

Application Number:	23/00166/HOUS
Location:	24 Dean Head, Todmorden Road, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 9LZ
Proposal:	Two storey side, single storey front and single storey rear extensions including the addition of a balcony to the first floor rear elevation and a glass balustrade and formation of new garden steps to the rear
Applicant:	Mr Arran Bassett
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. 24 Dean Head, Todmorden Road, a two-storey end-terrace dwelling located in a semi-rural setting in Summit, Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 22 Dean Head to the south-east, adjacent to no. 26 Dean Head to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. To the front of the property lies Dean Head Farm to the south-west and to the rear lies the Rochdale Canal to the north-east. The street scene is characterised by early to mid-20th century terraced housing of pebbledash construction with rear garden and allotments separated by an access road. The property is sited within Green Belt land and is served by the A6033, a high-trafficked classified road linking Littleborough with Hebden Bridge.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey extension which projects 3.95m from the side elevation of the host dwelling. It is characterised by a pitched roof and has ridge and eaves height to match the host dwelling.

A single-storey front extension is also proposed to project 1.3m from the front elevation of the host dwelling to accommodate a single garage and porch. It is characterised by a lean-to roof and has a ridge height of 3.67m and an eaves height of 2.95m.

Additionally, a single-storey rear extension is proposed to project 1.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, accessible via a set of steps from the rear curtilage. This is accompanied by a first-floor terrace balcony and glass balustrades on the first floor and ground floor.

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

Relevant History

82/D14784 - Conversion of dwellinghouse to two flats - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

There are a number of concerns regarding this application in particular parking provision.

The existing dwelling is situated on Todmorden Road which is a busy classified road (A6033) therefore it is necessary to assess any highway impact on the strategic highway network.

As a classified road a requirement of any development is that vehicles must be able to enter and leave the classified road in forward gear, therefore they must have adequate internal turning space. The loss of the driveway will remove the potential turning space within the site curtilage however it is noted that a precedent may have been set in this location so an objection on this basis may not be sustainable.

The side extension will remove the existing driveway to the side of the dwelling and the application indicates that the driveway will be replaced by the proposed garage. For the size of the extended property Council standards would require the provision of two off-street parking places excluding garage, and as the dwelling is on a classified road we would require this provision.

Council standards would also require that a minimum driveway length to a garage must be 5.5 metres in length, the proposed front extension would mean that the driveway standard cannot be achieved.

At this stage Highways cannot support this application for the concerns set out above.

Canal and River Trust

The Trust has no comment to make on the proposal.

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 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.”* Further to the above, Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that development which is not well-designed should be refused.
- ❑ The application proposes a two-storey side extension which adjoins the common boundary with adjacent no. 26. The proposed extension has a width greater than half the width of the host dwelling and features matching ridge and eaves height, the sum of which would appear non-subservient to the host dwelling.
- ❑ Whilst it is acknowledged the host dwelling is itself a terraced dwelling, properties along the building line maintains a rhythm of four terraced dwellings with defined visual breaks between them through differing materiality. The proposed side extension would remove this break and would contribute towards a ‘terracing effect’ between nos. 18-24 and nos. 26-32 Dean Head, in the absence of a setback as required by section 5.11 and 5.12 of the SPD to the detriment of the character of the street scene.
- ❑ The proposed front extension comprises a lean-to projection 1.3m forward from the main front wall. With the exception of nos. 46 and 68 Dean Head, properties along Dean Head maintain uniformity in its built form by means of a strong building line with modestly sized front porch canopies. The proposed garage and front porch therefore constitutes an incongruous and obtrusive addition which would not be in keeping with the host dwelling, adjoining terrace and surrounding street scene.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not be well-designed and fails to comprise a satisfactory standard of visual amenity and would result in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- ❑ The proposed plans indicate a bin store to the rear of the dwelling for refuse bins storage. Whilst refuse bins would likely require considerable movement between the access road and the highway, it is noted that similar arrangements are present in neighbouring properties and as such no concerns are had with the proposed arrangements.
- ❑ The development proposals are not well-designed and are therefore unacceptable and fail to accord 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.”*
- ❑ Additionally, 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 two-storey side extension does not directly face any properties to the front and rear and is sited at a substantial distance from Dean Head Farm Cottages. Moreover, the proposed rear extension projects 1.5m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of adjoining no. 22 and adjacent no. 26. In this regard, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity harm to neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ The application proposes a terrace balcony on the first floor with glass balustrades on the rear and side elevations. Section 4.4 of the SPD states balconies *“should be carefully designed to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring properties.”* The rear curtilage space of adjacent no. 26 is separated by an access road and has an intervening distance of approx. 6m from the proposed balcony. Additionally, potential overlooking impacts may be mitigated by means of condition for obscurely glazed screens, restricting views towards only the furthest parts of neighbouring gardens which are used less intensively. On this basis, it is considered the amenity impacts of the proposed balcony would be acceptable.
- ❑ 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 site is set against A6033 Todmorden Road, which is recognised as a classified road, with substantial traffic movement at reasonable speed throughout the day.
- ☐ The proposals 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 proposed side extension would completely erode the existing driveway to the side of the dwelling. The remaining driveway length of 3.8m, falls short of the minimum Council standard of 5.5m and would not be viable as a parking space, with the resultant development therefore including no off-street parking provision. The proposed garage would be viable as a single space, however inadequate space exists for the manoeuvring of vehicles clear of the highway. However, it is noted adjacent nos. 8 and 10 Dean Head also feature similar driveway layouts and parking arrangements for neighbouring properties without driveways are accommodated by off-street parking to the rear access road. On this basis, it is considered a refusal on grounds of highway safety could not be reasonably substantiated.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ 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, amongst other things, a two-storey side extension and single-storey extensions to the front and rear of the host dwelling. For the purposes of the floor space and volume calculations, the original dwelling would not include the existing shed.

☐ Green Belt calculations were not submitted for this application. Notwithstanding, based on the proposed plans, the original dwelling

comprises of a floor space of 54.99m² and a volume of 366.11m³. The sum of the proposed extensions constitutes a floor space of 58.51m² and a volume of 314.32m³, which equates to an increase in floor space and volume of 106.4% and 85.85% respectively, significantly exceeding the 35% allowance stated in 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 constitutes a disproportionate increase in volume and floor space, it is considered the proposal would harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt.
- ❑ The proposed two-storey side extension would obscure the view of the open land to the rear of the dwelling from Todmorden Road. Notwithstanding, the present context of the street scene is characterised by terraced residential dwellings and bungalows with limited spacing in between, thus it is considered the proposal would not significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt. However, given the disproportionate additions to the original dwelling, openness would be harmed.

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. Other harm has been identified in terms of the design of the proposals. 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 and the failure of the development

to be well-designed. 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.

2. By virtue of its scale, form and massing, the proposed two-storey side extension and single-storey front extension would constitute non-subservient and incongruous additions to the host dwelling, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the wider street scene. The development proposals would not be well-designed and therefore fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' 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 – Drawing No. 22-084-001
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. 22-084-002
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 22-084-200
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22-084-010
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 22-084 201

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19/04/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	20/04/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen