

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00058/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00058/HOUS
Location:	1 Wolstenholme Hall Farm Edenfield Road Rochdale Rochdale OL12 7TT
Proposal:	Change to fenestration on elevations, two lanterns to existing roof, rendering to all elevations, and cladding on south elevation
Applicant:	Mr Parton
Case Officer:	Hamish Rigg
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

The application relates to 1 Wolstenholme Hall Farm, a two-storey detached property on Edenfield Road, situated north-west of Wolstenholme in the foothills of The Pennines. The property is part of a farm complex comprising barns and converted residential properties. Surrounded by open countryside, the site falls within designated green belt land as per UPD Policy G/D/2.

Wolstenholme Hall Farm is associated with Wolstenholme Hall which sits adjacent to the east. The Hall is a Victorian manor house with considerable heritage value, however the application property isn't considered to fall directly within its setting.

The applicant property is the most southerly residential building on the farm complex, approx. 20m from Edenfield Road. The property faces east and has a separate garage building to the north. The adjacent buildings to the north include no. 2 Wolstenholme Hall Farm and Wolstenholme farm, and associated farm buildings.

The area is characterised by expansive green landscapes and open farmland, as well as York Stone boundary treatments and houses.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for alterations to fenestration and the application of off-white render across all elevations. Furthermore, the application of grey cladding to the south elevation, two roof lanterns, and a Juliette balcony on the south elevation. No structural works are being proposed. The replacement windows would consist of aluminum slate grey frames and the Juliette balcony would comprise a frameless glass balustrade.

Relevant History

13/00616/HOUS – granted STC:

Erection of single storey side and rear extension, rear dormer extension and instillation of new windows in roof space on front and side elevation.

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties 16/02/2024. No objections were raised.

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/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
G4	Protecting Green Belt

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

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Green belt/ principle for development: 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 152 and 153 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 154 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.

In light of the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in relation to 'exception c' as it would not result in any 'disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'. The proposed works are deemed cosmetic and involve no structural changes, additions, or enlargements. The principle for development in the green belt is therefore established through compliance with paragraph 154 of the NPPF.

Design: DM1 and P3

Policies P1, P3 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

The main consideration regarding the proposed design is the application of render to all elevations which could detract from views of the rural landscape and prevalence of York Stone that characterise the area. This is particularly significant due to the public right of way running along the eastern boundary of the site, which establishes a prominent public vantage point from which to view the property.

Nonetheless, off-white render is deemed acceptable as the property is set back from Edenfield Road and largely concealed by boundary treatments, foliage, and farm equipment and structures. Furthermore, whilst render is a less common material in the area, there are examples of its use, including at 1018 Edenfield Road, approx. 200m from the property. In addition, the plans indicate that the render would be adequately broken up by fenestration, and on the southern elevation- which is more visible from Edenfield Road- it would be applied alongside grey vertical cladding. The cladding itself would result in a high quality contemporary finish, although a material sample to confirm its quality will be required by condition.

The proposed fenestration is similarly acceptable as it is well-proportioned and suitably arranged.

The proposed roof lanterns atop the existing single-storey side extension would be a welcome addition to the property, creating an interesting architectural feature to be viewed from Edenfield Road.

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

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 nature of the works which involve no enlargements or structural alterations, nor the insertion of any windows facing other properties, there would be a neutral impact on residential amenity. Therefore, 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

The proposed works would have no impact on the existing parking and servicing arrangements, and 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:

- Existing block plans 1WF/002
- Proposed block plan 1WF/003
- Proposed plan 1WF/001E

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 of the cladding, as

per the submitted plans, to be used externally on the southern elevation of 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.

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	27/03/2024	Signed: Hamish Rigg
Authorisation	27/03/2024	Signed: Ryan Killeen

Report Author Hamish Rigg