

Application Number:	23/00367/HOUS
Location:	Crimble Bungalow Crimble Lane Heywood OL11 4AB
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and alteration to fenestration on front elevation
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Biju Mathew
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

Crimble Bungalow is a large L-shape detached residence sited within the Bamford ward of Rochdale and is outside of the Defined Urban Area and wholly in an area designated as Green Belt land, as defined under saved UDP policy G/D/2. The property lies east of Crimble Lane to which the plot sits adjacent to Crimble Hall Farm to the north and The Crimble restaurant to the west. The plot itself is substantially large and characterized by vegetation running along the boundary, a wraparound conservatory and generous surrounding amenity space. Access to the bungalow is via a private road off of Crimble Lane from Bury and Rochdale Old Road to the north. The rear curtilage boundary is bound by open agricultural fields also designated as Green Belt land.

Description of Proposal

The applications seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing wraparound conservatory to facilitate the erection of a single storey side and rear wraparound hipped roof extension projecting 2.9m from the existing rear elevation and 6.2m from the western side elevation. All materials will be to match those on the existing, including detailings and the eaves will be the same as that on the existing house.

Relevant History

89/D23428 Erection of Conservatory to Side and Rear of Dwellinghouse
Granted June 1989

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

No comments received at time of writing.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to the surrounding neighbours. No public 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
G7	Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity
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 proposed development has been amended a significant number of times as a result of a lengthy period of negotiation with the case officer. Notably, the amendments made have been regarding change to the overall scale of development not being acceptable in principle by virtue of the bungalow being sited within the Green Belt, therefore was significantly reduced. There have also been changes to the design of the scheme throughout amendments to better respect the scale and design of the existing bungalow.

Assessment

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as Green Belt Land 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 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 proposed development seeks to extend the dwelling at both the side and rear to form a new extension hosting extended habitable living space following demolition of

the existing conservatory. Planning history indicates the existing conservatory was granted permission in 1989 therefore is not considered as part of the original build.

The volume calculations suggest the total volume increase from the original build would constitute a 330m³ increase taking the total volume of the dwelling, including the extension, to 1567.00m³. The overall volume increase of 26.67% would therefore be compliant with the 35% threshold for development on greenbelt land.

The submitted footprint calculations show the proposed floor space to occupy approx. 103.40m², increasing the total floor space of the dwelling, including the extension, to 398.90m². The total volume increase from the original would be 34.99% and also compliant with the 35% threshold.

The proposed extension is therefore considered to comprise a proportionate addition relative to the original size of the building.

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, on top of the existing, would constitute an appropriate increase in volume and floor space, it is considered the proposal would not significantly harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt.

Summary

Taking all of the above into consideration in reference to principle of development within a well-defined parcel of the Green Belt, it is not considered for the development to contribute to any unnecessary urban sprawl or present any substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the scheme not exceeding the limits set out in policy. The development would not contribute to the sprawl of an urban area given it is not sited within and is not considered to contribute to disproportionate additions in the Green Belt.

With reference to openness which has a visual and spatial component, the impact of the proposed development is considered minimal to the nature of the existing bungalow. The boundary of the existing site is relatively well-contained by large trees and vegetation and whilst the existing build is relatively visible from surrounding areas, it is typically within the context of these defined boundaries. In that respect, the site appears as a developed parcel of land within the Green Belt solely to accommodate residential living.

In conclusion and by virtue of the above assessment, to extend the dwelling to this size is considered acceptable in general principle for reasons outlined above. However, this general suitability must be balanced against all other relevant material considerations, as discussed in detail in the following sections of this report.

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that all new developments will be expected to demonstrate that they “are of high quality design and take the

opportunity to enhance the quality of the area". Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve." and "good design is a key aspect of sustainable development".

The proposed development would demonstrate good design principles and has been designed to principally respect the scale, form and design of the existing dwelling. The overall general massing of the bungalow will be noticeably increased towards the northern and western elevations however, the development is not so large that it would contribute to disproportionate additions in relation to the size of existing dwelling.

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD requires new development to be subservient to the parent dwelling and to be in keeping with it. The plans indicate the extension would be set down 0.3m from the existing ridge therefore subservient in this regard. The existing front elevation features a staggered siting across the façade creating a variation of depths however, the front elevation of the extension is set back 0.7m from the front elevation closest to the north-west boundary so can therefore be considered subservient in this regard. The depth of the extension surpasses the rear most elevation by 2.9m to create a wrap-around feature. This is not considered to pose any unacceptable harm to the form of the existing dwelling.

The extension projects a sensible distance relative to the overall width of the host dwelling and is considered proportionate in its overall nature. The extension is also not considered to negatively impact upon the existing character of the house given the visual aspect of the extension is not considered to significantly differ from the original design.

The material palette of the extension would visually respect the overall external appearance of the existing dwelling and incorporate detailing found on the host dwellings existing front façade e.g stone facing cills. The roof form would match the existing hipped roof on both the side and rear elements of the proposal and window proportions would match those existing.

In a wider sense, there is not considered to be any harmful impact to the overall plot through the proposed addition. The development is however considered to be an overall improvement to the existing arrangement with the replacement of the wrap around conservatory.

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

Residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the SPD.

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets out the following guidance for single storey rear 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 dwelling is centrally located within its plot, approx. 70m away from the nearest building therefore the above guideline can be interpreted flexibly in this case given any harm to surrounding properties is considered minimal.

Section 4.1 of the SPD sets out minimum separation distances for habitable room windows when directly facing another dwelling. As a result of the significant separation distances away from any surrounding residential plots is in excess of approx. 70m, the proposal is acceptable in this regard. Further to this, all habitable rooms within both the extension and existing dwelling are considered to receive adequate light and outlook.

There is not considered to be any direct unacceptable impact to residents residing in surrounding complexes.

Aforementioned above, the plot is generously large therefore post development, the plot will retain a sufficient amount of garden space for the enjoyment of the occupiers.

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

Post development, the property will increase from a 4-bed to a 5-bed dwelling. The plot hosts parking provision to the properties frontage adequate for a minimum of two car parking spaces therefore is acceptable in this regard.

The development is not considered to affect the private road into the plot off both Crimble Lane and Bury and Rochdale Old Road and access to the property from these roads will remain unchanged.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Trees:

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states "Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change".

A blanket TPO covers the immediate and wider area including Crimble Bungalow, Crimble Lane, The Crimble Restaurant and a parcel of open land adjacent to Crimble Farm. Historical maps, including TPO surveys, indicate this blanket TPO does not relate to all trees in this vicinity and rather individual, specified trees as listed in the Order.

A method statement and implications assessment has been submitted alongside the plans as well as a map indicating which specific trees are protected on the site in order to assess any impact to the existing trees to which the development poses no direct impact to the seven protected trees within the grounds of Crimble Bungalow particularly where trees are to be bound by protective fencing prior to development taking place (where specified on CCCLR/MS/01 Method Statement Plan).

It is noted in recent years a large tree has been removed from the site, previously sited next to the existing conservatory as well as a small shrub to the rear however, neither are listed as one of the seven TPO's therefore the previous removal of these are not of concern.

The development itself is sited approx. 20m from the nearest protected tree therefore not considered to pose any significant concern.

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:-
 - 0423-19 dwg.100 Location Plan
 - 0423-19 dwg. 101 Rev B Proposed Block Plan
 - 0423-19 dwg.123 Rev D Proposed Roof Plan
 - 0423-19 dwg.120 Rev D Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - 0423-19 dwg.122 Rev D Proposed Elevationsand 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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan 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. Prior to commencement of the works hereby approved, the tree protection measures as specified in the submitted Method Statement Plan (CCLR/MS/01) and Arboricultural Method Statement shall be fully implemented, and shall be retained throughout the period of construction. In addition, no activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with policy G7 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	20.11.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	30.11.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo