

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0064
Location: Sheep Bank Farm, Blackstone Edge Old Road, Littleborough, OL15 0LH
Proposal: Change of use and conversion of existing barn into 3no. holiday lets.
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Bob Melling

SITE DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

The application relates to a large shippon which sits adjacent to the farmhouse of Sheep Bank Farm. The site is located amidst extensive open farmland to the southeast of Littleborough Town Centre. Sheep Bank Farm has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) due to its architectural and historical significance. The application site is located within the Green Belt. The farmhouse and shippon contribute to the local rural landscape and are sited in an isolated and elevated position with open aspect views over Hollingworth Lake to the southwest. Access to the site is via Syke Road, an unadopted access road which connects to Rakewood Road.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for the conversion of the barn into 3no. holiday lets. The barn would not be extended, and no landscaping works are proposed. Each holiday let would have three bedrooms and parking is available adjacent to the building. New openings would be formed using aluminium frames and other materials would match those used in the exterior of the existing barn i.e. natural stone and slate. Metal rainwater goods would be installed. New openings would utilise existing or blocked up openings where possible. An inset roof terrace is formed by recessing a portion of the roof structure, creating an external amenity space contained within the overall roof envelope.

RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

25/00613/HOUS: Proposed two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, porch replacement, window replacement and insertion of new windows. Approved.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) 2024:

JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

JP-G9 The Green Belt

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-P2 Heritage

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

E2 Increasing Jobs and Prosperity

E5 Encouraging the Visitor Economy

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage

P3 Improving Design of New Development

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

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)

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: 17/05/2026

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: 05/05/2026

AMENDMENTS

Amendments were made to the window detailing and a structural survey was submitted to confirm that the building is capable of conversion.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development: Green Belt

The application site is allocated as Green Belt under PfE Policy JP-G9 which 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:

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 sets out 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.*
- 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 within the Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.

The proposals seek to re-use an existing building that is considered to be of permanent and substantial construction. The building would be altered; however, it would not be extended. On this basis, the development would comply with exceptions (c) and (h(iv)).

Openness

Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that *‘the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.’*

‘Openness’, for the purpose of Green Belt policy, is not formally defined within planning policy or legislation but is taken to mean the absence of built development. The term ‘openness’ comprises a spatial and visual component which should be assessed in considering whether a proposal preserves the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposal would result in a degree of visual change through the introduction of additional windows; parking spaces and a bin store associated with the holiday accommodation use. However, these elements would not result in an increase in the building’s footprint, volume or height, nor would they introduce substantial new built form into the Green Belt. The additional works would be modest, subordinate to the existing barn, and capable of being accommodated without materially reducing the spatial or visual openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would therefore preserve Green Belt openness. Whilst a greater level of vehicle movement and parking is likely associated, this is well contained within the existing farm complex and would appear against a backdrop of features associated with human activity such as buildings, other vehicles and associated paraphernalia.

Planning Balance

In light of the above assessment, it is considered the proposed development would meet inappropriate development exceptions (c) and (h(iv)). which allow for the re-use of buildings of

permanent and substantial construction and 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. As such, there is no requirement for the decision-maker to consider whether any Very Special Circumstances are applicable and the proposal therefore accords with Policy JP-G9 and the NPPF.

Design and Heritage

The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in PfE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials.

PfE Policy JP-P2 and CS Policy P2 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.

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF sets out that 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 216 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 application relates to the conversion of an existing agricultural shippon located within a small and tightly-grouped farmstead comprising only the farmhouse and the shippon. Sheep Bank Farm is identified as a non-designated heritage asset, deriving its significance from its age, architectural form and historic role.

The shippon is a simple, utilitarian agricultural structure with minimal fenestration, clearly subordinate to the farmhouse in terms of architectural detail and status. This hierarchy is an important element of the character and evidential significance of the farmstead and its setting.

The proposal would retain the existing shippon in its entirety, with no extensions or alterations to the footprint, height or roof form. The basic agricultural form of the building would therefore

remain unchanged, ensuring that it continues to read as a secondary structure within the farmstead and does not compete visually with the farmhouse.

This restrained design approach is considered appropriate, given the rural location of the site and the proximity of the non-designated heritage asset.

The conversion would require the introduction of additional openings to provide light and accommodation suitable for the intended holiday use. It is noted that existing openings would be utilised where practicable, thereby limiting intervention into the original fabric of the building. New openings would be fitted with aluminium frames, which are considered appropriate in this context and would avoid an overly domestic or suburban appearance.

The number of openings has been reduced during the course of the application, however it is noted that a larger opening is proposed on the southwest-facing elevation, which overlooks Hollingworth Lake. While this represents a more noticeable alteration when compared to the existing condition, it is not considered to be unduly harmful to the existing character and appearance.

The proposal also includes an inset roof terrace, formed as a recess within the existing roof slope of the shippon. The terrace would not project beyond the established roof plane, nor would it result in any increase in the height or massing of the building. Importantly, the roof terrace is located on the roof slope which does not face the adjacent farmhouse, thereby limiting its visibility in views of the principal building and avoiding any direct visual competition or overlooking. As a result, the terrace would have a limited visual presence and would not undermine the established hierarchy between the farmhouse and the shippon.

Overall, the fenestration pattern and roof alterations are considered coherent and appropriately restrained. The shippon would continue to be read as a single converted agricultural building rather than appearing fragmented into separate domestic units.

The proposed window proportions and detailing are considered to represent a high standard of design, avoiding ornate or suburban features that would be incongruous in this rural context. The submitted 3D visualisations indicate deep window reveals, which would add depth and shadow consistent with traditional agricultural construction and help maintain the robust and simple character of the building.

A condition requiring the submission of detailed window and door sections, including reveal depths, materials and finishes, is recommended.

The proposal would not increase the scale, height or massing of the shippon, nor would it introduce architectural detailing that would compete with or detract from the farmhouse. The inset roof terrace is orientated away from the farmhouse and would not present as a visually prominent feature in views from the farmhouse.

While the increased fenestration and change of use would introduce a greater degree of domestic character to the shippon, this would result in no more than a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, arising from changes in appearance rather than any loss of historic fabric or visual dominance.

Any identified less than substantial harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the development would secure the long-term viable reuse of an existing rural building, preventing deterioration and supporting the continued use of the farmstead.

In addition, the proposal would deliver clear tourism benefits through the provision of small-scale holiday accommodation in close proximity to Hollingworth Lake.

These benefits align directly with CS Policy E5, which seeks to 'promote and support development that can enhance the visitor attraction of the area covering Hollingworth Lake and Country Park'. The proposal would contribute positively to the local visitor economy in a manner that is sensitive to its rural and historic context.

When weighed against the limited and less than substantial harm identified, these public benefits are considered to clearly outweigh that harm.

The proposal demonstrates a carefully considered and sympathetic design approach, retaining the form, scale and agricultural origins of the shippon while facilitating its viable reuse. The relationship between the farmhouse and the shippon would remain legible, with only limited and less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

That harm is clearly outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, including support for tourism in accordance with CS Policy E5. Subject to appropriate conditions securing detailed design matters, the proposal is considered acceptable in design and heritage terms.

Residential Amenity

The proposed use of the site as three holiday units would result in a higher frequency of arrivals and departures when compared to a single residential dwelling. However, it is noted that the applicant owns the adjacent residential dwelling as well as the proposed holiday units, and therefore no conflict would arise in respect of the relationship between those buildings.

In addition, the site is relatively isolated, with the nearest unrelated residential dwelling located approximately 220m away. Having regard to the separation distances involved, the limited scale of the development and the nature of holiday accommodation, it is considered that the potential for noise and disturbance would be limited and unlikely to result in a level of harm that would be detrimental to the living conditions of surrounding occupiers.

While the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) does not formally apply to holiday accommodation, it has been used as a reference point when assessing the quality of the proposed units. For a three-bedroom, five-person dwelling over two storeys, the NDSS sets a minimum internal floor area of 93sqm. Holiday Unit 2 would exceed this standard, while Units 1 and 3 would fall marginally below it. However, all units would be provided with a private inset roof terrace, offering additional external amenity space. Given the limited shortfall, the holiday nature of the accommodation and the provision of private outdoor space, the proposed units are considered to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation, especially given the reduced need to perform typical household activities such as washing, cooking and cleaning. Notwithstanding, a condition to restrict each unit to holiday lets only is applied in order to prevent a sub-standard form of permanent accommodation being used for such purposes.

In addition to the above, it is considered that each holiday let would benefit from a suitable degree of natural light and outlook, ensuring a comfortable and inviting internal environment.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would provide a suitable level of amenity for future users, in accordance with PfE Policy JP-P1, CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

CS Policy DM1 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 proposed plans do not indicate any designated parking arrangements, notwithstanding, there is sufficient gravelled area within the site for parking which would be retained. No harm has been identified with regard to impacts to highway safety. The Council's Highways Officer has also raised no objection.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

The Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) were consulted on the application and confirmed that the site is clearly very low risk in terms of bat activity. Notwithstanding, an informative will be attached to this permission regarding the 2019 Regulations.

A barn owl assessment was submitted by the applicant, which confirmed that there was no evidence of any owl activity in or around the site. It was also noted that there were no access points for barn owls to gain access to the building. The applicant has agreed to erect a barn owl box and this measure would constitute a biodiversity enhancement, which can be secured via condition. An informative will be attached to this permission regarding other nesting birds.

Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The applicant confirmed that no grassland would be disturbed to facilitate the parking or bin storage arrangements. Based on observations during a site visit, the Case Officer has no reason to doubt this. Therefore, it is not considered that the property would trigger the requirement for statutory BNG.

Overall, the Council is satisfied that the proposed development would not result in harm to protected species in accordance with CS Policy G7, PfE Policy JP-G8 and the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk

CS 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 utilises sustainable urban drainage solutions wherever possible.

The site is not located within a flood risk zone nor is it located within a critical drainage area.

The proposed development would utilise an existing shippon which is closely related to the adjacent farmhouse. The site is remote from any other dwellings, and the continued use of the existing roof drain is considered acceptable. Given the proximity of the building to the farmhouse, it is considered that the proposed development should be able to discharge foul water via the system used by the farmhouse.

Contamination

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

The Public Protection Officer has recommended the inclusion of condition requiring a watching brief to be undertaken and a verification report to be submitted if no contamination is found. Noting the historical use of the site as well the period of construction it is considered reasonable to request an assessment to ensure that future users of the holiday lets are protected from any contaminants on the site.

Therefore, subject to the inclusion of a condition it is considered that the proposal would meet the requirements of CS Policy G9 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

The Council received one letter in response to the proposed development. The letter raised the following points:

- Concern that only a minority of nearby households appear to have received notification of the planning application.

Officer response: Public consultation has been carried out in accordance with statutory requirements. Furthermore, the Case Officer put up two site notices.

- Suggestion that the stated site address may be unclear or misleading in relation to how the property is accessed.

Officer response: The site address is consistent with that used in previous planning applications relating to the site. Access arrangements are shown on the submitted location plan.

- Strong concern regarding proposed access arrangements during construction and for future use.

Officer response: The submitted location plan identifies access to the site via Syke Road. The red edge application site does not extend to Whittaker Lane.

- Emphasis that access should be restricted to the stated route and not via a nearby private lane.

Officer response: Whittaker Lane falls outside of the application site boundary, and no access is proposed via this route as per the submitted plans.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation And Design

(Summary): While there are no objections to the principle of converting the building, further details/amendments are required.

Rights of Way Officer

No comments received at the time of writing.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Comments provided on 29.04.2026:

Bats

The bat survey information provided is for the adjacent building, not the barn proposed for conversion. These surveys did however record only very limited bat activity in the locality with no indication of a bat roost nearby and are currently still valid. I am therefore satisfied that it would be unreasonable to request further surveys as the site is clearly very low risk. As a precaution, I recommend an informative along the following lines is applied to any permission.

Whilst the building to be converted is low risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the 2019 Regulations it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s).

Barn Owl & Nesting Birds

The building could provide bird nesting opportunities for species such as barn owl, swallow and house sparrow. As no bat and bird assessment has been provided, it cannot be determined whether or not barn owl are present, the assessment of the adjacent building not covering birds in any detail. I therefore recommend that prior to determination an assessment of the barn for barn owl is provided. Other nesting birds can be dealt with via a standard bird nesting condition.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The development appears to result in the loss of a small area of grassland to car parking with wildlife issues restricted to nesting birds.

No BNG statement has been provided and it is unclear whether or not the development is exempt from mandatory 10% BNG owing to the apparent loss of over 25sqm of vegetation to parking spaces. I therefore recommend that prior to determination, the development is assessed by a suitably qualified person to determine whether or not the development is exempt. If not exempt a BNG assessment and metric should be provided.

Comments provided on 18.05.2026:

Summary

Thank you for the sending through the barn owl assessment. I have no reason to doubt the findings of the survey. I recommend the following informatives and conditions. My previous recommendation re. BNG still apply.

Nesting Birds

I recommend an informative along the following lines.

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act. If a bird's nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment

I am satisfied that one barn owl box would be adequate enhancement for wildlife effects. The details of the barn owl box can be provided via condition.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application, and the application has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies with the Development Plan.

Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation to civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Condition(s) (8)

- 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:

- Location Plan_Barn Conversion – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2010
- Existing Site Plan_Barn Conversion – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2011
- Proposed Site Plan_Barn Conversion – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2012
- Existing Barn Elevations – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2201 rev. A
- Existing Barn Plans – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2102 rev. A
- Proposed Barn Elevations – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2251 rev. C received 23/06/2026
- Proposed Barn Plans – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2152 rev. C received 23/06/2026
- Proposed Roof Plan_Barn – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2153

- Existing and Proposed Barn Perspectives – drawing no. SBF-SVA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2301 rev. C received 23/06/2026
- Report on Structure by Healey Consulting dated June 2026
- Email from Andrew Huyton received on 15/05/2026 regarding barn owl survey
- Preliminary Roost Assessment by e3p dated January 2025 ref: 82-065-R1-1
- Nocturnal Bat Survey Report by e3p dated June 2025 ref: 82-065-R3
- Bat Hibernation Survey Report by e30 dated March 2025 ref: 82-065-R2-1

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset 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.

- 4 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 and windows 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 metal 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.

- 5 Notwithstanding any details hereby approved, no above ground works shall take place until full details of all rainwater goods including materials, method of support, design and surface finish have been submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and retained as such thereafter.

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

- 6 Prior to occupation of the development, a scheme for the provision of at least one barn owl box shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The box(s) shall be implemented prior to occupation and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development would provide suitable species habitat enhancement, in accordance with Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G8 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 A watching brief shall be undertaken during the work for the hereby approved development. In the event that contamination is suspected or found at any time when carrying out the approved development or contamination is caused, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and development affected or potentially affected by the contamination must stop. An investigation and/or risk assessment and/or remediation shall be carried out in accordance with an agreed process and within agreed timescales to have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If contamination is not suspected, found or caused during development, this must be confirmed in a completion letter which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The completion letter shall include photos of all surfaces showing no potential contamination is present.

Reason: To ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers in accordance with Policy G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 The accommodation hereby approved shall be used only for short-term holiday accommodation and shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence. No individual, group or family shall occupy the accommodation for a period exceeding 28 consecutive days in any calendar year. The accommodation shall not be used for any other purpose (including any other purpose within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order).

Reason: To ensure that the accommodation is used solely for short-term holiday purposes and not as permanent residential accommodation, thereby preventing a sub-standard form of residential development and enabling the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the use of the site, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-H3 and JP-P1 of the adopted

Approval Reason(s) (1)

- 1 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.

Informatives (1)

- 1 All bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981; the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006; and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010). Should bats or evidence of bats be found prior to or during development, work must stop immediately and Natural England contacted for further advice. This is a legal requirement under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and applies to whoever carries out the work. All contractors on site should be made aware of this requirement.
- 2 The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended, it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under the act. If a bird's nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).