

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0347
Location: PLUMPTON COTTAGE, 186 BURY AND ROCHDALE OLD ROAD, HEYWOOD, OL10 4AT
Proposal: Adaptation to facilitate live in assisted care provision including single-storey rear extension, porch extension, raised terrace and access ramp with associated boundary treatment
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
Officer: Luke Rigby

SITE

The application site consists of Plumpton Cottage, a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located to the south of Bury and Rochdale Old Road. The existing dwelling comprises both ends of the terrace, which appear to have at one point been separate dwellings which now form part of the application site; there is a dwelling which sits between the two which does not form part of the application site.

The existing dwelling is constructed of facing brick with a hipped roof. The application site is located within the Green Belt as defined by Saved UPD Policy G/D/2, and appears at some point, to have been extended into an SBI to the rear of the site. The trees/woodland area to the rear of the application site form part of Tree Preservation Order 010 which was sealed in 1952.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

04/D44224 - Two storey rear extension, side porch extension and refurbishment of out building – Approved 14 December 2004

13/00757/HOUS - Erection of car port to south (side) of dwelling including erection of retaining wall to south western side of car port

14/00019/HOUS - Erection of car port to south (side) of dwelling including erection of retaining wall to south western side of car port (resubmission of 13/00757/HOUS)

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of an enclosed hydrotherapy pool to the rear elevation, a rear access ramp, covered porch, and associated boundary fencing.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-G9 The Green Belt

Local Guidance

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/2 Green Belt

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

P3 Improving Design of New Development

G4 Protecting Green Belt

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: N/A

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: In accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, notification letters were sent to immediate neighbours.

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Thank you for the additional information for this application, including the bat tree assessment. I have no reason to doubt the findings of the tree inspection which assessed the trees to have negligible bat suitability. No further bat surveys/assessments are required to facilitate the works.

I would be ok to accept that T4 and T6 are reduced in height as opposed to full removal. Tree 5 would still need to be removed due to the RPA being compromised and therefore as per my previous comments, we'd recommend that two trees are planted on-site to compensate for the loss of T5. A simple management plan could be provided and secured by condition to detail the management of the trees.

Highways Department

No objection.

ASSESSMENT

Principle

The application site is located entirely within the Green Belt as defined by Saved UDP Policy G/D/2 and Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth, the Framework) sets out that most development within the Green Belt is inappropriate. Paragraph 153 of the Framework states that inappropriate development within the Green Belt is harmful to its openness and should be resisted unless very special circumstances exist.

Paragraph 154 of the Framework sets out that certain types of development within the Green Belt should not be considered inappropriate. The application proposes the addition of an extension to the existing dwelling to form a hydrotherapy pool, addition of a rear covered porch, and access ramp and boundary fencing. Insofar as relevant to this application, exceptions 154(c) and 154(h)(ii) are considered to be engaged.

(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;

(h) Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

ii. engineering operations

The proposed hydrotherapy pool and covered porch are therefore considered appropriate development within the Green Belt subject to the development not

resulting in a disproportionate addition above and beyond the size of the original dwelling and preserve openness.

Paragraph 5.20 of the Housing SPD states that extensions which result in a 35% increase in floorspace or volume will not be considered disproportionate within the Green Belt. It goes on to state that this is a general figure, however, and there may be exceptions where a lower or higher figure are applicable.

Permission was granted in 2014 for the construction of a car port, with a 32.85% increase in total floor area. The proposed hydrotherapy pool and covered entrance porch would consist of an additional 20 cubic metres of volume and 5sqm total floor area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the 2014 permission was not implemented, it carries weight in the planning balance. The marginal increase in built form over that development in this instance is not considered disproportionate.

The proposed boundary treatment engages Paragraph 154(h)(ii) as an engineering work. Such development is not inappropriate so long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt.

The boundary treatment would be to the rear of the application site and would therefore have limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt; it is unlikely to be seen from the highway or other public vantage points given the siting of the dwelling and existing treatments.

Similarly, the alterations and refurbishment to the patio/terrace area and the installation of the access ramp and balustrade are not considered significantly detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt given its siting and screening afforded by the existing dwelling.

Whilst the works may be considered to be appropriate within the Green Belt, the applicant has also put forward very special circumstances in case the council were to determine the works were inappropriate. These VSC relate to the disability requirements of the resident. Whilst personal circumstances are not in most cases appropriate material considerations, it is acknowledged that there may be instances such as that put forward with this application where they may be considered as material and which in turn could represent VSC. Full consideration of that is however unnecessary in this instance as the LPA accept the proposals themselves as not being inappropriate.

Having regard to the above, the proposed developments are considered appropriate development within the Green Belt, in accordance with Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Design, character and appearance

The proposed developments are not considered to appear significantly incongruous or out of character. The hydrotherapy pool would have a hipped roof which is in keeping with the hipped roof of the existing dwelling and the proposed porch would appear as a marginal addition to the existing dwelling which would not be readily visible.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed boundary treatment would appear somewhat contemporary in relation to the existing dwelling, its siting would be such that its visual impact overall is considered acceptable. It is unlikely to be unduly prominent when viewed from the adjacent Bury and Rochdale Old Road.

As such it is considered that the proposed extension and alterations would be acceptable, in accordance with CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Residential amenity

Regard has been had to the relative positions of windows, separation distances, the orientation and height of buildings and boundary treatments. It is considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on health or quality of life, having particular regard to residential amenity.

It is noted that all habitable rooms within the application property would continue to receive an adequate amount of natural light and that a sufficient garden space would be retained.

The proposal would be set an appropriate distance away from any neighbouring properties and at a notably lower ground level, resulting in a negligible impact.

As such, it is considered proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of both the occupiers of the application property and the neighbouring properties, in accordance with CS policy DM1, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Highways and parking

The application property would retain two off-street parking spaces, and would have no unacceptable impacts upon highway safety in accordance with CS Policy T2 and CS Appendix 5.

Trees and Ecology

The application site has, at some point, extended into the SBI to the rear of the application site. The trees within the SBI are protected by Tree Preservation Order 010 which was sealed in 1952. It identifies several mature trees which cumulatively contribute to the verdant character of the surrounding street scene and also afford significant screening to the rear application boundary.

The submitted AIA indicates that the development would require the removal of one tree T5. The removal of this tree is required as the development would encroach within its root protection zone. Whilst the tree is sited within the SBI, it is not subject to TPO 010.

The removal of T5 would expose two further trees, T4 and T6 to adverse wind. The AIA indicates that these trees are structurally weak and recommends their removal. These two trees are subject to TPO 010 and therefore the Local Planning Authority

would not support their removal. It is pertinent to note that there is some ambiguity in the application submission surrounding the health of T6 – the AIA indicates that T6 is a structurally weak tree, however the Preliminary Roost Assessment indicates that T6 is in very good condition.

Two further trees, T1 and T3 are proposed for pruning (with T3 also proposed to be reduced in height by 4m to approximately 19m), but are to be retained. These trees are also located within the SBI and T3 is also protected by TPO 010.

Officers consulted with the Council's Tree Officer however received no response. In addition, Officers consulted with Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU). GMEU consider the removal of T5 acceptable subject to a 2:1 replanting scheme, however similarly resist the removal of T4 and T6. The works to T1 and T3 are considered acceptable by GMEU.

Officers discussed alternative options with the applicant and GMEU, who indicate that reducing T4 to 10m and T6 to 15m would be considered acceptable. Officers consider, in consultation with GMEU, this to be acceptable.

It is noted that whilst GMEU do not object to the works to T1 and T6, these lie outside of the application site (and red-edge boundary) and therefore works to such trees cannot be authorised by virtue of this application. Such works would be the responsibility of the owner of those trees.

The application submission includes a Preliminary Roost Assessment which concludes that the trees on the application site that would be impacted by the development are of negligible potential for roosting bats. GMEU has reviewed the PRA and finds this acceptable. No further assessment is therefore required.

Having regard to the above, whilst the loss of T5 would be disappointing, it is considered that its replacement in a 2:1 ratio is sufficient to offset the harm caused to the SBI. The works to T3 and T4 are considered acceptable.

Conclusion

Subject to the conditions set out below and taking into account the provisions of the development plan and all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

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.[AC1]

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 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) (5)

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason – To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 This permission relates to the following plans and documents: -

DWG No. 2307/L-100 (Location Plan)

DWG No. RTS 27032026 AIA 002 (Tree Survey)

DWG No. 2307/L2-206 Revision A (Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plans)

DWG No. 2307/L21-310 (Proposed Boundary Treatment)

TSE-02532 (Secura Design Proposal)

DWG No. RTS 27032026 TCP 001 (Tree Survey)

DWG No. 2307/L21-307 Revision A (Proposed Elevations)

DWG No. 2307/L2-207 Revision A (Proposed Ground Floor Plans)

DWG No. 2307/L1-106 Revision B (Proposed Site Plan)

DWG No. 2307/L2-208 Revision A (Proposed First Floor)

DWG No. 2307/L21-308 Revision A (Proposed Elevations)

Preliminary Roost Assessment For Bats (Pennine Ecological; July 2026)

RTS/27032026 002 (Site Tree Appraisal)

RTS/27032026/TPP 004 (Tree Survey)

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these hereby approved.

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 Unitary Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 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 or be those specified on the approved plans or application form.

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 The tree works and protection measures shall be carried out in full accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement within the Site Tree Appraisal produced by Rowbottom's Tree Services (ref RTS/27032026 002 dated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 11th August 2026), including:

- the felling of T5;
- the crown reduction of T3 to approximately 19 metres;
- the crown reduction of T4 to approximately 10 metres; and
- the tree protection specified therein.

The works to T3 and T4, which are protected by TPO010, are hereby authorised by this permission. Following the completion of the reduction works, trees T3 and T4 shall be inspected annually for a period of 5 years, with a record of each inspection made available to the Local Planning Authority on request.

Reason – To secure the retention and appropriate management of protected trees T3 and T4 within the Site of Biological Importance, and to safeguard retained trees during construction in accordance with Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 Within the first planting season following the felling of T5 hereby approved, 2No. replacement trees of similar size, and of species native to the habitat of the Site of Biological Importance, shall be planted within the application site.

If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting any tree is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously diseased or damaged, a replacement tree of

the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the same location during the next planting season, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason – To ensure that the loss of T5 is adequately mitigated through replacement planting and to maintain and enhance the ecological value of the Site of Biological Importance, together with the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policies JP-G7 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.