

Application Number:	25/00189/HOUS
Location:	Syke Bank Farm Rooley Moor Road Rochdale OL12 6BN
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Mr Robert Brierley
Case Officer:	Rosalind Gralton
DETERMINATION DATE 18.06.2025	EXT OF TIME 05.09.2025
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?	NA
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

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

Location

The site relates to a two storey farmhouse at Syke Bank Lane Farm, Rochdale. The site is located off an unadopted road to the north, just off Rooley Moor Road. The site is visible from many viewpoints from Rooley Moor Road and Smallshaw Road.

OS Maps show the single storey building to the rear of the property is part of the original building. Evidence shows a former range to the south, with a partial historic wall of this still evident today. The property benefits from a porch extension.

Natural stone hardstanding has been installed to the front and north of the property

The site is located within the Green Belt, and within the Catley Lane Head Conservation Area. The site is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) due to its age and vernacular architecture.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two storey side and single storey rear extension

The proposed two storey extension is designed with a pitched roof, with the single storey element a flat roof rear extensions. The proposed extensions would use a breadth of materials including glazing, natural stone and timber cladding.

A glazed link is proposed between the extension and the main dwellinghouse. Vertical timber cladding is proposed to the front and rear elevation. Windows are proposed to the front, side and rear elevations as well as conservation rooflights to the roof.

The extension would measure 5.4m above ground level, set down 1m from the ridge height of the main dwellinghouse. The dwelling would be sunken below ground level by 800mm. To the rear, the internal ground level will be reduced to accommodate glazed patio doors on the rear elevation.

Internally the extension provides ancillary accommodation across two floors including a bedroom, kitchen/diner, and en-suite bathroom.

Relevant History

22/01317/HOUS Two storey side extension Withdrawn 2023-02-20

22/00887/FUL Part two-storey, part single-storey side extension to dwelling to form Bed and Breakfast comprising 6 no. guest rooms following demolition of barn remains Withdrawn 2022-09-08

12/55885/FUL Conversion of redundant buildings to form three two storey dwellings including associated detached garage, formation of access road, parking spaces and landscaping Grant subject to conditions 2013-03-22

15/01111/DOC Submission of details to comply with conditions 3 (materials), 4 (windows and doors), 5 (contamination), 6 (structural method statement), 8 (boundary treatments), 9 (landscaping), 10 (parking areas) and 11 (access road) on planning permission 12/55885/FUL Request Completed 2016-03-09

Township/Member comments

None

Consultee responses

Conservation And Design

First comments received 23/05/2025

- Objections received due to the proposed removal of glazed link, different styles across the fenestration, rooflights not aligning, material palette inappropriate. Less than substantial harm would be caused.

Amended scheme received 13/08/2025

- Amendments were submitted following Conservation and Design team comments. The submitted amendments were in line with the comments and the objection is removed.

Representations

The application was publicized by way of site notice and neighbour notification. 3 letters of objection were received. A summary of the concerns raised is provided below:

- Scale and layout inappropriate - ground floor footprint substantial – comparable to a two storey semi
- Concern over future use of the property and whether it will remain a single dwelling
- Extension would be a disproportionate addition – appears as a separate dwelling
- Impact on conservation area and as a NDHA
- Encroachment into the green belt and erosion of the green belt
- Not very special circumstances
- Should be determined by committee
- Proposed materials unacceptable
- Precedent for further erosion of green belt

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:

JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-G9	The Green Belt

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/2 Green Belt

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

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

Amendments were sought to secure design changes following consultation with the Conservation Officer.

Assessment

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 153 of the NPPF establishes that, as with previous Green Belt policy, *“local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. ‘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 *“development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:*
 - 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), including buildings, 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 (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"

- 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 enlarge the existing property through the addition of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The property benefits from an existing porch, single storey rear extension and an outbuilding, and historically, the original building infilled where the two storey side extension is proposed. It is unclear when the southern half of the building fell into disrepair, however historic maps show the original building outline with the area of the two storey side extension. See map below from 1928.



Map 1: OS Map showing Syke Bank Farm, dated 1928.

- The application is considered however on the basis the porch, single storey rear extension are not part of the original dwellinghouse.
- The submitted design and access statement presents the original building volume as 583 m³. The council has no reason to dispute this. The proposed extension is demonstrated to show an increase in volume of 36% (211m³).
- Both the proposed floor space and volume broadly accord with the allowance of the SPD and is therefore considered to constitute a proportionate addition over and above the original dwelling.

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, largely reflective of the spatial proportions of the building shown on the historic maps (See Map 1).
- The proposed extension would be seen and understood against the existing building to which it is subordinate in height, with the single storey rear extension tucked behind. The proposed materials are to be secured via condition, and would further aid the appearance of the extension blend with

the surrounding built form. However, it is considered that public vantage points of the proposal is ultimately limited given its substantial distance from the adopted highways and public rights of way is located circa 70m from the extension. While the building is at an elevated position, the proposal extension would not significantly 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) 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. Paragraph 153 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 Policy JP-G9 of the adopted PfE and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Heritage and Design: P2, P3 and DM1

- CS Policies P3 and DM1 require development proposals to adhere to high quality design and enhance the borough's identity and sense of place by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. In addition, paragraph 131 of NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF explains that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
- Within Conservation Areas, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 applies. Section 72 of this Act requires local planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
- The application is supported by a Heritage Statement. The application site is a detached house within the Catley Lane Head Conservation Area. This Conservation Area was first designated in 2017. Catley Lane Head is a historic Pennines Hamlet to the north-west of Rochdale. The Conservation

Area retains the rural setting in which it historically developed. The application property is a non-designated heritage asset due to its age and vernacular architecture, and on the whole makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

- The amended proposal shows a two storey gable design subordinate to the existing property, detailed with a glazed link to separate the two elements, clad in a natural timber and stone material. Details of materials are to be secured via condition, in addition to further details of window and door reveals, with a depth to match the existing property.
- Whilst unashamedly contemporary in its appearance, the overall form and scale, use of materials and the placement and design of glazing is considered to produce an attractive addition to the host property that assimilates well with its agrarian vernacular and the wider rural setting. Subject to appropriate planning conditions, the proposals would have a neutral impact upon the significance of the host building and the character of the conservation area.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS Policy DM1, 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. This is reflected in both the NPPF and PfE, which establish the importance of achieving high standards of residential amenity.
- Section 4.1 of the SPD for residential development sets out the following space standards for all new development:
 - 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;
 - 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room;
 - 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.
- Given the siting of the proposed extension would not unduly overlook the neighbouring properties. In addition, the volume of the extension would not result in an overbearing or overshadowing impact on the neighbouring properties, and would not cause an unacceptable 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

- The proposed scheme would have no impact on the existing off-street parking arrangements and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies DM1 and T2.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that any conditions imposed on the original permission remain in force other than as expressly hereby varied and development must be started in accordance with Section 73(5) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved:

- Application Form
- Amended Proposed Block Plan– received 13/08/2025
- Amended Proposed Plans– received 13/08/2025
- Amended Proposed Elevations – received 13/08/2025
- Location Plan

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. No above ground works shall take place until such time as a detailed specification and/or samples of materials to be used externally in the construction of the development have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the duly approved details thereafter.

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

4. No above ground works shall take place until full product specifications for the windows, external doors, roof lights, and detailed designs of the window and door reveals, at a scale of not less than 1:50, to be used on the development hereby approved, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The windows and doors shall be installed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted

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	08/09/2025	Signed: RGR
Authorisation	11/09/2025	Signed: RK