

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0245
Location: 24 DEAN HEAD, TODMORDEN ROAD, LITTLEBOROUGH,
OL15 9LZ
Proposal: Proposed garage extension and new front porch.
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Rosalind Galton

Site

The application relates to no. 24 Dean Head, Todmorden Road, a two-storey end-terrace dwelling located in a semi-rural setting in Summit, Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 22 Dean Head to the south-east, adjacent to no. 26 Dean Head to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. To the front of the property lies Dean Head Farm to the south-west and to the rear lies the Rochdale Canal to the north-east. The dwelling is sited on a gentle downward incline towards the north-east up to the rear curtilage space, where it slopes steeply towards the Canal. The street scene is characterised by early to mid-20th century terraced housing of pebbledash and render construction with rear garden and allotments separated by an access road. The property is sited within Green Belt land and is served by the A6033, a high-trafficked classified road linking Littleborough with Hebden Bridge.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks permission for a single storey side extension with front porch and overhanging canopy roof at the front extension, wrapping over the garage and porch.

Relevant History

82/D14784 - Conversion Of Dwellinghouse To Two Flats - Grant subject to conditions 1983-02-24

23/00166/HOUS - Two storey side, single storey front and single storey rear extensions including the addition of a balcony to the first-floor rear elevation and a glass balustrade and formation of new garden steps to the rear. Refuse 2023-04-20

23/01046/HOUS - Part-single, part-two storey side extension with balcony and glass balustrade to the rear first floor elevation following demolition of existing outbuilding, formation of garden steps, and alterations to fenestration on the ground floor rear elevation (r - Grant subject to conditions 2024-05-16

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

Policy JP-G9: The Green Belt

Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places

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

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).

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments were received.

Principle of Development – Green Belt: G4

The application site is allocated as Green Belt under Policy JP-G9 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, which establishes a revised Green Belt in the Borough and supersedes Policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and Policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. Policy JP-G9 does not set out specific requirements for development proposals within the Green Belt and as such the provisions of the NPPF apply.

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: [...] 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;”*

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 single storey side and front extension to the host dwelling. For the purposes of this assessment, the original dwelling does not include the existing shed outbuilding to the side of the property. While Green Belt calculations have not been submitted, based on an approximate calculation the proposed extension would result in an increase of approximately 27% of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension therefore would fall below the 35% allowance and constitute a proportional addition which is not considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

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.

No harm has been identified in terms of the spatial component of openness where the proposed extension is considered to constitute a proportionate addition and an appropriate development.

The proposed single storey side extension would obscure the view of the open land to the rear of the dwelling from Todmorden Road. Notwithstanding, the present context of the street scene is characterised by terraced residential dwellings and bungalows with limited spacing in between, thus it is considered the proposed extension would not significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.

It is not considered, given the position of the proposed front porch, the proposed porch would not cause harm by reason of spatial or visual openness.

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 135 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 JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states development should, wherever appropriate, be consistent with distinctive places with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.

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 revised plans comprise a single side extension which is set back from the main front wall of the dwelling. The extension would therefore appear subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed use of a pitched roof form would also appear in keeping with the host dwelling. The submitted plans also indicate the proposed extension would be constructed in materials matching the host dwelling. It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration. The submitted plans indicate a bin store to the rear of the dwelling for refuse bins storage. Whilst refuse bins would likely require considerable movement between the access road and the highway, it is noted that similar arrangements are present in neighbouring properties and as such, no concerns are had with the proposed arrangements. The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, the PfE, 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.”

The proposed side extension does not directly face any properties to the front and rear and is sited at a substantial distance from front-facing Dean Head Farm Cottages. Thus, the proposed development is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts in this regard.

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 site is set against A6033 Todmorden Road, which is recognised as a classified road, with substantial traffic movement at reasonable speed throughout the day.

The proposed side extension would, despite providing parking for at least one vehicle, erode part of the existing driveway to the side of the dwelling. The scheme results in a remaining driveway length of 8.5m, which would meet the minimum Council standard. However, taking into account of the required internal turning space, the proposal would only provide one viable off-street parking space excluding the garage, which falls short of the maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy. Notwithstanding, regards have been had to the existing parking arrangements of neighbouring properties, particularly of terraced dwellings which do not benefit from driveways and rely on parking in the rear access road and on Todmorden Road. On this basis, it is considered a refusal on grounds of highway safety could not be reasonably substantiated. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Planning Balance

In light of the above assessment, it is considered the proposed development would meet inappropriate development exception (c) of Paragraph 154 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, provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land

within it. Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No harm through inappropriateness has been identified and no additional harm with regard to the openness of the Green Belt has been identified. The proposal therefore accords with the PfE and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (3)

- 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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of plans:

- Location Plan - Drawing No. 25-054 001
- Site Plan Proposed - Drawing No. 25-054 200
- Site Plan Roof Scape Drawing No 25-054 201
- Plans and Elevations as Proposed - Drawing No. 25-054-210

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 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 the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.