



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/W/25/3367862

Harwood Fields Farm Castle, Hill Road, Birtle, Rochdale BL9 6UL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by condition of a planning application.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs S & T Robinson against Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application ref is 25/00289/DOC sought approval of details pursuant to conditions Nos 3, 9, and 11 of planning permission ref 24/00225/FUL.
 - The application was refused for the details pursuant to condition No 11 by notice dated the 28th of May 2025.
 - The development proposed is for the conversion and extension of part of an existing stables building (inc. demolition of the remainder of the stable block and associated structures) to form one dwelling.
 - The details for which approval is sought are for existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building finished floor levels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and the details submitted pursuant to Condition No 11 attached to planning permission ref 24/00225/FUL granted on the 25th of July 2024 in accordance with the application dated the 20th of March 2025 and the details submitted with it are approved.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs S & T Robinson against Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. While the Council discharged Conditions 3 and 9, it refused to discharge Condition 11 due to the absence of the proposed ground floor levels and building finished floor levels details. However, the Council have confirmed that ground floor levels and building finished floor levels were provided but not uploaded to their document management system. Therefore, the 'SR-24-09-23-B3 Ground Levels and Floor Level (amended 16/03/2025)' plan was not considered by the Case Officer when reviewing the application. The Council has indicated that had it been aware of the aforementioned plan, it would have approved the application as it has decided not to defend the appeal. There are therefore no matters of dispute between the parties.

Main Issue

4. In light of the information confirming that the Council would have approved the discharge of Condition 11, the main issue is whether there are other

considerations that might indicate that the proposal would be unacceptable, in particular living conditions and character and appearance.

Reasons

5. Condition 11 was attached to the original approval to protect the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The condition does not however refer to any relevant planning policies.
6. Based on the 'SR-24-09-23-B3 Ground Levels and Floor Level (amended 16/03/2025)' plan and observations from my site visit, the proposed finished ground and floor levels would be commensurate with the buildings surrounding the appeal site, reflecting the character and appearance of the area. Further, the proposed ground and floor levels in combination with the moderate distance from surrounding dwellings would prevent the proposal from adversely affecting the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
7. Based on the information before me, the proposal could be built in accordance with the approved plans, would not block a doorway, and provides sufficient clarity of ground level to the newly erected amenity area located adjacent to the property.
8. As such, the proposal would be acceptable with regards to its effect on the character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. There would therefore be no conflict with the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area, and provide a high standard of amenity.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed for the discharge of Condition 11.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR