories of appropriate development in the Green Belt identified in the National Planning Policy Framework and Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policy D/4 (Control of Development in the Green Belt - General). Therefore, the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is unacceptable in principle. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it. The site is a densely vegetated parcel of land with a prominent frontage onto Broad Lane and occupies a rural setting viewed in conjunction with open farmland to the east (front) and west (rear). The proposed dwellinghouse would conflict with the openness of the Green Belt and would injure visual amenity in the surrounding landscape. The applicant has failed to demonstrate any very special circumstances to justify this inappropriate development and the harm that it would cause. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of UDP policy D/4 (Control of Development in the Green Belt - General) and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. As a result, the proposal does not comprise sustainable development and the presumption in favour of it should not apply.
2. The applicant has failed to make provision for recreational open space for the proposed development as required by Unitary Development Plan policy H/6 and its associated Supplementary Planning Document: 'Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing'.

15/00579/HOUS - Replacement detached garage and boundary wall – Withdrawn.

17/00413/FUL - Change of use from agricultural land to extension to private garden, including demolition and replacement of existing detached garage – Withdrawn.

20/00767/FUL - Change of use from agricultural land to extension to private garden, including demolition and replacement of existing detached garage – Refused.

1. The proposed change of use of land to provide an extension to the residential curtilage constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt, as it would not preserve its openness and conflicts with the purposes of including land within it. No very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies G4, P2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed detached garage constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would not preserve its openness. No very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

22/01329/FUL - Change of use of land to form extension to existing curtilage; erection of garage/store and demolition of existing timber outbuilding – Under consideration.

Township/Member comments

Consultee responses

Conservation And Design

Summary: With minor amendments, a neutral impact on the significance of the heritage assets could be achieved.

Significance Assessment: Burnedge House is an attractive 19th century house, constructed of coursed sandstone with dressed ashlar details. The property is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset due to its architectural and historical values. The house adjoins Burnedge Farmhouse, an early 17th century Grade II listed building. Further to the southwest of the site along Broad Lane, is Moorgate East Farmhouse and 3 Broad Lane, a late 17th century stone Farmhouse.

The proposal is for a single storey extension to Burnedge House. Given the nature of the property and the proximity to Burnedge Farmhouse, the proposal has the potential to impact upon the significance of both designated and non-designated heritage assets. The application is supported by a heritage statement, which is considered to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 194.

The proposed extension would be dual pitched and would infill the northwest corner of the property. The extension would be set back slightly from the principal elevation of the property. It would be dual-pitched and constructed of stone with a natural slate roof, and timber windows.

It would be preferable for the extension to be set back further to reduce its visual impact and improve the relationship with the existing dwelling. However, the slight set back of the proposed extension, its single storey height and position within an existing recess mean that it would not be overly dominant or overly harmful to the existing dwelling.

Similarly the design and proposed material palette would complement the existing property and would not detract from the symmetry and architectural detailing of the frontage. The windows along the side elevation are oversized and their proportions appear somewhat awkward in relation to those on the frontage and elsewhere on the host dwelling. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that this elevation of the extension would not be readily visible from any public viewpoints. To improve the relationship, one window could be reduced to the size of the existing, with the other changed to a set of French doors.

Subject to the above amendments, and conditions, requiring large scale details of windows, metal rainwater goods, conservation style rooflights and samples of materials, a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and the nearby designated heritage asset could be achieved.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties, site notices were placed in the vicinity of the site and a press notice was released. On representation in support of the application was received. The representation has been summarised below:

- ☐ The extension will further enhance the property and will also greatly benefit the area.
- ☐ The extension is sympathetic to the design and aesthetics of the existing building and will hardly be noticeable to any local residents and to members of the general public who pass the property via the unadopted lane.
Officer comment: Discussed in the design and heritage section of the report.
- ☐ Existing investment in the refurbishment of the property has benefited the area and all of the neighbouring properties.
- ☐ ***Officer comment: This is not considered a material consideration and therefore cannot be considered in the decision making process.***

Policy

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended)

Section 66 of the above Act states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

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:

P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
T2	Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5	Schedule of Parking Standards
G4	Protecting Green Belt

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

Amendments

Following recommendations made by the Conservation Officer, the following amendments were made:

- ☐ One window on the ground floor side elevation reduced in size, and
- ☐ Replacement of window with glazed doors and inclusion of Juliet balcony.

Assessment

Design and heritage asset: DM1, P2 and P3

- ☐ The application has been identified as a non-designated heritage assets and the property neighbours Burnedge Farmhouse (Grade II) and Moorgate East Farmhouse and 3 Broad Lane (Grade II). As such the property is located within the setting of listed buildings.
- ☐ Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the Borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider

settings. Policy P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, in addition to requiring a number of other basic planning considerations.

- ❑ Paragraphs 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
- ❑ Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- ❑ Paragraph 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. In determining planning applications which may impact the significance of a designated heritage asset, Paragraphs 199-200 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and, where there is any harm to, or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), clear and convincing justification for this harm is required.
- ❑ Paragraph 203 of the NPPF adds that 'the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'
- ❑ Burned House is an attractive 19th century house constructed of coursed sandstone with dressed ashlar details. The property is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset due to its architectural and historical values. The south-western wall while side on to the highway clearly reads as the principal elevation because of its architectural features. The principal elevation appears to be largely unaltered and has simple detailing and symmetrical features.

- ② The proposed extension would have a dual pitched roof which mimics the orientation of the host property. The pitch of the roof would be slightly shallower than the host property, and it would have been preferable to have a pitched roof that is the same as that as property. However, it is noted that the host property has a window on the first floor side elevation, which does restrict the pitch and height of the proposed roof. Nevertheless, the design of the roof is considered to be acceptable.
- ② The proposed extension would be set slightly back from the front elevation of the host property. However, as noted by the Conservation Officer, it would have been preferable for the extension to be set back further to reduce its visual impact and improve the relationship with the existing dwelling. However, the slight set back of the proposed extension, its single storey height and position within an existing recess mean that it would not be overly dominant or overly harmful to the existing dwelling.
- ② Originally, the application proposed to include two over sized windows on the side elevation. The proportions appeared incongruous in relation to other windows on the front and side elevation of the host property. However, the proposal was subsequently amended with the addition of a smaller window which is line with the other windows in the property and the addition of glazed double doors. The proportion of the amended openings is considered to be in keeping with the host property. The proposed front elevation would be the most visible element of the proposed extension. The proposed window on the ground floor would be the same size and would line up with the other windows on the ground floor of the host property and as such is considered acceptable. Furthermore, the addition of the surrounds to the openings to match that of the host property, will help to create a positive relationship with the rest of the host property.
- ② With the addition of the glazed double doors, for the purpose health and safety and the requirements of building regulations, a Juliet balcony was included in the proposal. The proposed Juliet balcony would be constructed out of metal and glazing. The design of the proposed Juliet balcony would be a relatively unobtrusive design. It would also not be visible from public vantage points and would be read in relation to the modern single storey side extension. As such the addition of the Juliet balcony is considered to be acceptable subject to the inclusion of a condition requiring material samples to be provided.
- ② Overall, the design of the proposed extension with the addition of the proposed materials to match the host property, would represent a subservient addition and would not be overly prominent. Of particular note is the front elevation, which would be clearly visible from public vantage points. The proposal due to its scale, size, matching design and architectural detailing would not detract from historic fabric of the host property.
- ② Subject to the additions of conditions requiring details of details of windows, metal rainwater goods, conservation style roof lights and samples of

materials, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and the setting of the nearby designated heritage assets. As such the proposal would accord with the requirements of policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ A proposal needs to demonstrate it does not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Furthermore, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of future residents and occupiers. Additionally, paragraph 130 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments 'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.' Furthermore considerations needs to be given to the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- ☐ The proposed extension would have windows to the side and front. The proposed extension would house a combined dining and living room. It is noted that the proposed amendment has included a Juliet balcony to the proposal. The proposed extension, although slightly elevated, would be at ground floor level.
- ☐ There are no windows facing towards the adjoining property of Burnedge Farm. Additionally, the existing property would screen the proposed extension from Burnedge Farm. There are no properties to the side of the proposed extension.
- ☐ The only property that would be conceivably impacted by the proposed extension is Moorgate East Farm. Taking note of the requirements set out in the SPD, it is considered that the proposed extension would be sufficiently set away from the neighbouring property to meet the requirements set out in the SPD. Overall, it is considered that the proposed extension would not unduly impact on the amenity of any of the neighbouring property.
- ☐ Habitable rooms of the applicant property would retain a sufficient amount of light and outlook. Additionally, the property would retain a sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or the habitable property and therefore would be in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

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 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 extension would represent a 9% addition in terms of volume and 15% in terms of floor space. Additionally it is noted that the proposed extension would be sited to the side, within a recess and with two storey elements of the host property located to the rear and side. The design and scale of the extension is such that it would appear as a subservient addition.
- ☐ As such it is considered that the proposed extension would not result in a disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The application is considered to be acceptable in respect to Green Belt policy and is in accordance with the policy.

Conclusion

- ☐ The scale of the development in respect of the increase in size of the property in the green belt is considered to be acceptable. The proposed extension would meet the requirements of criterion (c) and is considered a proportionate addition to the original building. The design, size and siting of the proposal is considered to be an acceptable form of development, with the proposal being considered a subservient addition. Additionally, the proposed extension would have neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and setting of the nearby designated heritage assets.

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. Drawing no: W350-03. Rev: A
Existing Floor Plans. Drawing no: 1414 001 002
Existing Elevations & Sections. Drawing no: 1414 001 003
Topographical Survey. Drawing no: 1414 001 001
Proposals-extension to house. Drawing no: W350-01-B. Received by email on 06/03/23

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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no external 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 the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of Non-Designated Heritage Asset and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Details of the windows and door to be utilised in the development hereby permitted, including samples if so required, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any such windows and doors are installed in the development. Such details shall indicate, at a scale of not less than 1:20, the longitudinal and cross-sectional detailing, surround detailing, and means of opening together with any finished treatment. The windows and door shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter so maintained.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of Non-Designated Heritage Asset and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Full product specifications of the materials to be used for the rain water goods, soffits, eaves and any fascias of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their use in the construction. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved material specification and be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of Non-Designated Heritage Asset and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Details of the roof lights to be installed in the roof of the development hereby permitted, including samples if so required, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any such roof lights are installed in the roof of the approved development. For the avoidance of doubt, roof lights shall be of a 'Conservation Style' and shall be set flush with the roof slope or as close as is practicable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of Non-Designated Heritage Asset and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	10/03/23	Signed: MM
Authorisation	16/03/23	Signed: RG