

Application Number:	23/01341/HOUS
Location:	1 Ramsden Farm, Roundthorn Road, Middleton, M24 1ZB
Proposal:	Erection of single storey annexe.
Applicant:	Mr Marcel Duffy
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 05.02.2024	EXT OF TIME 01.03.2024
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?	M
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

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

Location

The application relates to no. 1 Ramsden Farm, a large detached dwelling located on a private road between Round Thorn Road and St. Dominics Way/Brookbank Close, Alkrington. The site falls within an area designated as a Greenspace Corridor on the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map, and forms a peripheral part of the wider corridor which runs between the southern bank of Wince Brook up to the built-up edge of Alkrington Garden Village. The subject property is one of four detached dwellings approved under application ref: 16/01302/FUL and is located on the site's western boundary. The site is adjacent to nos. 36 – 52 St Dominics Way to the west and no. 2 Ramsden Farm to the northeast. The rear boundary of curtilage is open to the Greenspace Corridor beyond, where the ground level falls away in a north-easterly direction towards Wince Brook and Grimshaw Lane.

Nos. 1 and 4 (at either end of the road) benefit from detached garages which are set forward of the houses and face inwards, perpendicular to the primary building line. The subject property is finished externally with facing brickwork (including a low plinth at the base), K-render in soft white, reconstituted stone heads and cills to window openings, anthracite colour interlocking roof tiles and black ash-effect UPVC windows.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey outbuilding to form additional living accommodation. The proposed annex would have a footprint of 78 square metres

and be set in close proximity to the western boundary fencing. It would have a hipped roof form with a maximum height of approximately 3.72m and a height to eaves of approximately 2.41m.

Internally the outbuilding would provide ancillary living accommodation to include an entrance, bedroom, kitchen, living room, ensuite, storage and utility.

The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match those used externally in the host dwelling and the existing off-street arrangements would not be affected by the proposed works.

Relevant History

<u>16/01302/FUL</u>	Proposed residential development of 4 detached houses with private access road Decision: Grant Subject to Conditions
<u>23/00273/HOUS</u>	Erection of a detached single-storey outbuilding to form additional living accommodation and other recreational spaces Decision: Refuse
<u>23/00799/CPL</u>	Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed outbuilding within the rear garden Decision: Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and a site notices was displayed for wider publicity. 9 letters of support and 7 letters of objection were received in response to the proposed development. The letters of objection raised the following concerns:

- ☐ Overdevelopment of the plot.
Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'design' section of the report.
- ☐ Size and design is out of character with surrounding area.
Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'design' section of the report.
- ☐ Extra traffic and noise due to mechanical construction machinery.
Officer's response: This is not a material planning consideration.
- ☐ The development is too close to neighbouring properties.
Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'amenity' section of the report.
- ☐ Increased noise disturbance, loss of privacy and loss of light.
Officer's response: This is assessed in the 'amenity' section of the report.
- ☐ Uncertain that the building will be used for the stated purpose.
Officer's response: The planning application must be assessed based on the submitted plans.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area
G/8 Greenspace Corridors (*To be read in conjunction with CS Policy G6 until replaced by Site Allocations or other DPD*)

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
G6 Enhancing green infrastructure
G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability
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

Principle of Development

The application proposes a detached outbuilding to provide ancillary living accommodation. Longstanding case law establishes that ancillary accommodation can be viewed as appropriate development, providing the accommodation is incidental to the main dwelling house.

Additionally, case *Uttlesford DC v Secretary of State for the Environment and White* 1992 JPL 17, established that it is not necessary for a relative of the occupier of the main dwelling to rely upon the facilities in the main dwelling house, in order to maintain additional living accommodation.

The proposed living accommodation would comprise an entrance, bedroom, kitchen, living room, ensuite, storage room and utility. The level of accommodation is sufficient for the property to be occupied without a reliance upon the main dwelling house, however, given its relationship spatially with the host dwelling and its reliance on a shared site access and external amenity space it is considered that, in line with the *Uttlesford DC* case, the development can be viewed as incidental to the main dwelling house and as such is acceptable in principle.

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 131 and 135 of the NPPF state that *"good design is a key aspect of sustainable development"* and that *"planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping."*

Paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD states that house extensions should be *"in keeping with the host dwelling and generally should be subservient to it."*

The proposed outbuilding features elements of design that would be acceptable such as the hipped roof as well as finishing materials that would be in keeping with the host dwelling. However, the scale of the proposed outbuilding would be incongruous in the context of the existing dwelling, the plot itself, and the pattern of density within the locality.

The existing dwelling has a footprint of 136.2 square metres whilst the existing garage, outbuilding (PD) and proposed annex would have a combined footprint of 230.7 square metres. It is considered that this would result in overdevelopment of the plot and that it would also result in the plot appearing closed-in, with built development stretching the full width of the site.

The residential development at Ramsden Farm was intended to be spacious in character, with open frontages and a clear visual break with the adjacent properties on St Dominics Way. The proposed annex would erode the aforementioned visual break, which would unduly harm the character and openness of the development.

With regard to the site itself and the pattern of development of the locality, the proposed works would not respect the context of the borough's sense of place. Whilst the impact on the pattern of density of the area would be reduced to a degree due to the size of the curtilage of the site, the footprint of the works would remain vastly disproportionate in comparison to other developments in the locality. Moreover, when viewed from the entrance to Ramsden Farm, the resulting arrangement of multiple outbuildings to the front and side of the main dwelling house would appear visually overbearing, creating a cramped perception. As a result, the proposal would be in direct contradiction of policy P3 of the Core Strategy.

The design of the proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals must not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Privacy

The annex would be positioned towards the western boundary, adjacent to the rear gardens of nos. 38 - 40 St Dominics Way.

The proposed development contains a large opening on the side elevation directly facing the host property and several openings on the front elevation, which would measure a substantial distance to the nearest residential properties on Round Thorn

Road. On this basis, the proposed development is not considered to result in an undue loss of privacy for the neighbouring properties.

Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact

Paragraph 4.1 of the SPD provides guidance on minimum distances that apply to all new residential developments and developments which affect existing residential properties. The purpose of the guidance is to avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of neighbouring properties as well the applicant property. The SPD states that a minimum of 10m should be retained between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

The proposed annex would be set over 10m from any of the true rear elevations of the neighbouring dwellings at nos. 38 - 52 St Dominics Way. Additionally, the majority of the annex is screened by the existing boundary treatment and the annex would be stepped below the adjacent rear gardens which limits the visual impact. The LPA recognise that the distance to the rear conservatories of nos. 38 and 40 St Dominics Way is slightly less at 7m, however, given the aforementioned screening and the scale of the annex, it is considered that the proposed annex would not overshadow or have an overbearing impact on any of the neighbouring properties.

Noise Disturbance

Paragraph 191 of the NPPF seeks to mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.

Whilst the proposed development would increase the living accommodation at the property, the resulting residential use would result in levels of noise and activity that would continue to be typical of a residential dwelling.

Occupier Amenity

The proposed annex would contain a large set of bi-fold doors that would face the side elevation of the host property at a distance of some 5.57m, it is noted that the facing side elevation of the host property does not contain any principal windows to habitable rooms.

Moreover, it is considered that the proposed annex would be supplied with adequate levels of natural light and outlook. In addition, the host property would retain a suitably sized rear garden space with a functional layout.

Summary

In light of the above, the proposed development would not unduly impact on the residential amenity of the present and future occupiers of the neighbouring properties or the applicant property and therefore accords with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

The proposals do not reduce the existing provision of off-street parking which is considered appropriate for a dwelling of this size. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Greenspace Corridor

The land in question falls within an area of Greenspace Corridor as defined on the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map. Policy G/8 states that the Greenspace Corridors shown on the proposals map will be protected, with developments only permitted where they will enhance the recreational, ecological or landscape and amenity value of the corridor. Criteria (e) and (f) of saved UDP policy G/8(A) state that development will not be permitted within the Greenspace Corridor where it would result in unacceptable harm to:

- (e) “the better landscape qualities and character of the corridor”; and
- (f) “the amenity value of the corridor where it provides welcome visual relief from urban development, including attractive views in and out of the corridor”.

Further to this, Policy G6 of the Adopted Core Strategy above all, seeks to sustain and enhance a green network to support growth and regeneration in the borough, with specific reference to enhancing recreational links between urban areas and open countryside for purposes incidental to wildlife and local opportunities for recreation as well as improving visual amenity.

When considered in the wider context of the corridor (which spans for several hectares between Kirkway and Greengate), it is not considered that the building would have a harmful impact on the visual, recreational or ecological value of the Greenspace Corridor.

Recommendation: Refuse for the following reason

1. The proposed annex would constitute a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the application site by virtue of its scale and size and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene. The proposal therefore constitutes poor design and is contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document 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.

Informative

For the avoidance of doubt, the decision relates to the following drawings:-

- Location Plan. Drg no. 22.128.201. Rev P1
- Existing Site Plan. Drg no. 22.128.202. Rev P1
- Proposed Site Plan. Drg no. 22.128.203. Rev P1
- Proposed Floor and Roof Plans. Drg no. 22.128.301. Rev P1
- Proposed Planning Areas. Drg no. 22.128.303. Rev P2
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 22.128.401. Rev. P1
- Proposed Elevations (Annex With Existing House). Drg no. 22.128.402. Rev P1
- Proposed Annex Elevations. Drg no. 22.128.403. Rev P1
- Site Sections. Drg no. 22.128.501. Rev P1

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	26/02/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	29/02/2024	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling