

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01268/HOUS

Application Number:	23/01268/HOUS
Location:	Higher Cleggswood Farm, Higher Lakewood, Rakewood Road, Littleborough, OL15 0AZ
Proposal:	Partial demolition of existing detached annexe together with engineering operations to facilitate the erection of a subterranean garage/pool including other landscaping works and creation of hardstanding; erection of replacement single storey side extension including alterations to fenestration to side elevation and addition of roof lights to front roof slope to host dwelling
Applicant:	Lisa and Tim Knight
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
DETERMINATION DATE 31.07.2024	EXT OF TIME 16.08.2024
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 Higher Cleggswood Farm, a two-storey detached converted farmhouse of stone construction located amidst extensive open farm land, south of Littleborough Town Centre. The dwelling is sited on an isolated and elevated position with open aspect views over Hollingworth Lake to the south and thus makes an important contribution to the local rural landscape. The property, alongside the adjacent row of barn buildings converted to four terraced properties to the north-east, forms part of a residential development known as Higher Lakewood which is accessible via a private access road from Rakewood Road.

The property is identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) due to its architectural and historical significance and is situated within the Green Belt. Though the farmhouse has been subject to later alterations, much of its historic fabric remains evident. As it stands, the residential curtilage comprises a single-storey side extension and lower ground floor garage (approved in 2007), a stable outbuilding later turned into ancillary use, and a raised terrace surrounding the property.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single-storey annexe to the north-west facing elevation of the host dwelling, following the demolition of the existing side extension and the partial demolition of the existing stable outbuilding. It is characterised by a gable roof form perpendicular to the host dwelling and has a ridge height of 5.41m and a height to eaves of 2.72m. The south-west facing elevation comprises recessed aluminium windows and gable metal screens. It would be constructed in stonework and slate roof to match the host dwelling. The proposed annexe is connected by a frameless glazed link with a height of 2.57m.

The application also proposes engineering operations to facilitate the construction of a subterranean garage and swimming pool underneath the proposed annexe. The garage would be accessed via a car lift from the driveway.

Additional hard and soft landscaping works include the following:

- ☐ The improvement and minor extension to the existing raised terrace;
- ☐ The addition of metal balustrade around the raised terrace;
- ☐ The formation of access steps from the raised terrace to the south-west;
- ☐ The construction of boundary and retaining walls;
- ☐ The formation of new hardstanding of permeable paving; and
- ☐ The removal and replacement planting of one tree alongside the planting of hedges and shrubbery.

The proposed works to the host dwelling include the following:

- ☐ The addition of two windows to the south-east facing side elevation;
- ☐ The addition of one window to an existing opening to the north-west facing side elevation;
- ☐ The replacement of the south-west facing ground floor fenestration with full height windows and stone surrounds;
- ☐ The replacement of three roof lights to the south-west facing rear roof slope; and
- ☐ The addition of two roof lights to the north-east facing front roof slope.

Relevant History

19/00378/HOUS - Proposed rear extension and modifications to form roof terrace – Refuse

Officer's Comment:

1. By virtue of its scale, the extension would result in disproportionate additions to the original building and therefore comprise inappropriate development in

the Green Belt, which is harmful by definition. The extension would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm identified and the proposal is therefore contrary to policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

19/00101/CPL - Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a creation of hard standing comprising stone flags for agricultural use – Refuse

14/00757/FUL - Use of land as an extension to the private curtilage of the farmhouse including the erection of a timber outbuilding, outdoor kitchen, access, drive and manoeuvring area and boundary fencing - Retrospective - Appeal part allowed part dismissed

13/00377/CPE - Application for certificate of lawful use (existing) for use of land as an extension to the private curtilage of the farmhouse including the erection of a timber outbuilding – Refuse

11/D54178 - Conversion of roof space to form additional living accommodation together with the installation of 6 no. Conservation style roof lights, the installation of a window in the west facing elevation, the installation of 3 no. External timber shutters to rear elevation and the amendment to the driveway gradient – Grant subject to conditions

07/D50220 - Refurbishment of existing house including construction of single storey extension and lower ground floor garage – Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

Higher Cleggswood Farm is present on the first edition OS map from 1851 and appears to retain a significant amount of historic and original fabric. The site along with the adjacent barn make an important contribution to the landscape around Hollingworth Lake. Therefore, it meets the criteria for assessment as a non-designated heritage asset.

There are no heritage objections to the principle of the demolition and replacement of the existing extension as it is not considered to be of any particular historic interest. The proposed extension would be of a similar size above ground to the existing extension. While it would have a slightly greater overall height, its pitched form would reduce its overall mass slightly at the upper levels.

The proposed extension would read as a subservient addition to the host property and would not appear unduly dominant. It is also considered that the form of the

extension, with its simple dual pitched roof, would relate better to the architecture and form of the host property. The glazed link would also help to provide a clear separation between the historic farmhouse and the new extension. It will be important to ensure that high quality detailing and materials are secured achieved via conditions, to prevent the design from being watered down.

Given that the new garage and pool would be largely underground, it is considered that their visual impact on the farmhouse would be limited. A landscaping condition including details of the proposals for the surplus soil is recommended.

The number of new windows on the south-east gable elevation on the submitted plans appears excessive and should be reduced. Amended plans have addressed this issue which is acceptable.

The proposed roof lights should be conservation style and set flush with the roof slope. All new windows should be fabricated of either timber or aluminium, with details secured by condition.

Summary

Subject to conditions, the proposed plans as amended would have a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

Urban Design

The steeply pitched roofline of the proposed extension is apparent and does somewhat detract importance and prominence away from the main dwelling. The roof pitch could be lowered slightly to relate better with the main roof pitch. Notwithstanding, the current pitch could be accepted if the details and materiality are to an exceptional standard.

The stonework of the extension should match the farmhouse and resolve the harm caused by the unsympathetic stonework of the existing extension.

The stone soffit and recessed vertical metal screen are key design details which help promote high quality design and enhance the quality of the area. Additional submitted drawings showing details of the stone soffit and metal screen are satisfactory. These features would be sited on an elevation with key views from Hollingworth Road and as such, the design should not be relegated with weaker alternatives as to not compromise the overall design quality.

The proposed south-east facing fenestration appear to dominate and imbalance this elevation as a whole. Amended plans indicate a reduction of windows which has resolved the earlier concerns. Suitable conditions are recommended for the material selection to ensure detail such as stone surrounds are maintained with the additional window insertions and to avoid a 'patchwork' effect.

The glazed link is a positive design move to link the extension with the original farmhouse. The success to this link would be the seamless element to the glazing,

as such it should be ensured this transition is not dominated by thick framework or dark glazed panels that have the risk to over dominate the design.

Summary

Taken as a whole, the proposal has been designed in a tasteful manner, preserving a strong sense of place with sympathetic modern design interpretations. The applicant has shown positive intentions to maintain high quality materiality throughout the scheme, which should be carefully controlled via conditions as to prevent visual harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal extension is an improvement upon the existing extension which adequately meets the requirements of Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy, and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF. Subject to conditions, the Officer is supportive of this application.

Highways and Engineering

Highways raise no objection to the proposal which is unlikely to impact upon the highways network.

United Utilities

United Utilities has provided guidance on drainage matters and the management and maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems. A drainage condition relating to the discharge of the proposed swimming pool has been recommended.

Standard advice relating to the potential impact of the proposed development on United Utilities' assets are attached.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No comments received at the time of writing.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

No comments received at the time of writing.

Tree Officer

No comments received at the time of writing.

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)

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:

Policy JP-G7 Trees and Woodland

Policy JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy JP-G9 The Green Belt

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Policy JP-P2 Heritage

Local

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

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

Following comments from the Conservation Officer and Urban Design Officer, amendments were made to reduce the number of proposed window openings to the south-east side elevation. Stone surrounds were also added to the remaining proposed windows.

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in

Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.

- ② The proposal seeks to construct, among other works, a single-storey attached annexe to the host dwelling. Notwithstanding the considerable 5.41m in ridge height, the proposed annexe is of a single-storey form with an in-keeping dual-pitched roof form which is considered to be of a proportionate and subservient form to the host dwelling, particularly when viewed from the south-west, where views of the host property from the nearby highway are most prominent.
- ② Whilst it is noted the front-facing gable of the proposed annexe appears somewhat conspicuous against the dual-pitched form of the farmhouse, it is acknowledged the proposed annexe is intended to be read as a modern addition to the dwelling, as evident by the simplified built forms, large gable end glazing and contemporary architectural detailing. Notwithstanding, the proposed annexe and the associated works as a whole constitute a well-designed and sympathetic scheme that responds positively to the context to which it relates to. It has also been sensitively considered in light of its prominent siting and key views along Hollingworth Lake and is supported by extensive landscape and visual impact assessments. The NPPF affords significant weight to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design in an area. As such, it is considered the proposal represents a high standard of design which would enhance the character and appearance of the area and local landscape.
- ② The submitted plans indicate the use of stonework and slate tiles to match the host dwelling. In addition, a mix of traditional and contemporary material palette is proposed for the proposed annexe, the suitability of which can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the host property.
- ② The proposed alterations and additions to windows to the farmhouse are generally considered to be appropriate sited and designed with the existing fenestration.
- ② Works relating to the proposed hard landscaping and boundary treatments are considered to be suitable designed and would be subject to condition requiring details, specification and materials.
- ② The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and the NPPF.

Heritage: P2

- ② Policy JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone and Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strive 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.
- ② Paragraph 203 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 209 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 has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) by the Council’s Conservation Officer due to its historic and architectural interest as a pre-1845 farmhouse. By virtue of its siting, it also contributes significantly to the cultural landscape around Hollingworth Lake, as identified in Policy P2 of the Core Strategy. It is therefore subject to a balanced judgement regarding the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.
- ☐ The existing side extension is of recent construction and of no particular historic interest. Therefore the proposed demolition and replacement of this element is would have a positive impact on the significance of the farmhouse as a NDHA.
- ☐ By virtue of its dual-pitched roof form and overall reduced scale and massing, the proposed annexe would relate better to the vernacular and built forms of the farmhouse than the existing side extension. The proposed annexe would not appear unduly dominant to the farmhouse and would read as a subservient addition to the dwelling.
- ☐ The use of a glazed link feature is also considered a well-considered feature that would provide a clear separation between the historic farmhouse and the contemporary extension and enhance the significance of the farmhouse.
- ☐ Given the subterranean nature of the proposed garage and swimming pool, the below ground works are considered to have a limited visual impact of the farmhouse. Notwithstanding, a condition requiring details of the surplus soil following the regrading works has been recommended.
- ☐ Due to the contemporary design of the proposal, it is recommended that high quality materials and detailing are secured via conditions relating to material samples, doors and windows drawings and large scale details of the key architectural features.
- ☐ The proposed fenestration, as amended, indicate a reduction from the previously submitted plans which would be considered appropriately designed. The addition of stone surrounds to the proposed openings would also be sympathetic to the existing fenestration and historic fabric. Suitable windows and roof lights in ‘conservation style’ are to be secured via conditions in the interest of safeguarding the significance of the NDHA.

- ☐ Taken as a whole, subject to the relevant conditions, it is considered the proposed development would have a neutral impact on the significance of the farmhouse as a non-designated heritage asset. The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P2 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Trees: G6

- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the removal of one tree to the north west of the host dwelling. Policy JP-G7 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan states where development would result in the loss of existing trees, measures that would result in a net enhancement in the character and quality of the treescape and biodiversity value in the local area would be required. Whilst the application has not provided justifications regarding the tree removal, it is noted a detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted, supported by a Landscape Design & Access Statement which proposes the replacement planting of *Betula pendula* tree, hedging and a variety of shrubbery species to be planted within the host curtilage. Given this, it is considered the proposed landscaping works would adequately contribute towards the enhancement of the local landscape character and would be acceptable in accordance with Policies P3, G6, and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G7 of the adopted 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.”*
- ☐ By virtue of its siting on a substantially elevated and isolated position, the proposed annexe does not directly face any properties and is not expected to result in significant amenity impacts in this regard. The proposed south east-facing windows also do not directly face the adjacent row of terraced properties which raises no concerns.
- ☐ 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 proposal would result in a four-bedroom dwelling which would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy. The submitted plans indicate the proposed subterranean garage which can accommodate four vehicles, in addition to the existing off-street parking space for two vehicles to the front driveway would be retained. This is in excess of the maximum parking standard and raises no concerns.
- ☐ The submitted plans also indicate the hardstanding to be constructed from a mix of permeable materials including permeable green gap paving. As permeable driveways do not require planning permission, it would not be necessary to condition details.
- ☐ The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Ecology: G7

- ☐ A preliminary bat survey and two nocturnal bat surveys were undertaken at the application site between May and September 2023. Whilst the daytime survey had assessed the three buildings within the residential curtilage as having moderate bat roosting potential, the dusk survey has observed no bats emerging from any potential roosting feature within the buildings. As the buildings were not found to support roosting bats of any species, based on the evidence presented, the Council is satisfied the proposed development would not result in harm to the protected species, in accordance with Policy G7 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-G8 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF. It would not be necessary to recommend condition in this instance.

Principle of Development – Green Belt

- ☐ 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 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.”* The following exceptions are relevant:

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;*

☐ Paragraph 155 of the NPPF notes that *“certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.”* One of the relevant forms of development are engineering operations.

☐ 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, among other things, a replacement single-storey attached annexe with a subterranean garage and swimming pool, following the demolition of the existing side extension and partial demolition of the existing stable outbuilding.

☐ The single-storey side extension (approved as part of planning application ref: 07/D50220) was constructed circa 2008. The stable outbuilding sited within the northern corner of the residential curtilage appears to have been subject to alterations over time but its footprint appears extant in excess of 20 years. It was also confirmed in the appeal of 14/00757/FUL that the stable outbuilding was allowed to be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the host dwelling. For the purposes of this assessment, both of these additions constitute extensions and do not form part of the original dwelling. As it stands, the existing extensions comprising the side extension and stable outbuilding represents a 92% and 146% increase in volume and floor space respectively, which is in substantial exceedance of the 35% allowance.

☐ The submitted Planning Statement has provided a breakdown of the existing and proposed calculations. Taking into account of both the above ground and below ground works, the proposed extensions would result in a net volume increase of 1% over the existing extensions. However, when considering only the visible above ground works, the proposed additions constitutes a 47%

decrease in volume compared with the existing extensions. With regard to floor space, the proposed extensions would result in a reduction in floor space of 3%, where 59% of the floor space relate to part of the proposed development which takes place below ground.

- ☐ With this in mind, notwithstanding the marginal increase in total combined volume over and above the original dwelling, the resulting building mass of the proposed annexe would nonetheless constitutes a material visual reduction in scale compared with the exiting side extension. The additions in volume and floor space that form part of the below ground works would have no additional visual impact on the original building. Given the specific circumstances of the site context and the proposed development, it is considered the proposed development would result in a marked visual improvement to the existing built forms and would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- ☐ It is noted the proposal also comprise works relating to a set of access steps sited set away from the proposed raised terrace to the south-west of 1.64m height and an extension of the 2m-high raised terrace to the southern corner. It is accepted that the proposed steps would replace the existing steps which accounts for the changes in levels between the ground floor of the dwelling and the adjoining open space. The proposed terrace extension would form part and parcel to the construction of the proposed subterranean garage. On this basis, the works described would be assessed as works falling under engineering operations which would be subject to the test of 'openness' under Paragraph 155 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.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ As assessed previously, the proposed annexe constitutes a consolidation and visual reduction of built forms compared with the existing extensions and thus is not considered to significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.
- ☐ The proposal also comprises a partial removal of the existing stable outbuilding at the highest elevation of the application site which would contributes towards the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt.
- ☐ The proposed subterranean works would be sited below ground and would be partly obscured and viewed in the context of the existing retaining wall which sits to the south-west of the host dwelling. The proposed extension of the raised terrace would infill part of the retaining wall that is already readily visible from public vantage points. Given this, and the elevated position of the

application site from the street level, it is considered the proposed engineering works would have no significant visual impact upon the original dwelling and would not harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

- ☐ In light of the above assessment, it is considered the proposed development would meet inappropriate development exception (c) and (d) 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 and the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces, and exception (b) of Paragraph 155 which would allow for engineering operations 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: 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:

- ☐ Site Location Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-00001 Rev. P04
- ☐ Site Location Plan Google Map – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-00002 Rev. P02
- ☐ Existing Plans: Farmhouse & Extension – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-02001 Rev. P01
- ☐ Existing Plan & Elevations: Annex Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-02061 Rev. P02
- ☐ Existing Elevations: Farmhouse & Extension – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-02201 Rev. P01
- ☐ Site Plan - Existing: Analysis – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-02501 Rev. P01 (A3)
- ☐ Site Plan – Existing – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-02502 Rev. P02
- ☐ Demolition Plans: Farmhouse & Existing Extension – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-03051 Rev. P02
- ☐ Demolition Elevations: Farmhouse & Ex. Extension – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-03052 Rev. P02
- ☐ Demolition Plan & Elevations: Annex – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-03061 Rev. P01

- ❑ Site Plan Existing: Demolition Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-03501 Rev. P02
- ❑ Proposed Plans – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05001 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Basement Floor Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05002 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05003 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05004 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Second Floor Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05005 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Roof Plan – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05006 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Section A-A – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05101 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Section B-B – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05102 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05201 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed North Elevation (front) – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05202 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed East Elevation (side) – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05203 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed South Elevation (rear) – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05204 Rev. P04
- ❑ Proposed West Elevation (side) – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05205 Rev. P04
- ❑ Site Section SA-SA – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05130 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Section SB-SB – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05131 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Plan Proposed: Analysis – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05501 Rev. P02 (A3)
- ❑ Site Plan Proposed: Basement – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05502 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Plan Proposed: Ground Floor – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05503 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Plan Proposed: First Floor – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05504 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Plan Proposed: Second Floor – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05505 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Plan Proposed: Roof – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05506 Rev. P03
- ❑ Site Plan: Proposed Residential Curtilage – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05510 Rev. P01
- ❑ Existing & Proposed Volume – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05601 Rev. P02
- ❑ Existing & Proposed Footprint – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05602 Rev. P02
- ❑ Existing External: Permeable – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05604 Rev. P02
- ❑ Proposed External: Permeable – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05614 Rev. P03

- ☐ Proposed Extension: Metal Grill – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05301 Rev. P01
- ☐ Proposed Glazed Link – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05302 Rev. P01
- ☐ Proposed Balustrade, Terrace – Drawing No. 0763-P3A-XX-XX-DR-A-05303 Rev. P01

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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. 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, Policy JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. No above ground works shall take place until details of the roof lights to be installed in the roof of the approved development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, roof lights shall be of a 'Conservation Style' and shall be set flush with the roof slope or as close as is practicable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of non-designated heritage assets and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials of the proposed doors, windows, soffits, eaves, verges and ridge have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include detailed elevation and cross-section drawings, and the type, colour and texture of the materials. For the avoidance of doubt, the windows shall be of timber or aluminium

construction. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policy P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of boundaries or retaining walls have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved structures have been erected in accordance with the approved details. The structures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance 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.

7. The proposed soft landscaping works, including planting plans, specifications and schedules (including planting size, species and numbers/densities), existing plants / trees to be retained and shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on “Softworks Plan & Schedule – Extension Drawing No. 0035-MS-XX-XX-DR-L-0023 Rev. P04” received 09/05/2024 and “Landscape Design & Access Statement by Make Space Rev. MS-0035-ID-005-04” received 09/05/2024 for timing / phasing of implementation or within the next planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner, and maintained thereafter.

Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition 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, in accordance with Policies P3, G6, G7 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G7 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until full details of hard landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks, hard surfaced areas and materials, and proposals for the surplus soil.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location and the nature of the proposed development, 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.

9. Notwithstanding any details of details in the application, the works required to install the proposed car lift hereby approved shall not take place until the details, specifications, appearance and design of the car lift has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved structures shall be erected in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance 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.

10. Prior to works required to construct proposed swimming pool, the details of drainage for the proposed swimming pool shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and agreed in writing. The details shall include:
- (i) rate of discharge;
 - (ii) volume of discharge; and
 - (iii) timings for emptying of the swimming pool.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the swimming pool can be properly emptied without damage to the local water environment and to manage the risk of flooding, in compliance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-S4 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the NPPF.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	15/08/2024	Signed: SY
Authorisation	15/08/2024	Signed: RK

Notes for applicant:

Under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) it is a criminal offense for a person to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird, or damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use or being built. Additional care should be taken through the nesting season which runs from 1st March to 31st August inclusive. If any nesting bird is found or suspected which would be affected by the development, work should cease immediately and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted for advice at the expense of the applicant. Planning permission does not provide a defence against prosecution under the aforementioned act.

The applicant's attention is drawn to the list of protected species of animal under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981). Under this act, it is a criminal offence if a person is to intentionally kill or injure , or intentionally or recklessly damages or destroys, disturbs or obstructs a structure or place which any specified wild animal uses for shelter. If any Schedule 5 animal is found or suspected which would be affected by the development, work should cease immediately and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted for advice at the expense of the applicant. Planning permission does not provide a defence against prosecution under the aforementioned act.

Report Author Sam Yuen