

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
23/00096/AM	Majid Mir	3 August 2023

Address: Mill House Farm Over Town Lane Rochdale OL12 7TQ

Proposal: Section 73 application to vary conditions 2 (Plans), 3 (materials), 7 (Parking), 8 (Landscaping), 9 (Boundary treatments) and 11 (bat/bird boxes) and remove conditions 1 (time limit), 4 (Stone panel), 5 (Contamination), 6 (Nesting season) and 10 (Tree Protection) of planning permission 16/00381/FUL (Retrospective)

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N/A
-----	--	-----

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RG

DATE: 7 June 2024

SITE

The application relates to site of the former Mill House Farm on Over Town Lane in Norden, Rochdale. The site is located to the east of Over Town Lane itself, approximately 350m to the north of its junction with Edenfield Road and within the defined Green Belt. The overall site is approximately 1.4 hectares in size. Presently on the site is a modern dwelling set within expansive garden with a number of mature trees. Planning permission was granted for construction of the dwelling following the demolition Mill House Farm (16/00381/FUL).

The dwelling is situated in an elevated position and to the south of the site. There is a private driveway which leads from the access road onto Over Town Lane. Over Town Lane splits in two at the southern point of the site. One splits off towards a recently constructed residential development that is located to the north of the applicant site. The application site is also accessed from the same road and is also part of the adopted highway. The fork to the south leads to Rainshore Farm. This not part of the adopted highway.

The farmhouse that was replaced by the existing property was a relatively traditional design, built in stone with a slate roof, and has been significantly altered and extended in the past. A number of single storey rear extensions had been added to the farmhouse, built in timber, glass and rendered blockwork. The surrounding site also hosted a number of substantial red brick outbuildings and a wood store along with an open tennis court.

PROPOSAL

The application has been made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S73). The application proposes to make alterations to the design of the property as well as complying with conditions which were attached to the existing planning permission. The application seeks to vary conditions 2 (Plans), 3 (materials), 7 (Parking), 8 (Landscaping), 9 (Boundary treatments) and 11 (bat/bird boxes) and remove conditions 1 (time limit), 4 (Stone panel), 5 (Contamination), 6 (Nesting season) and 10 (Tree Protection) of planning permission 16/00381/FUL.

The dwelling and all associated work has been undertaken and such is a retrospective application.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-P2	Heritage

JP-G6	Urban Green Space
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-H1	Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
JP-H2	Affordability of New Housing
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

- C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
- C3 Delivering the right type of housing
- C6 Improving health and well being

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

- P1 Improving image
- P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
- P3 Improving design of new development

SO4 Promoting a greener environment

- G6 Enhancing green infrastructure
- G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity
- G8 Managing water resources and flood risk
- G9 Reducing the impact of pollution

SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

- T2 Improving accessibility
- DM1 General development requirements
- SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

- EM/7 Development and Flood Risk
- EM/8 Protection of Surface and Ground

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

- 78/D07732 Extension to outbuildings - Granted
- 90/D25669 Alteration and extensions to dwellinghouse – Granted STC
- 02/D40550 Single and two storey extensions to dwelling – Withdrawn
- 02/D40620 Erection of 1.8m high boundary fence (partly retrospective) – Refused | Appeal Allowed

03/D41561	Single storey extension to front and two storey extension to side of dwelling including demolition of existing conservatory and utility outbuilding - Withdrawn
16/00381/FUL	Proposed demolition of existing house and ancillary buildings and construction of a new dwelling. Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

Highways raise no objection to the proposed amendments to the parking arrangements.

Gtr Manchester Ecology Unit

Changes considered to be relatively minor, and will not have a substantive impact on the overall value or impact on the landscape or on nature conservation interests.

Tree Officer

Changes considered to be relatively minor, and will not have a substantive impact on the overall value or impact on the landscape or on nature conservation interests.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No objection.

Environmental Control (Landfill Gas)

Reports are acceptable and can recommend discharge of remaining conditions.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and a notice displayed in the vicinity of the site. In response, two letters of support and one letter of objection have been received, as summarised below.

- ☐ Did not conform to the previous planning application.
Officer comment: The application is a retrospective application to vary conditions relating to the original planning permission.
- ☐ Impact on wildlife or birds.
 Never put up the bird boxes or bat boxes.
- ☐ Building is higher than the previous building and is larger in size.
 Parking spaces for seven cars
Officer comment: The application is a retrospective application to vary conditions relating to the original planning permission. An assessment of the application has been made below.
- ☐ The occupant has false grass and palm trees in the garden.
Officer comment: An assessment of the application has been made below.
- ☐ Is not an eco-house.
Officer comment: In the original application, it was considered by the planning officer that the proposal fell within the green belt policy within the previous version of the NPPF. As such there is no need to provide special circumstances to justify the development. The planning officer

for the original application considered that the proposal accorded with policies D/4, D/8 and H/3 of the Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development – Green Belt.

Policy G/D/2 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) allocations plan identified the Green Belt within Rochdale and the Core Strategy Policy G4 was to be read alongside policy G/D/2. However, Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) was recently adopted by Rochdale Council. Policy JP-G9, supersedes policy G4 of the adopted Core Strategy and makes small amendments to the green belt boundary within Rochdale. It is noted that the application site is retained within the green belt

As such policy JP-G9 of the PfE is therefore relevant to any applications on the site. As stated in Policy JP-G9 of the PfE and the NPPF states that the green belt serves five purposes which are to:

- ❑ to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- ❑ to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- ❑ to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- ❑ to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- ❑ to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. 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.' Paragraph 152 of the NPPF establishes that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 that continues in stating that 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 Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. There are however listed exceptions to this which 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.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that certain other forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt, provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- a) mineral extraction;
- b) engineering operations;
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
- f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Appropriateness of the development

The application to replace the dwelling would fall under point (c) in the above exceptions criteria. The Framework establishes two tests, firstly relating to the use, and then an objective assessment of the relative size of the existing and replacement building. The application property is retained within a residential use and therefore the first test is achieved. The second test is a matter of judgement based on the evidence of each case as the Framework does not define 'materially larger'.

It is noted the Council's adopted Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance in regards to extensions within the green belt. The SPD states that 'disproportionate additions comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt and will not be approved unless

very special circumstances exist that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.' The SPD sets out that extensions that deliver up to 35% increase in floor space or volume over the original dwelling would in most cases 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.

A Court of Appeal judgement in Redhill Aerodrome Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government establishes that 'any other harm' in paragraph 153 of the NPPF includes non-Green Belt harm that is to be taken into account in the weighing exercise of the planning balance as to determining whether or not very special circumstances exist which would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness and any other harm.

This Court of Appeal judgment is an important reminder that under paragraph 153 of the NPPF, when considering any planning application concerning proposed development in the Green Belt, local planning authorities should continue to ensure that substantial weight is given to harm to the Green Belt and any other harm.

As the application seeks to vary condition on the original application, the assessment on whether the proposed development would be materially larger than the building it replaces will take in to consideration the building that was replaced. The planning officer in the original application noted that the existing buildings on site (all to be demolished) comprise a total volume of 1,155.86 cubic metres (made up of the existing house and conservatory extension, 914.1m³, the garage, 192.2m³, and the brick outbuilding, 49.56m³).

The planning officer calculated that the proposed total volume of the new building would be 1,386 cubic metres – representing an approximate 19.9% increase in volume on the existing house. The planning officer added that ‘the proposed dwelling would be positioned in roughly the same position as the farmhouse to be demolished, and although it would be approximately 11m wider, it is noted that the demolition of the extensions and outbuildings would mean that the dwelling resultantly occupies only one confined area of the plot as opposed to being spread across the wider site.’ A greenbelt assessment has been provided with this application. The report notes that the dwelling as built is 8 cubic metres larger than and would result in a volume of 1394 cubic metres and therefore an increase of 20.6%. This is only 0.7 cubic metres larger than the previously approved development.

Further to this it is noted that the proposed dwelling as built is the same height as proposed in the previous application. However, the dwelling as built has seen an increased level of excavation around the site and therefore a greater level of the basement has become visible. This is the element that would have a height of approximately 10.6m. However, as noted by the planning officer for the previous application, It was noted by the planning officer ‘the ‘basement’ level of the property would be set back into the land and the impact would therefore be minimised when viewing the house from a distance and the dwelling would therefore not appear any larger than the existing farmhouse above the existing landform. Even with the increased excavation, the impact of the proposed development would not be substantially greater than what was approved or what stood there previously. As such it is considered that the proposed development would still meet the criteria of exception (d) of paragraph 154 of the NPPF.

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.

“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.

The planning officer made the following assessment of the previous proposal:

- The proposed property would be served by the same private driveway access from the roadway leading between Over Town Lane and the former Rainshore Mill.
- The curtilage of the proposed dwelling would be identical to that of the existing farmhouse, comprising the entire site-edged red in the triangular shaped area of land between the two lanes to the west and east of the site.

- Noting the volume calculations, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would have any greater impact on the openness and character of the Green Belt, assisted in part by the setting of the house within what essentially constitutes a clearing surrounding by a densely wooded boundary.
- The proposed materials for the property are a clear departure from that traditionally expected within a semi-rural enclosed upland location and from those presently used of the original construction of the farmhouse. However, it is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling has been deliberately and unashamedly designed from the ground up to appear as a contemporary, modern addition which nevertheless respects its setting. The proposal is considered to be a very high quality scheme, exceptional in its architectural design in the locality and raising the standards of design in the immediate surroundings and would make use of a range of high quality materials (which would be subject to final approval by condition).

Considering the alterations to the proposed dwelling over the approved dwelling under the previous application, it is considered that the assessment made above is still in most parts applicable in regards to this application. The property would be located within a similar area to the house that previously stood there and is located within the curtilage of the original dwelling. Additionally, the dwelling is sited behind a wooded area and would not be clearly visible from the public highway. The dwelling is only visible when travelling further up the unadopted Over Town Lane that is to the west. From this view, impact of the proposed development would be no greater than the previously approved or original building.

Furthermore, it should be noted that a modern building design in itself does not lead to a greater impact on the openness of the green belt or constitute inappropriate development. The design is modern and like the dwelling it replaces, it is seen as a standalone building with limited or no impact on any of the other buildings in the local area.

As such it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the openness of the green belt and would not constitute inappropriate development within the green belt.

Design and Visual Amenity

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the NPPF state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

The application consists of a number of alterations to the design of the dwelling. These include, design and position of windows, introduction of new openings, alterations in heights and position of ballustrade, increase in balcony area, enclosure of balcony area, materials, and alterations to landscaping.

The planning officer considered that the farmhouse that was demolished did not possess any architectural features of interest and any historical significance by virtue of being a simple stone-built farmhouse has been gradually eroded by way of a number of insensitive and unattractive additions.

As noted by the planning officer in the report for the previous application, it was considered that the proposal 'reflected an extremely high standard of architectural design, with an innovative use of high quality materials to create a modern dwelling

whilst also making use of more traditional materials to reflect aspects of other properties in the surroundings'. The alterations proposed do change elements of the design. Of particular note is the alterations to the fenestration which play a prominent role in the overall design of the dwelling. However, it is noted that some elements of the design were not structurally viable options and the amendments are logical solutions to the original design. Although the design of the dwelling has changed, it has not sufficiently changed to warrant a refusal. The materials used are considered to be acceptable.

Furthermore, the site is set a considerable distance from the public highway and is partially screened from view. The proposed boundary treatment consisting of timber fencing, stone walling and metal gates are considered to be appropriate for the wider site. As such it is considered that alterations to the proposal would not visually alter the overall design of the proposal to the extent it would unduly impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene.

It is therefore considered that the application would accord with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

Paragraph 191 of the NPPF also states that Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. Paragraph 135 also seeks to ensure that planning decisions create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies DM1 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users, also requiring that development does not have impacts that lead to an unacceptable increase in air, water, noise, light or other pollution. Additionally, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires that proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Section 4.1 of the Council's *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document (adopted June 2016) sets out the required separation distances between neighbouring residential properties, as follows:

- i. 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;
- ii. 14m between a principal windows and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
- iii. 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

Section 4.2 adds that 'where buildings of three or more storeys are proposed, or there is a marked difference in levels, it may be necessary for the minimum distances set out in (ii) and (iii) above to be increased.' There are residential properties to the south and north of the site. Additionally, it is noted that there is a height difference within the site as well as there being a considerable height difference between the applicant property and the neighbouring properties. However, the distances between these properties is considerable. The distances are substantially greater than the minimum set out in the SPD with the nearest residential properties being the dwellings within the new residential development to north (approximately 63.5m to the boundaries and 86m to the rear elevations).

Additionally, it is noted that the along with the separation distances, the trees and vegetation surrounding the boundary provide additional screening.

It is therefore considered that the proposed amendments to the approved plans would not lead to unduly impacting on the amenity of the surrounding properties. As such, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Core Strategy policies DM1 and G9 and the NPPF.

Drainage

The site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at a low risk of flooding (less than 1 in 1000 or 0.1% annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year). Additionally, the site is not located within a Critical Drainage Area or National Surface Water 1 in 30 year Area.

The application included a drainage plan and letter from the surfacing contractor who confirmed porous materials were used on the drive. The Council's drainage officer has assessed the application and raised no objection.

As such it is considered that the application is acceptable and accords with policies accord with adopted Rochdale Core Strategy policy G8, saved UDP policies EM/7 and EM/8 and the NPPF.

Ecology

Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains where possible, and contributing to the Government's commitment to halt decline. Policy G6 of the adopted Core Strategy expects development proposals affecting green infrastructure to avoid the loss of existing features such as trees unless suitable alternative provision is made or they have limited value and require a replacement ratio of 2:1 for trees that are removed. Core Strategy policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

It is noted that although there are a number of mature trees on site, none of the trees are protected by a tree preservation order. The application has provided details of bat and bird boxes sited within the site. There are 14 bird and bat boxes scattered around the site, including those on mature trees around the application site. Furthermore, details of the landscaping scheme have been provided. Additionally details of landscaping have been provided. This includes details of 22 trees planted on the site.

GMEU stated that the proposed changes were relatively minor, and would not have a substantive impact on the overall value, landscape or on nature conservation interests.

As such it is considered the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the relevant policies within the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Contamination

Core Strategy Policy G9 states that the Council will ensure that any risks arising from contaminated land or land instability are identified, and that any appropriate actions to address these risks are taken, prior to development taking place.

A supporting report was included with the application. The report noted that the site was evaluated as a low environmental risk but recommendations from this report included a

watching brief during the reduced level dig to identify Made Ground, The report also included evidence showing the installation of the radon membrane. The Council's Contamination Officer considered the report to be acceptable.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy G9 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Access and Parking

With any application for new development it is important to assess the impact on highway safety and under policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy it is established that 'In all circumstances, the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area will have priority, while providing reliable journey times for those travelling through'. Whilst Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

The access to the site towards the entrance has been widened slightly to allow for parking at the bottom during icy conditions.

The highways department have raised no objections to the amended parking arrangements. It is noted that the property has more than sufficient parking for a property of such a size. Additionally, it is noted that the alterations proposed are located within the site and would not impact on highway safety.

As such it is considered that the proposed amendment is acceptable and would accord with policy T2 and Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Other matters – Removal of conditions

Condition 1 – Time limit.

Planning permission was granted by a decision notice dated 30 June 2016. Condition 1 stated that 'the development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.' Based on the evidence available, it suggests that development had started within the time limit stated within condition 1. Further to this, the application is a retrospective application to remove condition under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as the development has been fully constructed.

Condition 4 - Stone panel

The condition required samples to be provided. Details of the stone have been provided as such this condition have been met.

Condition 5 – Contamination

As noted above, a supporting report was included with the application. The report noted that the site was evaluated as a low environmental risk but recommendations from this report included a watching brief during the reduced level dig to identify Made Ground, The report also included evidence showing the installation of the

radon membrane. The Council's Contamination Officer considered the report to be acceptable.

Condition 6 - Nesting season

The condition restricted clearance of trees and shrubs in preparation for (or during the course of) development during the bird nesting season between March and August. As the work has been undertaken and no further clearance of trees or shrubs are proposed, the removal of the condition is acceptable. No further work to the trees or shrubs are proposed.

Condition 10 - Tree Protection

The condition did not require any further evidence to be provided and required that prior to development or works of site preparation taking place, all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site identified as requiring protection measures on the submitted Tree Survey (drawing no. 704.3A) will be enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012. No further work to the trees are proposed.

Conclusions

No harm through inappropriateness in the Green Belt has been identified and no additional harm to the Green Belt has been identified that is not outweighed by other considerations or suitably mitigated. The application proposal therefore accords with policy JP-G9 of the PfE and the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the protection of Green Belt land.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT SUBJECT TO FOLLOWING CONDITIONS

1. This permission relates to the following plans:-

- ☐ Site Plan as Existing. Drawing no: 11
- ☐ Site Plan as Existing. Drawing no: 12
- ☐ **Basement Plan as Built. Drawing no: 16. Rev: A**
- ☐ **Site Plan as Proposed as Built. Drawing no: 14**
- ☐ **Ground Floor Plan as Built. Drawing no: 15. Rev: A**
- ☐ **First Floor Plan as Built. Drawing no: 17**
- ☐ **North Elevation as Built. Drawing no: 19**
- ☐ **South Elevation as Built. Drawing no: 18**
- ☐ **East Elevation as Built. Drawing no: 20**
- ☐ **West Elevation as Built. Drawing no: 21**
- ☐ **Landscape Plan as Built. Drawing no: 10. Rev: A**
- ☐ **Site Layout. Drawing no: R0451-11. Rev: A**
- ☐ **Entrance Gates as Built. Drawing no: 22**
- ☐ **Site Plan (indicative landscape scheme). Drawing no: 10. Rev: A**

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings and documents 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the details of external materials as shown in the materials schedule received by email on 04/09/2023. The materials shall be retained as such hereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The parking areas shall be constructed in accordance with the hereby approved plan 'Site Layout (Drawing no: R0451-11. Rev: A). The parking areas shall be retained thereafter for the parking of vehicles.

Reason: In order that there is adequate provision for vehicles to be parked clear of the highway and to ensure the suitable disposal of surface water in order to comply with policy T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policies EM/7 and EM/8 of Unitary Development Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Landscaping work shall be undertaken in accordance with the following plans and documents:

Landscape Plan as Built. Drawing no: 10. Rev: A
Site Layout. Drawing no: R0451-11. Rev: A

Any trees or shrubs planted or retained which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location and the nature of the proposed development and in accordance with policies G6 and G7 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, JP-G7 Places for Everyone Joint DPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The boundaries, screens or retaining walls shall be installed in accordance with the approved plan 'Site Plan (indicative landscape scheme) (Drawing no: 10. Rev: A)'. The structures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The bird and bat boxes shall be installed as identified in the 'Landscape Plan as Built (Drawing no: 10. Rev: A)'. The bird and bat boxes shall be retained in perpetuity thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard any protected species which may either live or forage within the site in accordance with Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the revocation and re-enactment thereof, the

dwelling hereby approved shall not be altered or extended, and no buildings or structure shall be erected within its curtilage under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D, E and F of the above Order except with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent overdevelopment in the Green Belt in accordance with the objectives of Policies G/D/2, D/4 and D/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.