

Application Number:	22/01310/HOUS
Location:	149A Wardle Road Wardle OL12 9JA
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension, replacement of rear window with french doors and the addition of skylights to existing roof.
Applicant:	Mr Stephen Morris
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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?	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 no. 149A Wardle Road, a single-storey detached bungalow located in Wardle. The dwelling is adjacent to The Tryst to the north-east, adjacent to no. 149 Wardle Road to the south-east, and faces the highway to the east. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders open land to the south-west. The property was originally built as a summer house to The Tryst, before being later converted into a two-bedroom bungalow. It comprises of a detached garage with a paved rear curtilage and is accessible via a private driveway which is partly shared with The Tryst. The application site is situated within the Green Belt.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey extension which projects approx. 4.21m from the rear elevation and approx. 2.32m from the side elevation of the existing outrigger. The resulting development measures approx. 4.85m in width from the rear and is characterised by a hipped roof with ridge and eaves height matching the host dwelling.

The application also proposes the replacement of the rear lounge/dining room window with a set of French doors and the addition of two roof lights to the south-east facing roof slope of the host dwelling.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

Relevant History

94/D31015 - Detached outbuilding to rear of existing dwelling - Grant subject to conditions

03/D42189 - Change of use, conversion and extension to summer house to form two bedroom bungalow - Grant subject to conditions

05/D45877 - Change of use, alterations and extension to summer house to form two storey dwelling - Refuse

06/D47981 - Private garage - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No 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/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

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“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, section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ☐ The proposed rear extension comprises of a continuation of the single-storey form of the host dwelling which would appear subservient. The use of a hipped roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed windows, French doors and roof lights are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”*
- ☐ In particular, section 5.6 of the SPD states the following maximum standard for single storey extensions:

- ☐ *“For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ☐ The proposed extension projects approx. 12.32m along the common boundary of adjacent The Tryst. However, it is noted the host dwelling is significantly set back from adjacent The Tryst. Given the approx. 13.23m distance between the proposed extension and the nearest rear-facing habitable room window, it is considered the amenity impacts to the occupiers of The Tryst would be acceptable.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is sited approx. 15m from the nearest rear elevation of adjacent no. 149 and would be obscured by the existing garage which sits between the host property and no. 149. Therefore, it is considered the proposed development would have a neutral impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 149.
- ☐ The proposed fenestration would provide adequate natural light into the habitable rooms, in accordance with section 4.1 of SPD.
- ☐ Notwithstanding the considerable reduction of rear curtilage space as a result of the proposed extension, it is considered sufficient garden space would be retained for its occupiers, in accordance with section 5.4 of the SPD.
- ☐ 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

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ☐ The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from two to three and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ☐ The proposal would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces on the driveway, therefore the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

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.
- ☐ 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 proposal seeks to extend the dwelling to the rear elevation. Planning history indicates the original dwelling was granted planning permission as an outbuilding to adjacent The Tryst (application ref: 94/D31015). Planning permission was subsequently granted for the change of use to residential use (application ref: 03/D42189) with the curtilage boundary altered to exclude the curtilage of The Tryst. On this basis, the original dwelling is considered to be the dwelling as it was first built following the granting of application 94/D31015.
- ☐ As part of application 03/D42189, permission was also granted for a single-storey extension to the north-western elevation of the existing dwelling. The application property was subsequently granted planning permission for a detached garage to the south-west of the host dwelling (application ref: 06/D47981). Additionally, it was noted a porch was constructed to the side elevation of the host dwelling which was not present in the plans of the original dwelling. As such, the single-storey extension, garage and porch are not considered to be part of the original dwelling.
- ☐ The calculations submitted as part of the proposed plans indicate the proposed extension to constitute a 46.91% increase in volume and approx. 48.20% increase in floor space over and above the original dwelling, exceeding the 35% threshold. It is noted however, the calculations included the porch and single-storey extension as part of the original dwelling measurements and has not taken into account of the detached garage.
- ☐ Based on the existing plans from application 03/D42189, the original dwelling has a floor space of approx. 66.67 square metres. The existing single-storey extension, garage and porch has a combined floor space of approx. 47.82 square metres, which constitutes an existing floor space increase of approx. 71.73%.
- ☐ The proposed extension has a floor space of approx. 39.24 square metres. Taking into account of the previous extensions, the total floor space of all extensions is approx. 87.06 square metres, which constitutes a total 130.58% increase of floor space over the original building.
- ☐ Both the increase in volume and floor space of the extensions significantly exceed the 35% increase allowance and would not accord with section 5.20 of the SPD.

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.”

- ② “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.
- ② Given the proposed development, in addition to the existing extensions, would constitute a disproportionate increase in volume and floor space, it is considered the proposal would significantly harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt.
- ② By virtue of the application site being sited on a higher level than the highway, the open land to the rear of the property is almost completely obscured by the host dwelling when viewed from Wardle Road. The proposed single-storey extension would extend mostly inwards of the L-shaped footprint of the host dwelling which ensures the proposed extension would not be wholly visible from the highway. As such, it is considered the proposal would not significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt. Notwithstanding, given the disproportionate additions to the building, openness would be harmed.

Planning Balance

- ② In light of the above assessment, the proposal fails to meet inappropriate development exemption (c) which would allow for 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 and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, additional harm has been identified in terms of the adverse impact on the spatial openness of the Green Belt. No other harm has been identified in terms of design or neighbour amenity. However, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been identified that would outweigh the harm caused. The application is therefore contrary to policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposed extension represents a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Additional harm has been identified in terms of the adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been identified that would outweigh the harm, and the proposal therefore fails to accord with policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council’s ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ SPD 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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- ☐ Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. WR1 Amended 12/12/2022
- ☐ Location Plan, Site Plan and Section Plan – Drawing No. WR2 Amended 12/12/2022

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	13/02/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	13/02/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen