

Application Number:	22/01478/HOUS
Location:	65 Bury And Rochdale Old Road Heywood Rochdale BL9 7UA
Proposal:	Single storey side and first floor rear extension
Applicant:	Mr Alex Richardson
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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 65 Bury and Rochdale Old Road, an end-terrace property located in the Norden ward of Rochdale and in an area designated as Green Belt land. The original build of the property includes a detached rear garage and borders open pastoral land to the west and rear.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side and first floor rear extension to the west and rear elevations. The single storey side extension would have a height to eaves of 2.3m and feature a lean-to roof. The first floor rear extension would be an upwards continuation of the existing rear single storey ground floor and feature a pitched roof to match that on the existing.

Relevant History**94/D30447**

FORMATION OF VEHICULAR ACCESS TO A CLASSIFIED ROAD
Grant Subject to Conditions 06.04.1994

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding dwellings. No letters of representation were received.

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:

G4 Protecting Green Belt

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Green Belt G4 and G/D/2

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 the side and rear elevations of the host dwelling. Planning history indicates the detached rear garage is part of the original build. Although it is unknown whether the single storey extension to the rear is part of the original build, historic maps indicate the single storey element was erected pre-1948 therefore would be included as part of the original build when calculating the volume and footprint increase.
- ☐ The submitted greenbelt assessment includes the detached garage and rear single storey element as part of the original property measurements. The volume calculations suggest the volume total volume increase from the original would constitute a 95.56m³ from the original volume. The overall volume increase of 17.7% would be therefore compliant with the 35% threshold for development on greenbelt land.
- ☐ The submitted footprint calculations show the floor space to occupy approx. 9.2m² an overall increase of 10.8% from the original house footprint.
- ☐ Both the increase in volume and floor space of the extension would comply with Section 5.20 of the SPD and remain under the 35% threshold.

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.

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 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”. Policy P3 requires all new developments to “enhance the boroughs identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general”. Paragraph 10.21 of the G4 Green Belt section of the CS notes how “there should be a general presumption against inappropriate development”.

It should be noted that whilst the SPD does not set out direct standard guidelines regarding single storey side extensions, guidance for housing extensions are set out in Section 5. Paragraph 5.1 states that extensions should maintain space standards as set out in Section 4 and be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally be subservient to it. The single-storey side extension would project 2.9m from the existing west elevation and would be designed to respect the character and built form of the existing build. The first floor extension would be set down from the existing ridge height by approx.0.5m to act in subservience to the host dwellings roof form therefore acceptable by SPD standards.

The proposed natural slate pitched roof of the extension is thought to respect the roof form and material palette of the existing build.

Fenestration on the extension will match the traditional detailing design from that on the original build as well as maintaining the white UPVC throughout the whole build. Window surrounds comprised of natural stone, common on the original dwelling, are also sought to match the existing.

The proposed material palette for the extension is proposed to be a white render to match the render on the existing rear elevation. Although it would be favourable for the extension to be constructed in brick to match that on the front and side elevations, given render is an existing material, the proposed external walls palette would be deemed acceptable. It is noted the house currently features a different appearance of materials on all three elevations. It is thought due to the decay of the existing brickwork on the side elevation, a similar red brick was sought to ensure the side elevation remained of a similar appearance. It should also be noted the front elevations of the four houses within this vicinity host a mixed material palette with no.71 Bury and Rochdale Old Road hosting white render to the front and side elevation and no.69 hosting a significantly darker red brick to the front elevation.

Summary

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and would accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

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

Paragraph 5.8 of the SPD states “two storey or first floor rear extensions can have a much greater impact on neighbouring occupiers than single storey extensions, particularly on their enjoyment of their garden area due to the potential oppressiveness of a two-storey wall close to a common boundary” therefore planning permission is not normally granted to two-storey or first floor extensions that project beyond a 30 degree line drawn from the rear elevation of the neighbouring property.

Given the adjoining dwelling, no.67, currently hosts a single storey rear extension (thought to be part of the original build) the existing single storey extension of the application property does not project beyond the neighbouring extension. Therefore given the first floor extension would act as a continuation upwards of the existing ground floor extension, the development proposed to the rear would comply with Section 5.9 of the SPD.

It is also important to assess occupier amenity which could be negatively impacted as a result of development to ensure future use of the dwelling is not compromised. It is noted the first floor extension is proposed to host a bedroom to which it will host a side window however, would not be directly facing another dwelling therefore acceptable. However, proposed floor plans indicate the enlargement of the internal first floor hallway would receive no direct light. Given this is not a habitable room, this is not thought to harm the amenity of the occupiers therefore acceptable by SPD standards.

Summary

In view of the above assessment, 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

Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy requires a maximum of 2+ car parking spaces for dwellings outside of town centers. Given the number of bedrooms will be increasing at the property by +1, it is important to note there is space for approx.2 designated off-road car parking spaces to the side of the dwelling therefore would comply with Schedule 5 parking standards.

Summary

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;

- BOR-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2000 REV A EXISTING SITE PLAN AND LOCATION PLAN
- BOR-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2002 REV A PROPOSED SITE PLAN
- BOR-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2001 EXISTING ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS
- BOR-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2003 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS

And the development must be carried out in accordance with the 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 Policy DM1 and Policy P3 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	14.02.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	16.02.2023	Signed: AT

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo