APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01232/HOUS

Application Number:	20/01232/HOUS
Location:	31 Timbercliffe Littleborough OL15 9QL
Proposal:	Single storey front extension
Applicant:	Mr John Platt
Case Officer:	Majid Mir
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 31 Timbercliffe, a two storey mid-terraced property located in the Littleborough area of Rochdale. The property faces south east and faces no properties to the front or the rear. No.31 Timbercliffe sits within the Rock Nook Conservation Area and also sits within the Green Belt. To the front of the property is the highway which ends by no. 30 Timbercliffe. Directly opposite, no. 31 is an unsurfaced road that leads to a number of garages.

Description of Proposal

The applicant proposes to extend the porch to the front of the property. The proposed extension will be approximately 2.9m wide and have a depth of 1.3m. The proposed extension will be flush with the existing porch. A new door is proposed in the front elevation of the existing porch. The existing window will be placed in the front elevation of the proposed extension. An opening in the host property will be widened and include a door and glazed paneling. Additionally, a roof window is proposed in the extension.

Relevant History

Not applicable.

Township/Member comments

Not applicable.

Consultee responses

Conservation Officer
There are no comments or objections raised in response to this application.

Representations

Letters of notification have been sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice was placed within the vicinity of the site, and a press notice was placed. No representation has been received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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:

P2	Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
G4	Protecting Green Belt land

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

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

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.

Paragraphs 143 and 144 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 145 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.

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 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 'original' extent of the application property has been maintained, along with the addition of a subsequent single storey rear extension. The application property has an original volume of 309.1 cubic metres. The single storey rear extension has increased this by 21%, to 375 cubic metres. The proposed extension to the application property will increase the volume by an additional 10.2 cubic metres, thus representing a total of an additional 76.1 cubic metres over the application property's

original volume. This represents an increase of approximately 24.6% over the original application property's volume. Furthermore, when calculating the size of the development against floor space standards, the proposed extension and the single storey rear extension would represent an increase of approximately 25.9 % over the original application property's floor space size.

On this basis, the scale of the development complies with the SPD guidance and therefore it is considered that the proposed extension meets the requirements of crierion (c) and is considered a proportionate addition to the original building. The development is therefore not inappropriate in the Green Belt.

Heritage and Design: DM1, P2 and P3

In assessing the proposal in relation to its impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, the Conservation Officer was consulted. The Conservation Officer made no comment or objection in relation to the proposal.

The proposed extension is appropriately designed and will have a finished appearance that will match the existing. The proposed extension will be flush with the existing porch and be the same height. The proposed extension will be in keeping with the host property and will be a subservient addition.

The neighbouring property has a similar sized porch as the existing porch of no. 31, and it is also attached to it. The extension to the porch would see some of the symmetry and balance lost, however, the two properties are the only properties in the terrace that have porches. Additionally, the design and fenestration of the two porches is different. Furthermore, there is limited architectural value of the terraced properties, with there being a variation in colour and design of the terraced properties. Therefore, the extension of the porch to the full width of the host property, would not have a considerable impact on the visual amenity of the terrace properties.

The proposed extension will be to the front of the host property, however, the property is located on the edge of the development and does not face any other properties. Additionally, as the highway ends by no. 30, there is no trough traffic and there are only garages located to the rear of the properties. Therefore, the proposed extension is not likely to be seen by many and would have limited impact on the street scene.

The proposal is considered to have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is therefore considered that the design of the proposal is acceptable and accords with policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

It is considered that the proposed single storey front extension will not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The kitchen/dining area will not have direct access to an external window, however, it is considered that the proposed extension would not lead to a significant loss of light and outlook. The existing window on the host property would remain, and the window in the front elevation of the proposed extension will be directly in front. Additionally,

the application proposes to add a roof window directly above where the kitchen window is. Furthermore, the proposed extension will only project out by approximately 1.39m. Finally, the property faces south east and there are no properties in front of no. 30. This all mitigates against the loss of light and outlook from the proposed extension sufficiently enough to not cause an unacceptable loss of light and outlook. It is considered that the loss of light of light and outlook caused by the proposed extension would not be sufficient reason to refuse the application when compared to the existing situation.

The proposed extension will have no impact on the useable outdoor amenity space available to the occupants. Substantial outdoor amenity space will remain to the rear of the property.

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.

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:

   - Location plan, existing plan and elevations, proposed block plan, and proposed plan and elevations. Drawing no: P.E. 31. Dated: October 2020.

   and 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 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 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	26/11/2020	Signed: MM
Authorisation	01/12/2020	Signed: AT

Report Author Majid Mir