



PLANNING STATEMENT

*382 HEYWOOD OLD ROAD, MIDDLETON, ROCHDALE,
M24 4SB*

First floor rear extension and alterations to fenestration


Europa Business Park, Building 67

Bird Hall Lane

Stockport

SK3 0XA

January 2026



Contents

Page

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. PLANNING APPRAISAL	4
3. SUMMARY	10

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of the Applicant to accompany a planning application for a rear extension at first floor level

1.2 The site is situated in 'Open Protected Land' and this Planning Statement focuses on assessment of this policy designation and sets out why the development is acceptable, having regard to the development plan and other material considerations.

2.0 Planning Appraisal

Proposed Development & Site Context

2.1 The application site comprises of a detached property, situated within a ribbon of development along Heywood Old Road.




Figure 1: 3D Aerial of Site & Surroundings (Google Maps)

2.2 The property is a part two storey, and part single storey detached building, formerly used as a restaurant. It is situated close to the highway, with a large car parking area immediately to its rear. The application site is surrounded on the eastern side of Heywood Old Road by extensive development as can be seen in the aerial extract in Figure 1.



Figure 2: Proposed Site Plan Extract (NASA Design Studio), NTS



Figure 3: Existing/Proposed Rear Elevations Plan Extracts (NASA Design Studio), NTS

2.3 The application proposal, as can be seen in the accompanying plans, does not involve any increase in the footprint of the building. It seeks to add a first floor above an existing single storey element to the rear of the building.

2.4 The accompanying plans set out the floorspace of the building as it is currently, together with the proposal. The existing building has a total floorspace of 917sqm, with the proposal adding 127sqm to give a total of 1044sqm.

Planning Policy Context

2.5 The relevant parts of the development plan for the area comprise of policies from the Rochdale Core Strategy (Adopted October 2016) (Core Strategy), the saved policies from the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP), and the Places for Everyone Plan (March 2024).

2.6 The development plan policies in the UDP significantly pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework (revised version published July 2021), which is an important material consideration, and these policies can only be afforded full weight in decision-making where they are consistent with the NPPF.

2.7 The key relevant development plan policies are set out below:

Core Strategy

G4: Protecting Green Belt Land – seeks to limit development to those that are deemed to be not inappropriate in the Green Belt.

UDP

D/4: Control of Development in the Green Belt – General – sets out a criteria-based approach for the erection of new buildings in the Green Belt.

D/10 Protected Open Land – within areas defined as Protected Open Land this policy sets out defined categories that development should fall within.

This includes a limited extension to an existing building.



Figure 4: UDP Proposals Map Extract (Rochdale Council)
Site identified as being within 'Protected Open Land' designation

2.8 The planning policy considerations that are of most relevance will be highlighted and considered in appropriate detail alongside a discussion of each issue in the following section of the Statement.

2.9 Although a Green Belt Assessment was requested by the Council, it is important to note that the application site is not in the Green Belt but identified as Protected Open Land. As such, an assessment has been undertaken against the relevant UDP Policy D/10 with reference to size calculations and this is set out as follows.

2.10 UDP Policy D/10 requires development proposals to satisfy at least one of three categories – set out under a), b) and c):

D/10	PROTECTED OPEN LAND
-------------	----------------------------

Within the areas of Protected Open Land defined on the Proposals Map, development proposals will be permitted that fall within one or more of the following categories:

- a) development which would be acceptable were it in the Green Belt; or**
- b) limited infilling within an established pocket of housing or industry where this is in scale with the area and will not adversely affect its character or surroundings; or**
- c) a limited extension to an existing building which:**
 - i. forms part of an existing source of employment; or**
 - ii. is necessary for the establishment of a new enterprise or business which satisfies other policies of the Plan; and**
 - iii. is sited within the existing curtilage of the business concerned, and will not adversely affect the character of the surrounding land and its openness.**

Where new buildings are permitted, they should be sited to form a group with existing buildings. Where this is not possible, buildings, car parking areas and other new structures, should be sited where they will be well screened and unobtrusive in the landscape. All buildings and extensions should be of a high standard of design, using materials that are compatible with the landscape, and should not detract from the visual amenity and environment of adjacent Green Belt.

2.11 Part b) of this policy sets out that infilling within an established pocket of housing or industry is acceptable subject to its scale and ensuring there is no adverse impact on the character or surroundings. Figure 1 demonstrates the application site is enveloped by significant scale industrial/commercial uses, with Figure 4 (showing an extract of the UDP Proposals Map) showing the wider context with continuous ribbon development on the eastern side of the road.

2.12 The proposal in this context therefore constitutes limited infilling, and if we consider the latter part of this policy, it can be seen that the scale of the development is entirely in scale with the existing building on the site and of a

much smaller proportion than the large warehouse / steel portal framed buildings in the immediate vicinity. The actual increase in floorspace and in percentage terms is set out as follows:

- Existing Floorspace: 917 sqm
- Proposed Floorspace: 1044 sqm
- % Increase Floorspace 12%

2.13 As it would be sited to the rear of the site, entirely behind and of a smaller scale than the existing two storey part of the existing building, it would not be prominent from public vantage points and nor would it give rise to any other adverse effects on its surroundings. The proposal is therefore entirely compliant with part b.) of this policy and therefore is in accordance with policy D/10 as a whole.

2.14 In addition, consideration has been given to part c) of this policy which relates to limited extensions to existing buildings. If we have regard to the nature of the proposed development – a first-floor extension over an existing ground floor element (resulting in no footprint increase) and an increase in floorspace terms by only 12%, this is precisely the type of limited extension that this part of the policy seeks to support.

2.15 Part c) of the policy also requires compliance with two sub-sections i) or ii). These relate to the type of property that the limited extension is to take place on – either one that forms a source of existing employment, or one that will form a new business or enterprise. This proposed extension, on an existing restaurant building is considered to be compliant with these subsections, as it has been a restaurant and will continue to be following the addition that is proposed on this application. The final sub-section (iii) requires the development to be within the curtilage of the business, which

this development is and as set out in the preceding paragraph, would give rise to no harmful effects on character. As the development is well contained - above

an existing ground floor part of the building and within the existing built envelope of the site/area, there would be no harmful impact on openness in the general sense.

2.16 To summarise therefore, the proposal would be acceptable when considered against the Protected Open Land policy. It would be compliant with both parts b) and c) for the reasons set out and as the policy requires compliance with either a) or b) or c), and not all three parts, it is not necessary to consider part a) which seeks to assess the development as if it were in the Green Belt. The last paragraph of the policy wording relates in part to new buildings which this proposal is not, and in terms of design, the proposed development seeks to utilise sympathetic materials with the elevations reflecting the elements of the existing building which is being extended.

3.0 Summary

3.1 This Statement has set out the justification for the proposed development, which involves the addition of modest extension to an existing building.

3.2 The relevant policy for Protected Open Land has been considered and the scheme has been shown to be compliant with this.

3.2 If any further information is required, contact should be made with the agent.