

Application Number:	22/01370/HOUS
Location:	Ashdene Edenfield Road Rochdale OL12 7TR
Proposal:	Single storey side extension and demolition of existing conservatory and front porch
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Jonathan Harwick
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
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 Ashdene, a two-storey late 19th to early 20th century detached residential property located in the Norden ward of Rochdale and in an area designated as Green Belt land. The property includes a detached garage which is partially adjoined to a retaining wall which separates the application site from the rear access to a row of cottages. The property benefits from sufficient yard space and borders open pastoral land to the south of the dwelling.

Description of Proposal

The proposal is seeking a single storey side extension following demolition of the existing conservatory and front porch. The single storey side extension would project 6.3m from the host dwelling and features an overall height of 3.9m. The extension is proposed to be built on a slope towards the rear elevation due to the variability of ground levels. Construction materials would be red facing brick to match the existing dwelling and blue welsh natural slate for the roof.

Relevant History

04/D44125 Demolition of existing garage and erection of double garage with single storey link extension to existing dwelling. GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS 07.10.2004

16/01459/HOUS Demolition of existing garage and erection of new detached double garage with associated ground works. GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS 16.03.2017

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

8 letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. 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/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 Land
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
T2	Improving Accessibility

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

Amendments

N/A

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 elevation of the host dwelling following the demolition of the existing conservatory and porch. Planning history indicated the application was previously granted planning permission for demolition of the existing garage and erection of a new double detached garage however, correspondence with the agent discloses this work was never carried out. It can be seen from historical maps the garage remains part of the original build. The submitted Green Belt assessment suggests the garage was built at the same time as the host dwelling and currently sits in a very poor condition which depicts its longevity.
- The submitted green belt assessment includes the garage as part of the original property measurements. The volume calculations suggest the volume total volume increase from the original (incl. detached garage) would constitute a 115.57m³ from the original volume. The overall volume increase

of 16.40% would be therefore compliant with the 35% threshold for development on greenbelt land.

- The submitted footprint calculations show the floor space to occupy approx. 137.96m² (including retained porch and new extension), an overall increase of 37.38m² from the original house footprint. The total increase from the original would be 37.16%.

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 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”.
- ❑ 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. It is noted the 6.3m single storey side extension would not be designed to respect the scale of the original dwelling. The proposed extension would appear incongruous and feature a scale too wide for the front elevation which would sit disproportionate to the dwelling as a whole. The extension would also significantly undermine the balanced and symmetrical appearance of the existing front elevation.
- ❑ Although the submitted planning application provides no information on the types of windows being proposed to the extension, proposed plans would indicate a different design to those on the existing. It is noted, the windows on the host dwelling follow a traditional red brick detailing comprised of window surrounds, window arches and quoins. The proposed plans would see the extension fitted with bi-folding doors as well as no.3 roof lights. This would appear out of context and not reflect the traditional design of the host dwelling therefore not designed in subservience to it.
- ❑ Although acting as a continuation of the front elevation, it is noted the main entrance to the site would be from the rear. Comprised of one window which would sit close to the east elevation of the host dwelling - The blank rear elevation of the proposed extension would be of poor design. The natural blue slate pitched roof would form as an acceptable design given it matches that of the existing.
- ❑ The material palette is proposed to match the red brick detailing of the ground floor of the dwelling as well as the window surrounds and quoins. It is noted the primary material of the host dwelling on the first floor is white render.

- ❑ The demolition of the conservatory would see a prominent characteristic of the house removed. The proposed extension would not be constructed in place of the conservatory however it is noted the conservatory would better respect the character of the property than the single-storey side extension.
- ❑ Whilst there may be scope for a side extension, given the overall width is reduced, is set back from the front elevation and bi-folding doors removed and reinstated with windows to match the proportions of the existing, the single storey side extension, as proposed, would constitute as a poor and overly modern addition to an otherwise traditional and attractive dwelling.

Summary

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not 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.
- It is noted the distance between Ashdene and the adjacent houses to the rear (no.2 and no.8 Sunnyside Cottage) is approx. 25m therefore there would be scope for rear windows that would be compliant with SPD Space Standards.
- Noted in the design section of the report, the primary entrance to the site would be from the rear. Although not acceptable in a design context, the single-storey side extension addition to the property would be shielded from public vantage points and the public highway therefore acceptable.
- Proposed plans also depict an additional window to the ground floor of the extension. Although stated above, the distance between Ashdene and the adjacent cottages is 25m. The SPD requires a minimum of 21m for windows within habitable rooms therefore compliant with the SPD.

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

- Proposed plans do not indicate any changes to parking arrangements on site. The extension is also not proposed to host any additional bedrooms therefore scheduled parking standards would remain unchanged.

Summary

It is therefore considered that the parking arrangements at the site would be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of siting, scale and design, the proposed single-storey side extension would be of poor design and would not respect the traditional design and proportions of the original dwelling. As such, the development would have a significantly harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the host property. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' 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.

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- LOCATION PLAN
- EXISTING SITE PLAN
- PROPOSED SITE PLAN
- 2302.02 EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AND PROPOSED SECTION

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11.01.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	12.01.2023	Signed: AT

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo