APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01171/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01171/HOUS
Location:	Broadhead House Halifax Road Littleborough OL15 0LG
Proposal:	Two single storey extensions and front porch to annex
Applicant:	Mr John Nichol
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?	**N**

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

Location

The application relates to Broadhead House, a detached property with a detached outbuilding. The property is located in remote location with only the White House pub in close vicinity to Broadhead House. The proposal relates to the single storey out building located to the north of Broadhead House.

Description of Proposal

The applicant proposes to construct a single storey rear extension and a single storey front extension which will project out from the northern end of the existing outbuilding located within the curtilage of Broadhead House. The application also proposed to construct a porch to the front elevation of the existing outbuilding.

Relevant History

79/D09903 - Change Of Use From Private Dwellinghouse To Outdoor Pursuits Centre(Walking Rock Climbing Yatching Etc.) – Approved.

89/D24305 - Conversion Of Redundant Outbuilding To Self-Contained Holiday Accommodation – Approved.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Conservation Officer
Having examined the details of the above application and explored the history of the site there are no comments or objections raised in response to the proposed development.

Representations

Letter of notification has been sent to the neighbouring property and a site notice was placed within the vicinity of the site. No representation has been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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

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

Amendments

The projections of the front and rear extension have been reduced from 5.47 to 4.28m. The width of the proposed front and rear extension have increased from 4.1m to 5.4m.

Assessment

Principle of development - Annex

The proposed extensions to the out building will allow for an ancillary living accommodation to be provided. Longstanding case law establishes that ancillary accommodation can be viewed as appropriate development, providing the accommodation is incidental to the main dwelling house.

The living accommodation in the annex will consist of two bedrooms, shower room, lounge, sitting room and kitchen. The level of accommodation is sufficient for the

property to be occupied without a reliance upon the host property. However, in a relevant case law, Uttlesford DC v SSE & White [1992], the judge considered that even if the accommodation provided facilities for independent day-to-day living, it would not necessarily become a separate planning unit from the main dwelling; instead it would be a matter of fact and degree.

Therefore the main consideration in respect of the annex is whether the building would constitute a separate unit of residential accommodation resulting in a material change of use of the building, rather than an incidental use of the host property.

The applicant has stated that parents of the occupant will occupy the building. Considering the relationship between the host property and the proposed annex, it is high likely that it will be occupied by relatives. However, being occupied by relatives does not necessarily make the accommodation ancillary to the host property.

Considering the spatial relationship between the proposed annex and the host property and its reliance on a shared site access and shared external amenity space, it is therefore considered that in line with the Uttlesford DC case, the development can be viewed as incidental to the host property and as such is acceptable in principle.

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 143 and 144 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 145 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 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 'original' extent of the application property has been maintained. The application property has an original volume of approximately 2200 cubic metres. The proposed extension to the application property will increase the volume by an additional 173 cubic metres. This represents an increase of approximately 8% over the original application property's volume. Furthermore, when calculating the size of the development against floor space standards, the proposed extensions would represent an increase of approximately 11.6 % over the original application property's floor space size.

On this basis, the scale of the development complies with the SPD guidance and therefore it is considered that the proposed extension meets the requirements of point 'C' and is considered a proportionate addition to the original building, and therefore not inappropriate development.

Design: DM1 and P3

The proposed extensions that will house the sitting area and bedroom, would project out from the front and rear of the proposed annex and would see the depth of the proposed annex triple. However, the depth of the proposed annex would be approximately 12.8m, whereas the host property is approximately 14.4m. Additionally, the proposed extensions to the front would not project beyond the front elevation of the host property. Even with the addition of the porch, and the single storey front and rear extension, the annex will still be subservient to the host property.

However, due the size and layout of the proposed extensions to the outbuilding, it will change the relationship between the outbuilding and the host property. Additionally, it will considerably change the character and appearance of the outbuilding.

Due to the elevated position of the property in comparison to the highway, the property is in a prominent location. The proposed extension would be clearly visible from the highway and will have an impact on the visual amenity. Additionally, due to the layout of the proposed extensions, they will be prominent additions when viewed from the various locations on the highway.

The application proposes to use to matching facing stone, matching natural blue slate and matching windows to the existing. This will help to link the proposed extensions with the outbuilding and the host property.

The application proposes to include glazing in the gable end of the proposed front extension. The glazing will be similar in design to the existing glazing in the porch of the host property and also is a design feature used in the neighbouring property. It is therefore considered acceptable.

The proposed extension will be the same height as the existing out building and the ridge height of the proposed porch will be lower than the existing out building. Additionally. The use of gable roof design is considered acceptable as the outbuilding also has gable roof design.

On balance, 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

It is considered that considering the location and layout of the proposed extension, it will not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

All habitable rooms in the annex will retain sufficient amount of 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

There is sufficient amount of space for more than two vehicles to be parked off-street.
The proposed parking arrangements are therefore 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:

- Location plan. Drawing no: LP
- Existing and proposed site plans. Drawing no: HC-20340-(60)-BP. Rev: A
- Existing plan and elevations. Drawing no: HC-20340-(60)-01
- Proposed plan and proposed roof plan. Drawing no: HC-20340-(60)-03. Rev: A
- Proposed elevations. Drawing no: HC-20340-(60)-02. Rev: C

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 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	08/12/2020	Signed: MM
Authorisation	09/12/2020	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir