

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00886/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00886/HOUS
Location:	Hollands Farm Rooley Moor Road Rochdale OL12 6BN
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and new canopy over front entrance following removal of existing porch and rear conservatory
Applicant:	JOSH EMBREY
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

Location

The application relates to Hollands Farm, a semi-detached two-storey property on a converted farm complex off Rooley Moor Road, Rochdale. The applicant property and adjoining barns date back to the late 18th and early 19th Centuries, and have since been subdivided into separate dwellings. The dwellings on Hollands Farm are surrounded by open fields, providing a rural character to the site which extends well beyond the immediate vicinity. Hollands Farm is located within the Green Belt as per Policy JP-G9 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Owing to their historical and architectural interest, the buildings on Hollands Farm are non-designated heritage assets, and contribute to Catley Lane Head Conservation Area, in which they are located.

The applicant property is positioned at the northern end of Holland Farm, and faces west, overlooking a driveway and the fields beyond. It is adjoined by Festhigh Barn to the south, whilst to the north and east it borders mature trees and open fields.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing front and rear conservatories, and the erection of a single-storey rear extension and a front entrance canopy. The proposed rear extension comprises a flat roof and wraparound floor-to-ceiling windows/doors. Proposed materials include natural stone and black aluminium fenestration. The proposed entrance comprises timber beams mounted to stone plinths, supporting a pitched roof.

The extension would measure 7m (width) X 2.5m (height) X 4.9m (depth). The front entrance would measure 1.9 (width) X 3m (height) X 1m (depth).

Relevant History

03/D41797 – Grant STC

Conservatory extension to rear of existing farmhouse

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Conservation 31/10/2024

As a vernacular building predating 1848, it is a non-designated heritage asset. The building has been altered and subdivided during its lifetime. Some of these alterations, such as the porch and conservatory are unsympathetic and detract from its appearance.

There is no objection in principle to the replacement of the existing conservatories on the front and rear elevations, as these are not of any special architectural or historic interest. The removal of the front conservatory would enhance the appearance of the building. There are no objections to this element of the proposal.

There are some concerns with the rear extension. The depth and width of the extension have dictated the roof design and its shallow pitch. These concerns could be addressed by reducing the scale of the extension, so that a simple lean-to roof would work. Alternatively, a more contemporary approach could be taken, which if designed to a high quality using high quality materials.

Officer's response:

The applicant has addressed the concerns regarding the above concerns by submitting a revised scheme with a more contemporary approach. The revised scheme is assessed in this report.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-G9 The Green Belt

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Policy JP-P2 Heritage

Local

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

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

Amendments

Following comments from the Conservation Officer, a revised scheme was submitted with a more contemporary design.

Assessment

Principle for Development – Green Belt

The application site is allocated as Green Belt under Policy JP-G9 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, which establishes a revised Green Belt in the Borough and supersedes Policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and Policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. Policy JP-G9 does not set out specific requirements for development proposals within the Green Belt and as such the provisions of the NPPF apply.

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.”

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF establishes that “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. Paragraph 153 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 154 of the NPPF establishes that “a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.” The following exception is relevant:

- 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;*

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 “*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 “original dwelling” dates back to the early 19th Century and has a volume of 420m³ and a total ground floor space of 70m². It has since had several additions, including a two-storey rear extension, a single-storey side extension, and a front and rear conservatory, which have a combined volume of 337m³ and ground floor space of 95m². The subsequent extensions therefore already exceed the 35% limits established under Section 5.20 of the SPD, owing to the fact that they predate the existing and former Green Belt policies. As such, the impact of the proposed development on the Green Belt is assessed in respect of how it compares to the existing dwelling.

The proposed extension has a volume of 109m³ and a floor area of 34m², whilst the existing front and rear conservatories have a combined volume of 102m³ and combined floor area of 36m². This constitutes a 1% increase in volume across the entire dwelling, and an overall reduction in floor space. In of itself, the increase in volume is considered to have a negligible impact on the Green Belt. However, this is further aided by the fact that the proposed extension would be in a relatively contained position, surrounded by the host dwelling to the west and south. As such, the proposed extension would be viewed solely against a back drop of the existing dwelling, and would not obstruct any existing views into open land.

By preserving the openness of the landscape, the proposed extension is not considered to warrant a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling. As such, the principle for development is established by virtue of its accordance with the NPPF in terms of its impact on the Green Belt.

Heritage and design: DM1 and P3

When read collectively, the NPPF, policies P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and JP-P1 of Places for Everyone seek to achieve development of high quality design, 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. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area by being visually attractive as a result of effective architecture, layout and landscaping.

In addition, paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 206 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. A balanced judgement should be had, having regard to the significance of the asset and the scale of any harm or loss (NPPF paragraph 209). Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone states that Development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets and/or their settings will be considered having regard to national planning policy. Policy P2 of the Core Strategy promotes the protection and enhancement of key heritage assets and their visual amenity.

The host dwelling and adjoining barns are identified as non-designated heritage assets for their late 18th Century origin and their historical and architectural significance. Furthermore, the site falls adjacent to the Catley Lane Head Conservation Area. The impact of development on a non-designated heritage asset and a conservation area is a material planning consideration.

The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted, commenting that during its lifetime, the host dwelling has had some unsympathetic additions and alterations which have detracted from its appearance, but that it still retains some features of historical interest.

No objection was raised to the removal of the existing conservatories or the erection of the front porch canopy. Both these aspects of the proposal are considered to enhance the appearance of the building.

However, the officer raised concerns with the original plans for the single-storey rear extension which proposed a shallow pitched gable roof. They advised that the applicant could consider a more contemporary approach using high quality materials. A revised scheme was submitted on the advice of the conservation officer, which now comprises a single-storey flat roof extension, with wraparound bi-folding doors and full length windows.

The revised scheme is considered to be an improvement on the original proposal and is a good example of a contemporary addition to a historical building. The design is modest and simple, and therefore does not compete with, or detract from, the historical appearance of the host dwelling. The extension's siting and scale ensures that it appears subservient to the host dwelling, and does not dominate from any key vantage points.

Notwithstanding, the success of the scheme relies on the quality of the materials used in the construction of the rear extension. As such, a suitably worded condition will be attached to this decision, requiring the applicant to submit details of the materials being used, for approval from the council prior to any development taking place.

Subject to condition, the proposed design is considered to be acceptable, with certain elements that would enhance the appearance of the building. As such, the development would have a neutral impact on the historical significance of the host

dwelling and the wider conservation area, in accordance with the NPPF, PfE policies JP-P1 and JP-P2, Core Strategy policies P2 and P3, and the SPD.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The Council's adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 states that proposals need to demonstrate that they do 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. Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that extensions 'should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.' Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Due to the position of the single-storey rear extension, which is separated from the adjoining dwelling by an existing two-storey extension, its impact on neighbouring amenity is negligible. In addition, the extension is relatively modest in scale and complies with paragraph 5.6 of the SPD, which sets maximum standards for how far a single-storey rear extension can project from the rear elevation of an adjoining dwelling. By virtue of its compliance with the SPD, and given its contained position, the proposed development 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 proposed development would have no bearing on the current parking arrangements and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

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:

- Existing and proposed block plans: 24.3388.SC8.3
- Proposed elevations: 24.3388.SC8.2B
- Proposed ground floor plan: 24.3388.SC8.1A
- Proposed volume schedules: 23.3388.SC8.4
- Location plan

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 above ground construction works shall take place until samples and/or full specifications of the natural stone to be used externally on the building 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 interests of amenity and in compliance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding any description in the application, no above ground works shall take place until full product specifications for the windows and external doors, at a scale of not less than 1:50, to be used on the development hereby approved, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The windows and doors shall be installed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the protection of heritage, 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	04/12/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	05/12/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg