

Application Number:	23/00041/HOUS
Location:	292 Middleton Road Heywood Rochdale OL10 2LG
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extension following demolition of existing rear conservatory
Applicant:	Mr Mark Corlett
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	no
	Contrary to previous decision?	no
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	no

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	no
	Neighbour comments received?	no

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

Location

The application relates to 292 Middleton Road, Middleton - a two-storey, and semi-detached property. Middleton road comprises similar semi-detached properties of a matching style and material pallet. There is open space between the properties and large driveways creating a low density street-scene. The property sits within the Green Belt, and is surrounded by farmland, however approx.0.25km north is the M62 motorway. To the north is the adjoining property 290 Middleton Road, and to the south the adjacent house is 294 Middleton Road. The front elevation faces east and overlooks Middleton road highway and 291 & 293 Middleton Road. The rear boundary of the curtilage faces west and borders open farmland.

Description of Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for a single-storey, side and rear wraparound extension, following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The extension would include a lean-to, hipped roof, and 3 sky lights on the rear elevation. It would also include sliding glass doors on the rear elevation, and the application of render to match the existing cream render.

The height to eaves would measure approx. 2.4m and the maximum roof height would measure 3.5m. The width along the rear elevation would measure approx. 8m in width, protruding approx. 2.2m from the south-facing side elevation. The maximum

length of the extension measures approx. 5.8m, 2.3m of which will extend from the existing rear elevation of the host property.

Relevant History

None

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the relevant neighbouring properties 08/02/2023

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:

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ The property is situated in the Green Belt, therefore a key consideration for design is ensuring that the alterations are proportionate to the host property. As the extension complies with the additional 35% limit in volume and floor space, it is by definition proportionate to the host property. The extension is neither overbearing nor incongruous with the host property, and preserves the openness of the Green Belt landscape.
- ☐ Due to the wide spacing between properties, the side extension will be visible from the road. However it is set far enough back that it does not distract from the main architectural features of the house such as the bay window, and the symmetrical relationship with 290 Middleton Road.
- ☐ The amended roof form on the extension is an asset to the property as it matches the main roof in both material pallet and hipped design. It creates an architectural feature of the wraparound extension, enhancing the quality of the design.
- ☐ The fenestration to the rear of the property is crucial to the design as it breaks up the rendering, ensuring that there is no extensive continuation of a single material.
- ☐ Using a matching material pallet to the host dwelling will create subtle elements of symmetry, whilst remaining subservient to the host property.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Given the extensions compliance with all relevant standards set out in sections 4.1 and 5.5 of the SPD, no concerns are had in respect of an impact to the privacy and access to light and outlook of adjacent dwellings. Suitable outdoor garden area would be retained for the occupiers of the application dwelling and all habitable rooms would be served with satisfactory light and outlook.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ The alteration will have no impact on parking provision, as the maximum standard of 2 off street parking spaces will be maintained.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore 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.

Paragraphs 147 and 148 of the NPPF state 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. When considering any planning application, 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 indicates that "a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt", subject to the following exceptions:

- 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 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 floorspace 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 total volume of the existing property is 394.4m³ and the total floor space is 63.4m². The volume of the extension is approx. 59m³ which equates to an increase of 15%, and the total floor space is 21m², which equates to an increase of 33%.

On this basis, the scale of the development complies with the SPD guidance. It is considered that the proposed development meets inappropriate development exemption 'c', which allows 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.

Planning Balance

It is considered that in light of the above assessment, the proposed garage would qualify as an exemption to inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Paragraphs 149 and 150 of the NPPF state 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. No harm through inappropriateness has been identified and no additional harm to the Green Belt has been identified. The application proposal therefore accords with policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the protection of the Green Belt. As such, the proposed development is acceptable in principle and matters of detail and the application is accordingly recommended for approval.

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:

Proposed and existing site plan: NMC1001-C-DR-3001
Proposed front and rear elevations: NMC1001-A-DR-1006
Proposed side elevations: NMC1001-A-DR-1007
Proposed ground floor plan: NMC1001-A-DR-1005

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. 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.

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	21/04/2023	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	27/04/2023	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg