

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00053/HOUS

Application Number:	24/00053/HOUS
Location:	Crimble Bungalow, Crimble Lane, Heywood, OL11 4AB
Proposal:	Single storey side extension and alteration to existing fenestration following demolition of existing conservatory - Resubmission of 23/00367/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Biju Mathew
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 26.03.2024	EXT OF TIME 03.04.2024
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 Crimble Bungalow, a large L-shape detached dwelling located south of Bamford in an area of Green Belt land. The property lies east of Crimble Lane and is adjacent to Crimble Hall Farm to the northeast and a former restaurant complex formed by the extended Crimble Hall to the northwest. The application property is sited on a substantial wraparound plot with mature trees and shrubs along the site boundary. The property also benefits from an existing L-shape conservatory. Access to the property is via a private road off Crimble Lane.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey side extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The proposed extension would project 9.5m from the existing northwest-facing side elevation and would be set back 0.75m from the existing front elevation. It would be characterised by a hipped roof with a maximum height of approximately 6.31m and a height to eaves of approximately 2.50m, with the ridgeline of the proposed extension set down from the main ridgeline of the host

property. The proposed development would be constructed in materials to match existing.

Relevant History

<u>23/00367/HOUS</u>	Single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and alteration to fenestration on front elevation Grant subject to conditions
<u>89/D23428</u>	Erection of Conservatory to Side and Rear of Dwellinghouse Granted June 1989

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

No comments received at time of writing.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was displayed for wider publicity. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-G9	The Green Belt

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

G7	Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Principle of Development – The Green Belt

- ☐ The application site is allocated within the Green Belt under Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE). Policy JP-G9 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 152 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 153 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 154 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 to the side elevation following demolition of the existing conservatory. Planning history indicates that the existing conservatory was granted permission in 1989 and, therefore, is not considered as part of the original build.
- ☐ The volume calculations suggest the total volume increase from the original build would constitute a 353.11m³ increase taking the total volume of the dwelling, including the extension, to 1534.13m³. The overall volume increase of 29.90% would therefore be compliant with the 35% threshold for development on Green Belt land.
- ☐ The submitted floor space calculations show the proposed floor space to occupy approx. 96.47m², increasing the total floor space of the dwelling, including the extension, to 392.64m². The total floor space increase from the original build would be 32.57% and also compliant with the 35% threshold.
- ☐ The proposed extension is therefore considered to comprise a proportionate addition relative to the original size of the building.

Openness

- ☐ Paragraph 142 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.”

- ❑ Given the proposed development would meet exception c) of paragraph 154 of the NPPF, it is not necessary to consider the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt. Notwithstanding, the proposed development would constitute an appropriate increase in volume and floor space and would not significantly harm the spatial openness of the Green Belt.

Summary

- ❑ In conclusion and by virtue of the above assessment, to extend the dwelling to this size is considered acceptable in principle for the reasons outlined above. However, this general suitability must be balanced against all other relevant material considerations, as discussed in detail in the following sections of this report.

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identify that: *“Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.”*
- ❑ Policies 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.”*
- ❑ Whilst the proposed extension would noticeably increase the width of the host property, the development is not so large that it would contribute to a disproportionate addition when considering the size and shape of the existing bungalow and the substantial size of the existing plot.
- ❑ Moreover, the front wall of the proposed extension would be set back 0.75m from the front wall of the existing dwelling and the rear wall of the proposed extension would be set forward 0.75m of the rear wall of the existing dwelling. This would create a lowered ridgeline, demonstrating subservience to the host property.
- ❑ The proposed development would use materials to match existing, including stone detailing beneath the windows, and the proposed use of materials is considered acceptable.
- ❑ The roof form of the extension would match the existing hipped roof and the window proportions would also be acceptable.
- ❑ In a wider sense, there is not considered to be any harmful impact to the overall plot through the proposed addition. The development is considered to be an overall improvement on the existing arrangement with the replacement of the L-shape conservatory.
- ❑ The scale and design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE Joint Development Plan and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② Given the substantial size of the application site, it is noted that the proposed development would measure at least 26.91m to the site boundary. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in undue harm to the levels of residential amenity currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties.
- ② The submitted plans indicate that all habitable rooms would receive sufficient natural light and outlook. In addition, the property would retain a substantial amount of private outdoor amenity space.
- ② 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

Trees

- ② Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states “*Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change*”.
- ② A blanket TPO covers the immediate and wider area including Crimble Bungalow, Crimble Lane, the former Crimble restaurant and a parcel of open land adjacent to Crimble Farm. Historical maps, including TPO surveys, indicate that this blanket TPO does not relate to all trees in this vicinity, rather individual, specified trees as listed in the Order.
- ② The submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and Implications Assessment have identified that the proposed development would not directly impact the protected trees within the grounds of Crimble Bungalow. As such, no tree works are required. Notwithstanding, the Method Statement Plan (ref: CCCLR/MS/01) indicates that the trees will be bound by protective fencing prior to development taking place.
- ② Therefore, no concerns are had with regards to the impact of the proposed development on trees.

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. Drg no. 100
- Block Plan. Drg no. 101. Rev B
- Existing Block Plan. Drg no. 102
- Existing Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 110. Rev A
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 111
- Proposal Ground Floor Plan. Drg no. 120
- Proposal Elevations. Drg no. 121. Rev A
- Proposal Roof Plan. Drg no. 122

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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Prior to commencement of the works hereby approved, the tree protection measures as specified in the submitted Method Statement Plan (CCLR/MS/01) and Arboricultural Method Statement shall be fully implemented, and shall be retained throughout the period of construction. In addition, no activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with policy G7 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	02/04/2024	Signed: BM
Authorisation	03/04/2024	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling