

Application Number:	23/00054/HOUS
Location:	167 Wardle Road Wardle OL12 9JA
Proposal:	Part two, part single storey side extension including insertion of new window at first floor rear elevation. Resubmission of 22/01092/HOUS
Applicant:	Katy Thompson
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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. 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 is characterised by a row of semi-detached dwellings. The property is situated within a ribbon development in 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 an approx. 0.67m set-back on the front elevation on the first-floor. 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. The ground-floor front elevation of the extension comprises of a lean-to roof.

The application also seeks to insert a new window to the first-floor bathroom on the rear elevation of the host dwelling.

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

The application is a resubmission of a previous application (ref: 22/01092/HOUS) with amendments made to remove the previously proposed single-storey rear extension.

Relevant History

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

22/01092/HOUS - Two storey side and single storey rear extension including an additional window opening on existing rear elevation at first floor – Refuse

Reasons:

- ❑ 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.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The only highways issue regarding this application is parking provision. Although the application form indicates that there would be no impact on parking provision the loss of the garage means that parking must be accommodated on the driveway. The submitted plans do not indicate where this parking will be accommodated, if the applicant can provide two viable parking spaces Highways would raise no objection on this issue.

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

Highways would not expect 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

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ 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”*.

- ☐ The proposed side extension consists of an in-keeping hipped roof form and is set down below the ridge line of the host dwelling which would appear subservient.
- ☐ 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, nos. 169 and 171, are sited on a higher level and at an angle to the host dwelling. Additionally, the proposed 0.7m set-back would ensure a visual break in the building line and maintain a balanced appearance of semi-detached dwellings on the street scene. On this basis, on balance, it is considered the proposal would not result in adverse harm to the visual appearance of the area.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ 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 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed extension faces open land to the front and rear of the dwelling and does not directly face any properties, thus no concerns are had over any adverse overlooking and overshadowing impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that 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 increase the number 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.
- ❑ As noted by the Highways representatives, the loss of the existing garage would result in the reduction of one off-street parking space. Nevertheless, the proposal would retain the two existing off-street 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

- ❑ 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 planning permission for a part-single storey and part-two storey extension to the side elevation of the host dwelling. The submitted Green Belt assessment contends the existing single-storey rear extension as part of the original dwelling and has presented a historic map dating from 1964 showing an outrigger to the rear of the host dwelling. Planning history indicates an application for a single-storey rear extension was approved in 1981 (application reference: 81/D12180). Whilst the current rear extension appears to have been rebuilt, there is insufficient evidence to suggest the current extension is materially larger than the original outrigger indicated in the assessment. On this basis, the existing single-storey rear extension is taken to be the original dwelling.

☐ Planning history also indicates the property was previously granted planning permission for a lean-to garage in 1969 (application reference: 14/3/941). Thus, the existing single-storey attached garage is not taken to comprise part of the original dwelling.

☐ The submitted Green Belt assessment indicates the volume of the original dwelling, including the existing rear extension, to be 347.22 cubic metres and

the total extension volume, including the existing garage, to be 134.31 cubic metres, which equates to a 38.6% volume increase of the original dwelling.

- ② Floor space calculations were not provided in the Green Belt assessment. Regardless, based on the proposed floor plans, the original dwelling has a floor space of 59.14 square metres. The sum of the existing garage and proposed extension results in an additional floor space of 21.64 square metres, which equates to 36.6% increase in floor space of the original dwelling.
- ② Both the increase in volume and floor space of the extensions would exceed the 35% allowance stated in the SPD. However, given the siting of the proposed extension to the side of the host dwelling and the adjacent dwelling, the its impact on openness would be limited. Furthermore, if the LPA were to insist upon a reduction of 3% volume, it is not considered that this would appear materially different. It is also noted the applicant had accepted amendments to set back the first-floor front wall of the side extension in the original submission. As such, a further reduction in floor space may not provide an adequate functional internal layout for its occupants. As such, given the specific circumstances of the site and the proposed development, it is considered that the exceedance of the SPD guidance is acceptable on balance and the proposed development is considered to constitute a proportionate addition and would not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt

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 No harm has been identified in terms of the spatial component of openness where the proposal is considered to constitute a proportionate and appropriate development.
- ② The proposed side extension would obscure the views into open land to the rear of the curtilage when viewed from Wardle Road between the building line. However, given the present context of the street scene as a predominantly residential area of semi-detached dwellings which are not spaced too far apart, views to the rear are already at present very limited, and it is considered the proposal would not significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

- ② 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 147 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 G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 22.2886.3B
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2886.1D
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22.2886.2D

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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the hallway window in the first floor on the north-east side elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance 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	13/04/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	13/04/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen