

Application Number:	23/01074/HOUS
Location:	17 Smithy Nook, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 9NF
Proposal:	First Floor Rear Extension
Applicant:	Carla Walch
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
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 no. 17 Smithy Nook, a two-storey terraced stone cottage located in a rural context in Summit, north of Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 15 Smithy Nook to the south, adjoined by nos. 19-21 Smithy Nook to the north, and faces the highway to the east. The host dwelling and adjoining nos. 11-25 Smithy Nook (odd number only) have been identified as non-designated heritage assets due to their architectural and historic interest. The property is sited within Green Belt land.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension which projects 1.85m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing single-storey rear extension. The proposal is characterised by a gable-fronted roof form and is set down 0.93m from the ridge line with matching height to eaves.

The proposal would be constructed in stone walls, slate roofs and timber windows to match the host dwelling.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

The application site is a mid-terrace property on Calderbrook Road, Littleborough. The cottages are present on the first edition OS map from 1851. They are constructed of coursed stone with stone slate roofs. Some of the cottages have a full run of windows at upper floor level, which indicates that they were likely used as workshops associated with the region's textile industry. Given their age and retention of original features, they are of some architectural and historic interest. They are considered to be non-designated heritage assets and the provisions of NPPF Paragraph 203 and adopted Rochdale Core Strategy Policy P2 apply.

The proposal is for the construction of a two storey rear extension. This would be seen in the context of other extensions to the rear of the properties. Subject to appropriate materials, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. To ensure appropriate details, a condition should be imposed requiring the submission of material details.

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/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
G4	Protecting Green Belt
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 and Heritage: DM1, P2 and P3

- ☐ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ☐ 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.”*
- ☐ Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strives to *“protect the borough’s heritage by... conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.”*
- ☐ Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states, *“in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*
 - a) *the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - b) *the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
 - c) *the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”*

- ☐ Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states *“the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”*
- ☐ The host dwelling forms part of a row of terraced cottages which are present on the first edition 1851 OS map and has subsequently been identified as non-designated heritage assets by the Council's Conservation Officer due to its architectural and historic interest. The dwellings are of stone construction with stone slate roofs and some feature distinctive timber windows along the front elevation.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey rear extension is set down below the ridge line which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a gable-fronted roof form would also constitute satisfactory design.
- ☐ The proposed windows are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration and comprises surrounds which would match the existing architectural features of the dwelling.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling, and would be designed appropriately for this context. Notwithstanding, given its heritage interest, a materials condition has been recommended to minimise the harm to the significance of the NDHAS.
- ☐ The proposed rear extension would not be visible from the highway and would be seen in the context of the existing rear extensions of the adjoining properties. As such, the form and appearance of the terraced dwellings would not be altered when viewed from the front elevation. Subject to appropriate materials, the proposal would result in a neutral impact to the host dwelling and to the setting of the adjoining dwellings as non-designated heritage assets.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”*
- ☐ Having regard to Section 4.1 and 5.9 of the SPD, the proposed two-storey rear extension would comply with the relevant space standards and requirements to ensure acceptable levels of amenity for neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.

- ☐ 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 proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore 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 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 construct a two-storey rear extension to the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing single-storey rear extension. In the absence of available plans and planning history, it has not been possible to ascertain whether the existing rear extension forms as a later addition to the original dwelling. Therefore, for the purposes of this assessment, the single-storey rear extension would form part of the volume and floor space of the original dwelling.

☐ The submitted Green Belt calculations indicates an existing volume of 207.4m³ and a proposed volume of 19m³, which constitutes a volume increase of 9%, well below the 35% allowance.

☐ No floor space calculations were submitted. Notwithstanding, based on the submitted plans, the original dwelling comprises a floor space of 39.88m² and

the proposal would result in an additional floor space of 0.5m², which constitutes a marginal increase of 1%.

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 does not constitute a disproportionate increase in volume and floor space, the proposal is not considered to harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt. Likewise, no concerns are had with the harm to the visual openness of the Green Belt, given the siting of the extension to the rear of the dwelling, which would not be readily visible from the highway and the nearby public right of way.

Planning Balance

- ☐ In light of the above assessment, the proposal would 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 does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No harm has been identified in terms of the impact on the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt. The application is therefore accords to Policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 29/09/2023
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 23.3156.3 dated 09/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3156.1B dated 07/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. 23.3156.2C dated 07/2023

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 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 and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials and, where stonework is proposed, a one metre square freestanding panel of stonework showing the type of natural stone, coursing, jointing and mortar mix and finish. Where masonry detailing is required, details drawn at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall also be submitted. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with Policies P2, 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	02/02/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	02/02/2024	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen