

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00132/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
25/00132/FUL

CASE OFFICER
Majid Mir

DETERMINATION DATE 03.06.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: Stoney Head Higher Calderbrook Road Littleborough Rochdale OL15 9NH

Proposal: Conversion of garage to form 1 dwelling, alterations to fenestration, installation of rooflights, and associated work including landscaping and boundary treatment

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
-----	--	---

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

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

SITE

The application relates to a single-storey outbuilding built within the curtilage of 1 Stoney Head on Higher Calderbrook Road, Littleborough. The outbuilding appears to be used as a garage and store room. Planning permission was granted for the construction of the outbuilding retrospectively through planning permission 23/00931/HOUS. To the northeast is the curtilage of the neighbour residential property of no. 9 Salley Street. Further northeast is a row of terrace properties consisting of numbers 9 to 19 Salley Street. The properties are considered non-designated heritage assets. The properties are set on lower ground with the rear set at elevated positions in line with the application site. To the west is Stoney Head numbers 1 and 2 Stoney Head. Both the properties are set on higher ground than the outbuilding. To the south west is plot of land and numbers 5 and 7 Salley Street. Like the other properties on Salley Street, the properties are set on lower ground.

There are two separate vehicle access points for no. 1 Stoney Head. One is via Higher Calderbrook Road and is located close to no. 1 Stoney Head. The vehicle access point is by the outbuilding and from Salley Street. The access to the site is via a narrow path located between the side gardens of no. 7 and no 9 Salley Street.

The properties along Salley Street and Calderbrook are set close to the highway and create a built up frontage. The outbuilding on the other hand is located on higher ground and set back from Salley Street.

To the northwest is Higher Calderbrook Road and open greenfield land. Vehicle access for vehicles along Higher Calderbrook Road ends adjacent to Stoney Head. As with the properties of Stoney Head, Higher Calderbrook Road and the open greenfield land are set on higher ground than the outbuilding. To the southeast, and on the opposite site of Salley Street, there is also open greenfield land.

The site is located with the Green Belt.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission to convert the garage into one dwelling, make alterations to the fenestration consisting of replacing two existing windows on the southwest facing elevations, replace existing door with window on the southwest elevation, and replace the existing garage door with one window and glazed patio doors on the southeast facing elevation. The application also proposes to install three roof windows (rooflights) on the southwest facing roof slope, and associated works consisting of landscaping and boundary treatment.

The proposed dwelling would have one bedroom, one bathroom, one utility room and an open plan kitchen and living space on the ground floor. On the first floor the proposed dwelling would have a bedroom with ensuite and a store room.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Sub-Regional - Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G5	Uplands
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-H1	Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Development
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-C7	Transport Requirements of New Development

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

- G1 Tackling and adapting to climate change
- G2 Energy and new development
- 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, contamination and land instability

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 Water

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

08/D50328	Two Storey Side Extension to Dwelling. Decision: Granted subject to conditions.
08/D51598	Two storey side extension. Decision: Granted subject to conditions.
11/D54242:	Erection of detached double garage and 2 stables, Decision: Granted subject to conditions.
11/D55067	Application For A Lawful Development Certificate For Use Of Land To Form Extension To Private Garden (Existing). Decision: Withdrawn.
16/01304/HOUS:	Erection of a detached single storey building to form garage and two stables. Decision: Granted subject to conditions.
17/01072/FUL	Change of use from double garage and 2 no. stables to detached house. Decision: Refused. Reason for refusal: <i>The proposed development is tantamount to the erection of a detached dwelling house, which constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Additional harm would be caused due to the unsustainable location of the site, along with harm to the visual amenity of the area as a result of poor design and inappropriate materials. No very special circumstances have been identified that may outweigh the harm identified and the proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, saved policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, policies G4, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document.</i>
20/00957/FUL	Conversion of stable block and garage, including alterations to fenestration, to create detached residential dwelling with associated access, vehicle parking, private amenity space and landscaping. Decision: Refused. Dismissed at appeal. Reason for refusal: <i>The proposed development is tantamount to the erection of a detached dwelling house, which constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Additional harm would be caused due to the unsustainable location of the site, along with harm to the visual amenity of the area as a result of poor design and inappropriate materials. No very special circumstances have been identified that may outweigh the harm identified and the proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, saved policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, policies G4, P1, P3 and DM1 of the</i>

23/00931/HOUS Erection of a detached single storey building to form storage and garage building – Retrospective.
Decision: Grant to subject to conditions.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

No objection to this proposal.

The Coal Authority

No objection.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice was placed in the vicinity of the site. Five objections were received with two being from the same household. One representation supporting the application was also received. The comments are summarised below:

- ☐ Concerns raised about neighbouring properties not being notified on this and previous application.

Officer comments: Neighbouring properties were notified of the application in line with legislation. A site notice was also placed in the vicinity of the site.

- ☐ This is a green belt area and this garage was built by a builder with obvious intentions to turn it into a property.
- ☐ The once open field area is slowly being built up with lots of different buildings he is doing and the area is being ruined.
- ☐ Inappropriate and unsustainable development that is out of character with the local area and is an encroachment on Calderbrook's rural Green Belt area.
- ☐ Proposal represents an appropriate and sustainable form of development.
- ☐ It makes use of an existing structure without extending the building's footprint or causing any further encroachment into open countryside.
- ☐ Proposal maintains the openness and character of the Green Belt while helping to meet local housing needs.
- ☐ Previous applications refused and dismissed at appeal.

Officer comments: Where relevant, discussed in the 'principle of the development' section of the report.

- ☐ Excessive noise that would be incurred by residential use, particularly in unsociable hours, given the overcrowded plot size and elevation, especially with regards to vehicles and recreation.
- ☐ Light pollution leading to disturbance of neighbouring properties.
- ☐ Erosion of privacy and other nuisance to neighbouring properties on Salley Street.
- ☐ Noise and nuisance during unsociable hours.
- ☐ Loss of privacy and overlooking.
- ☐ Unauthorised work undertaken. Will regularise if granted planning permission and undertake other work under permitted development rights that would impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Officer comments: Where relevant, discussed in the 'amenity' section of the report.

- ☐ Residential properties in the immediate area are 19th Century gritstone cottages and houses. As such the buildings, as a residence, would look distinctly out of place.
- ☐ Proposal is a low-impact conversion that respects the setting and scale of the area.
- ☐ The development has the potential to improve the use and appearance of the site.
- ☐ Visual amenity impact on neighbouring properties.

Officer comments: Discussed in the ‘visual amenity and heritage’ section of the report.

- ☐ Impact on SAC/SPA/SSSI designated South Pennine Moors.
- ☐ Light pollution, leading to disturbance of local wildlife, including the bat population and functionally-linked habitat.

Officer comments: Discussed in the ‘ecology and biodiversity’ section of the report.

ANALYSIS

Principle of development and Green Belt

Green Belt

The application property and the whole of the curtilage is located within the Green Belt.

Policy JP-GP9 of the adopted Places for Everyone DPD (PfE) is relevant to any applications on the site due to it being in the Green Belt. This policy reiterates the purposes that are served by Green Belt designation and should be read alongside the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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 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 also states 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 unless it meets one of the exception criteria identified in the paragraph. The listed exceptions to this 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), 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.**
- 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.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF adds that 'the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
 - b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
 - c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
 - d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules'
- requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

Grey Belt is defined as land in the Green Belt which is comprised of previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes points A (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large, built up areas), B (to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another), or D (to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns) stated in paragraph 143 of the NPPF. Grey belt land excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 of the NPPF (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.

Having regard for the guidance in the NPPF, the land could be classified as Grey Belt Land. However, all the criteria are not met under paragraph 155, as at present, the Council has a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and the Housing Delivery Test does not fall below 75% in the previous three years. Furthermore, the most relevant exemptions identified in paragraph 154 are exemption (g) and (h).

The decisions of the previous planning applications are a material planning consideration when determining this application. However, there are distinctions between the two that are discussed below. Of particular note is that since the determination of these applications, the PfE has been adopted and the NPPF has been updated, with exemption (g) being amended and being of relevance to this application.

Application 20/00957/FUL requested planning permission to convert a single storey garage and stable building to a residential dwelling. The building was an unauthorised building. As noted by the Planning Officer, 'the existing building on the site is unlawful and does not benefit from an authorised use. It is therefore considered that the proposal amounts to the erection of a new dwelling within the Green Belt, which constitutes inappropriate development.' The Inspector however concluded that whilst it may be an unauthorised building with an authorised use, it is a building that is of permanent and substantial construction, and therefore it will be assessed as whether the proposal would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and whether it would conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Since the determination of that application, planning permission has been retrospectively granted for the construction of the outbuilding consisting of a garage and storage facility under planning permission 23/00931/HOUS. It is noted that planning permission was granted for an outbuilding to be used for storage and as a garage that would be used for incidental or ancillary purposes associated with no. 1 Stoney Head.

In regard to exception (H), which states that the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction, provided it preserves Green Belt openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, should not be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF sets out that Green Belt Serves the following five purposes:

- a. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b. To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d. To reserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

When determining planning application 20/00957/FUL, the Inspector considered that 'there would be a visual impact as a result of the alterations to the building and its residential occupation.' This site would not lead to a change of use as the site is presently located within the curtilage of a residential dwelling. However, the division of the site into two dwellings would lead to an intensification of the site. The Inspector did however add that as the proposal would not result in a significantly greater permanent footprint of development than the existing situation, there would be no significant spatial loss of openness.

The outbuilding is now an authorised building that is used as a garage and storage facility, ancillary to the host dwelling. The division of the site into two dwellings would lead to an increase of movement. It noted that although there is access for vehicles to enter from Higher Calderbrook Road, this is shared with the adjoining property. The Inspector stated that 'while I accept that the land and the garage may already be used for parking, albeit unauthorised, this appears to be ancillary to the parking provision immediately and more conveniently located to the rear of the appeal property.' It is however noted that evidence shows that both access points to park vehicles off-street are now being used. It is also noted, that whilst the parking immediate to the dwelling would be more convenient when moving from the car to

the dwelling, the more convenient access to the site for a vehicle would be from the more established highway of Calderbrook Road and Salley Street.

When viewed from Calderbrook Road and Salley Street, the residential properties within close vicinity of the site are set close to the highway. A large proportion of the properties do not have access to off-street parking and therefore park vehicles on the highway or to the front of the properties. Those that do have off-street parking, tend to park the vehicles to the side of the dwelling. The proposed development would likely see an intensification, however, when considering the size of the proposed dwelling, this likely to see one additional car park on the site in comparison to the present. Furthermore, these vehicles will be set further away from the highway, albeit in an elevated position. The vehicles would be no less prominent than the existing arrangements of vehicles parked on or just off the highway. Furthermore, with adequate screening from boundary treatment and landscaping, the vehicles can be adequately screened.

Taking into consideration the above, the proposal would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the design of the proposal has been amended to remove the large glazed opening that faced directly towards Salley Street with a more modest window and double doors. This would reduce the conspicuousness of the building. The Inspector also raised concerns about light spill from the roof windows would render the building more conspicuous during low light conditions. The previous proposal included four roof windows: two on either side of the roof slope. The proposal has been amended to reduce the number of roof windows to three on one side of the roof slope; two for the bedroom and one for the ensuite. This would reduce the amount of light spill, and especially during low light conditions than the previous proposal.

Considering the above, it is considered that the proposed development would preserve the Green Belt openness and would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The proposal therefore would meet exception criteria (H).

In regard to exception criteria (G), the Inspector stated that 'the appeal site lies between Salley Street and Higher Calderbrook Road. It is in a loose rural cluster of dwellings and farmsteads in the countryside outside the small settlement of Calderbrook.' Furthermore, the Inspector adds that 'the appeal site is in the countryside and it is physically, visually and functionally separated from the village envelope of Calderbrook. There is little to suggest that the loose cluster of development between Salley Street and Higher Calderbrook has a separate village identity. Therefore, the appeal site is not in a village.' Additionally, it was considered that the site was in an unsustainable location. As such, it can be considered that the site is located within a cluster of dwellings rather than in a built-up area.

The Court of Appeal decision of *Dartford Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government & ORS* (2017) found that 'previously developed land' as defined in the NPPF does include private residential gardens in areas that are not built-up, but excludes private residential gardens in built-up areas. The Core Strategy defines previously developed land/brownfield land as 'land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings) and associated fixed surface infrastructure, and that has not lost evidence of this previous use.'

The building, now an authorised building, is located within the curtilage of a residential dwelling. There does appear to be a distinct boundary between the proposed site and no. 1 Stoney Head, with the boundary treatment forming a separation between the two. Access to the main dwelling from the outbuilding is

possible via steps. There are also two separate accesses for the curtilage of no. 1 Stoney Head: Salley Street for the outbuilding and Higher Calderbrook Road for no. 1 Stoney Head. Visually and spatially, the outbuilding is separated from the dwelling and already appears like a separate entity.

Taking into consideration the above, the proposed change of use and the associated works would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt and therefore would meet exception criteria (G).

Housing Need

In addition to the above assessment on the impact on the Green Belt, Places for Everyone establishes the need for at least 616 net additional dwellings per year in Rochdale to meet the housing needs of the borough. Policy C1 of The Core Strategy sets a target of 80% of new housing on previously developed land, however, the Core Strategy seeks to focus this within the urban area.

Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that 'planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses'. Paragraph 125 of the NPPF advises that 'planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land'. Under sub paragraph (d) of Paragraph 125 of the NPPF, planning policies and decisions should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing.

Further to those relevant policies as identified in the Rochdale Core Strategy, relevant policies in Places for Everyone (PfE) have been identified. PfE Policy JP-S1 sets out that development should seek to maximise economic, social and environmental benefits. Preference should be given to previously-developed (brownfield) land. PfE Policy JP-H2 states that there should be a significant increase in the supply of new housing, including, specifically, the supply of low-cost market housing. Furthermore, as set out in PfE Policy JP-H4, new housing should be delivered at a density appropriate for the location and taking into account the site's accessibility.

In this instance, the proposal would assist the Borough's ability to achieve its housing requirements, albeit marginally. Furthermore, although the proposed dwelling would be located in an area that is not considered sustainable, it would be located within a cluster of other dwellings and would reuse an existing building.

In conclusion, the proposal would have a marginal benefit to the Borough's housing requirements and would reuse an existing building within a cluster of dwellings. It is considered that the proposed development would not cause substantial harm to the Green Belt and as such is considered to be accord with relevant policies with the PfE and the NPPF in regard to development in the Green Belt subject to consideration of all other material planning considerations.

Design and Heritage

Paragraphs 131 of the 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 goes on to state 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, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. Additionally, Paragraph 139 states development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

The site is located within close vicinity to the non-designated heritage assets consisting of a row of cottages from 9 to 19 Salley Street. Many of the properties within the surrounding area, including those along Higher Calderbrook Road and Salley Street are depicted on the first edition OS map from 1851. Given their age and the survival of historic fabric and features, they are of some architectural and historic interest. These properties meet the criteria for consideration as non-designated heritage assets. As such, Core Strategy Policy P2 and paragraph 216 of the NPPF are relevant. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that '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.' Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the Borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.

The application is surrounded by residential properties and the site is within the curtilage of a residential property. Permission for the building has already been approved, as such, the assessment can only consider the alterations proposed through this application. The proposed alterations would be relatively small-scale. The application also proposes to landscape the site and to install boundary treatment. The windows and doors would be appropriately sited and designed. The proposed plans show a low level timber fence being installed around part of the site. However, no sample details have been provided of the proposed boundary treatment and the extent of the boundary treatment is not clear. Furthermore, it is not clear exactly what is proposed for the landscaping. In this regard, it is considered appropriate to include conditions requiring further details of the boundary treatment and landscaping by condition.

The building is set further from the highway than many of the neighbouring properties on Salley Street and Calderbrook Road. The building is also sat on higher ground than those same properties. When travelling along Salley Street/Calderbrook Road, owing to the neighbouring properties and foliage, views of the building are limited until close to the access to the site. From these views, the large garage doors are clearly visible and prominent. The proposal originally proposed large glazed bifolding doors similar to those proposed for the previous application. The reduction of glazing with the addition of a window and double glazed doors would reduce the conspicuousness, when compared to the previous application. Furthermore, the openings would be less conspicuous than the large garage door.

Views of the building and the site from Higher Calderbrook Road are much clearer than those from Salley Street and Calderbrook Road. The views however are from a higher point. The alterations when viewed from this angle would be limited.

The proposed openings would include stone details which would be in keeping with the rest of the building and add visual interest. The design of the openings are considered to be acceptable. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would

not have any greater impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets than the existing building.

Subject to the addition of the conditions, it is considered that the design of the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets.

Neighbour Amenity and Occupier Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF 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.

Noise and disturbance

The application proposes to create a new dwelling in the existing garage. This would lead to an intensification on the site. However, the proposal would see one additional dwelling created. The site adjoins three dwellings and is located within a cluster of other residential dwellings. Concerns were raised about the potential increase in noise, especially during unsociable hours. This is not a planning consideration and there is other legislation to deal with such incidents.

Concerns were also raised about the noise and disturbance from vehicles and the intensification on the site. It is noted that the planning officer for the previous application (20/00957/FUL) stated that the 'introduction of vehicular movements and activity to the site may result in some additional noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties on Salley Street. However, this relationship would not be unacceptable and it is noted that the erection of the approved garage building would also result in vehicle movements.' In this regard, there has been no material change in the proposal to consider otherwise.

Overall, the increase of noise, light pollution and disturbance from the one additional dwelling would not be substantially significant to warrant a refusal.

Neighbour Amenity

Paragraph 4.1 of the Council's Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development (SPD) sets out the minimum distances that should be retained between residential dwellings. Paragraph 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 paragraphs 4.2 (ii) and (iii) to be increased.

Due to the raised level of the site, the proposed glazed doors and window in the eastern elevation of the dwelling would provide an outlook towards the rear elevation and garden space of the nearest properties on Salley Street (numbers 9 and 11). Additionally, the openings would directly face towards the conservatory of no. number 9 Salley Street.

Due to the elevated position of the garage, it appears more like a two storey structure and as such it can be assessed as a two storey structure. In this regard, the

SPD in paragraph 4.1 requires that a minimum distance of 21 metres is retained between a directly facing principal window of habitable room at an upper floor level and 10.5 metres is retained between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.

The distance to the nearest window on the rear elevation of number 9 is approximately 23.5 metres. To the boundary on the side, the proposed windows would be approximately 22.8 metres away. To the conservatory, the openings would be approximately 28.9 metres away. Furthermore, it is noted that the properties are partially screened by boundary treatment and vegetation. Should planning permission be granted it is considered that further screening could be required in the form of additional planting or appropriate boundary treatment. On this basis, it is not considered that any unacceptable loss of privacy would be caused to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

The relationship of the proposed rear garden area with the neighbouring properties (numbers 1 and 2 Stoney Head) would be unconventional, but it is not considered that this would result in any unacceptable loss of privacy between occupiers, subject to the erection of appropriate boundary treatments.

Occupier amenity

Along with not unduly impacting on the amenity of neighbouring properties, all proposal should provide high quality accommodation with sufficient amenity for future occupiers. Policy JP-H3 of the PfE states that all new dwellings should accord with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The NDSS sets requirements for minimum gross internal floor areas dependent on the number of bedrooms, bed spaces and storeys. The NDSS also sets out minimum sizes for double and single bedrooms. The proposed development would meet the minimum standards set out in the NDSS and therefore is acceptable in this regard.

All the habitable rooms would receive a sufficient amount of light and outlook. Additionally, sufficient amount of amenity space would be retained for the occupiers of the property.

In conclusion, subject to the addition of the condition, it is considered the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and the occupiers of the development would have an acceptable standard of amenity. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with policies DM1, G8 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, the PfE and the NPPF.

Highway and Road Safety

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided, and in all circumstances, prioritises the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location. Paragraph 116 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, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.'

The site is located on the outskirts of Littleborough and away from local amenities. As such the occupiers are likely to be heavily reliant on private vehicles. However, the proposed development would see the creation of a small two bedroom dwelling

which is not expected to generate substantially greater traffic than the existing arrangement. Furthermore, the highways department have raised no concerns regarding traffic generation.

The proposal includes two parking spaces which would meet the maximum parking standards as set out in Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.

The existing access used for the residential property would be used. The highways department have no concerns about the access to the site and also have raised no concerns about the servicing or refuse collection from the site.

Further to the above, the highways department have raised no overall objection to the proposal.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the proposed development would accord with the relevant policies within the Core Strategy, PfE and NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk

Policy G8 requires that new development does not lead to any form of increased flooding or impeded natural water and flood risk management. In this regard, it is important that development includes drainage that is appropriate for the site and that utilised sustainable urban drainage solutions where ever possible.

The site is not located within Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3; however, the site is located within a Critical Drainage Area.

The supporting Flood Risk Assessment concluded that 'the proposed change of use does not exacerbate the existing flood risk, and the current drainage system is considered adequate to manage surface water.' The assessment added that 'the use of permeable paving across the majority of the site significantly reduces the volume of surface water runoff, which helps to mitigate the risk of flooding, especially in heavy rainfall events. The applicant has stated that the site currently is gravel surface / permeable paving and that it would be similar in nature. However, insufficient details have been provided. Considering the site is located within a Critical Drainage Area, the topography of the land and with neighbouring properties and the highway potentially experiencing water run-off from the site, it is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring details of surface water drainage to be submitted.

Subject to the addition of a condition, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and accords with relevant policies in Core Strategy, the UDP, the PfE and the NPPF.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Other than the lawned area, the site has no ecological value. The application does not propose any alterations to the lawned and would meet the 'de minimis' requirement. Therefore, the application is exempt from minimum BNG requirements. The application proposes to additional landscaping to a small part of the site. This would have very limited biodiversity value.

It is also noted that as discussed above, planting along the boundary could help protect the amenity of the neighbouring properties and the openness of the Green Belt. This would also help support ecology and biodiversity on the site.

Concerns have been raised about the impact of the proposed development on bats and other habitats in the area. Additionally, concerns have been raised about the impact on South Pennine Moors SAC/SBI/SSSI. It is noted that the application is to convert an existing garage into an additional dwelling within the curtilage of an existing dwelling. There are also residential properties that adjoin the application site. The slight intensification of the use on the site and increase in light spill would not be sufficient to have such a negative impact on the local habitat to warrant a refusal. Additionally, considering the scale of the development, the proposed development would not impact on the South Pennine Moors SAC/SBI/SSSI. Furthermore, it is noted that no evidence has been provided to suggest otherwise from the objectors.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Time Limits

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. Plans

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

- Site Location Plan. Received by email on 08/09/2025
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drawing number: 23.3159.10C. Received by email on 08/09/2025
- Existing Details. Drawing number: 23.3159.8
- Existing Elevations. Drawing number: 23.3159.9
- Proposed Floor Plans. Drawing number: 23.3159.6E. Received by email on 20/11/2025
- Proposed Elevations. Drawing number: 23.3159.7D. Received by email on 08/09/2025

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. Materials to Match

The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

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. Landscaping

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, no above ground works shall take place until full details of both hard and soft 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, planting plans,

specifications and schedules (including planting size, species and numbers/densities) and a scheme for the timing / phasing of implementation works.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme for timing / phasing of implementation or within the next planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

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, the nature of the proposed development, amenity of neighbours and for the amenity of neighbours, and in accordance with Core Strategy Policies G6 and G7, Policies JP-G6 and JP-G7 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Boundary Treatment

Notwithstanding any details submitted as part of the application, prior to the installation of the boundary treatment, details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of boundaries, screens or retaining walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All structures shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development, amenity of neighbours and in accordance with policies P2, 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.

6. PD Rights

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 their curtilage under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes AA, A, B, D, E and F of the above Order.

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

7. Surface Water Drainage Scheme

Notwithstanding the submitted details, no above ground works shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, construction details for permeable paving including sub-base details (e.g. cross-section), if this type of paving forms part of the sustainable drainage system, shall be included. The duly approved scheme shall be

implemented prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved development and shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. To prevent an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development and to ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-S4 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure 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.

Notes for Applicant:

1. Coal Authority advice

The Coal Authority have provided the following advice:

The proposed development lies within an area that has been defined by the Mining Remediation Authority as containing coal mining features at surface or shallow depth. These features may include: mine entries (shafts and adits); shallow coal workings; geological features (fissures and break lines); mine gas and former surface mining sites. Although such features are seldom readily visible, they can often be present and problems can occur, particularly as a result of new development taking place.

Any intrusive activities which disturb or enter any coal seams, coal mine workings or coal mine entries (shafts and adits) requires a Mining Remediation Authority Permit. Such activities could include site investigation boreholes, excavations for foundations, piling activities, other ground works and any subsequent treatment of coal mine workings and coal mine entries for ground stability purposes. Application forms for Mining Remediation Authority permission and further guidance can be obtained from The Mining Remediation Authority's website at: www.gov.uk/get-a-permit-to-deal-with-a-coal-mine-on-your-property

What is a permit and how to get one? –

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/permit-process/permit-process>

In areas where shallow coal seams are present caution should be taken when carrying out any on site burning or heat focused activities.

If any future development has the potential to encounter coal seams which require excavating, for example excavation of building foundations, service trenches, development platforms, earthworks, non-coal mineral operations, an Incidental Coal Agreement will be required. Further information regarding Incidental Coal Agreements can be found here -

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/incidental-coal-agreement/guidance-notes-for-applicants-for-incidental-coal-agreements>

If any coal mining features are unexpectedly encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0800 288 4242. Further information is available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/mining-remediation-authority>.

Report Author Majid Mir