

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00859/HOUS

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
25/00859/HOUS

CASE OFFICER
Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 28.10.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: Little Nook Barn Heywood Old Road Middleton Rochdale M24 4GS

Proposal: Proposed single / double storey extension including a porch and a balcony.

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?	N

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

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

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT subject to conditions
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 28/10/2025

SITE

The application relates to Little Nook Barn, a two storey detached residential dwelling with a conservatory. The dwelling was once a barn and is now finished in grey render.

The site is accessed off Heywood Old Road and is on lower ground than the highway. The site is located on Protected Open Land as set out under saved UDP Policy D/10.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes a part single, part two storey extension with a balcony on the front elevation.

The dwelling consists of a kitchen, lounge and conservatory on the ground floor. The proposed single storey extension will provide a bedroom on this level. This will result in the ground floor consisting of a family room, lounge, kitchen porch and bedroom.

The proposed first floor will consist of three bedrooms and three ensuites. The proposed second floor will consist of two bedrooms with two ensuites and one walk in wardrobe.

The conservatory is proposed to be demolished and in place will be the two storey extension. The front elevation of the dwelling is labelled as the side elevation in the proposed plans. They intend to change the front elevation from the south east elevation to the north west elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

9. Places for People

JP-P 1	Sustainable Places
JP- G9	The Green Belt

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1	Delivering a more prosperous economy
E1	Establishing thriving town, district and local centres
SO2	Creating successful and healthy communities
SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place

P3	Improving design of new development
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving accessibility
DM1	General development requirements
SD1	Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
D/10	Protected Open Land

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

07/D49632 - Change Of Use And Conversion Of Barn To Dwelling Including Conservatory To Side (Retrospective). Approved

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Not applicable.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representation have been sent out to surrounding properties and a site notice displayed in the vicinity. No comments have been received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as Open Protected Land under saved Policy D/10 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (2006). Policy D/10 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that development proposals will be permitted that fall within several categories including development which would be acceptable were it in the Green Belt.

Under paragraph a) of Policy D/10, development proposals which would be acceptable in the Green Belt would be permitted.

Places for Everyone Policy JP-G9 provides the most up-to-date policy in respect of the green belt, and provides strategic aims for its use, and continued protection, however in determining applications for planning permission, it is the Framework which sets out the relevant test.

Paragraph 153 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; [officer's emphasis]**
- 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 (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt
- h) Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are: i. mineral extraction; ii. engineering operations; iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location; iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order

Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed scheme constitutes inappropriate development were it 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 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 floorspace or volume over and above the original dwelling would normally be considered appropriate and not disproportionate (this calculation would include previous extensions to the original dwelling, which is defined as the dwelling as it was first built or as it stood on 1 July 1948). However, the guidance goes on to state that the characteristics of properties and proposals will vary significantly and there may be instances when a 35% increase would be considered disproportionate and other occasions when a greater than 35% increase may be considered proportionate.

The proposal seeks to construct a two storey and single storey extension. The submitted plans have not included volume increases. However, calculating the volume increase for the two-storey extension alone, this would lead to a volume increase of approximately 35.4%. This plus the increase in volume from the single storey porch and extension would therefore take this well above the 35% limit for both floor area and volume and therefore would be considered inappropriate development. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not meet exception requirements of Paragraph 154(c).

Furthermore, in assessing the impact to openness, the sprawling of the building's footprint and general increase in bulk would give rise to a substantially larger and visually distracting structure that would be harmful to the visual and spatial openness of the area.

Given that the development is inappropriate and would be harmful to openness, under paragraph 153 it would need to be demonstrated that very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness, the harm to openness and any other harm arising from the proposals.

A full consideration of this matter is provided once it is established whether any other harm exists.

Design

Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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, which is largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

Despite clearly unsympathetic alterations to facilitate its conversion, including the application of render, insertion of repetitive and regular openings, the attaching of a conservatory and construction of a porch, the building does retain some legibility of its former agrarian use with the simple, linear form evident

The proposals would seek to attach a two-storey extension that would continue the linear form of the building, with a matched roof pitch and form, that would inherently respect the character of the existing building. However, the extent and rigid arrangement of glazing, which is slightly mis-matched from that present on the host property and the installation of a large, obtrusive balcony to the gable end, would only further diminish the building's character.

The single storey extension and porch would sit perpendicular to the host property and be formed with a pitched parapet above the excessively wide entrance. The addition of a porch would read as an overly domestic feature that would sit at odds with the building, and due to its scale, form and materiality would be a wholly obtrusive addition.

The remaining part of the single storey extension would be the most modest of the proposals, although its protrusion from the dwelling and its height would not sit comfortably and would read as a conspicuous and harmful addition.

The insertion of dormer windows to the east facing roof slope would be a wholly inappropriate form of development that would appear incongruous with what agrarian character remains of the building and its surroundings. Their inconsistent size and spacing, would only exacerbate their irregularity and would therefore comprise adversely harmful additions.

In view of the above assessment, the proposed development fails to provide a high standards of design and is not considered acceptable. The proposed development does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments *"should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties."*

The proposed new windows on the rear and side (previously front) elevation will not overlook any neighbouring properties. This is acceptable in relation to amenity.

As part of the application a balcony is proposed on the elevation that is to be the front elevation. Balconies should not result in an overlooking of neighbouring properties, the proposed balcony will not overlook any neighbours or result in a loss of neighbour amenity.

The proposed rooms provide satisfactory light and outlook and are acceptable in terms of amenity.

The proposed development will leave a sufficient amount of garden space for future occupiers.

There are no concerns regarding the impact of the development on the amenity of future or neighbouring occupants, in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The proposed development will not have an impact on the existing parking. There will be sufficient room for parking and there will not be any highway safety implications.

The proposal accords with the requirements of Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Balance

Having regard to paragraph 153 of the Framework, the proposals give rise to harm through inappropriateness, harm to openness and harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Given that the proposals relate to the extension of a private residence, its benefits are nil. Therefore, in determining the application it is clear that very special circumstances do not exist which would outweigh the harm identified.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reason:

1. By reason of their scale and size, the proposed extensions would amount to disproportionate additions to the host building and therefore comprise inappropriate development, and would be harmful to the visual and spatial openness of the area. Furthermore, the proposed extensions, taken individually or cumulatively would fail to be well-designed and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. No very special circumstances exist which would outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness, the harm to openness and the harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area and therefore the development proposals would not accord with the requirements of saved Policy D/10 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, Policy P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G9 and JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

For avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans

- Location Plan
- Proposed Site Layout Plan 11
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan 06
- Proposed First and Second Floor Plan 07
- Proposed Elevations 08
- Proposed Elevations 09