

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/01017/HOUS

Application Number:	25/01017/HOUS
Location:	16 Heald Close, Littleborough, OL15 0DL
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension including alterations to roof and fenestration of existing side extension.
Applicant:	Maisie & Miles Routledge & Hirst
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 27.11.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

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

Location

This application relates to no. 16 Heald Close, a two storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse located in the Hollingworth Lake area of Littleborough. The application property faces the highway to the northwest, is adjoined by no. 14 Heald Close to the southwest and is adjacent to no. 18 Heald Close to the northeast. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear gardens of nos. 75 to 79 Lake Bank, and these properties are set at a lower ground level than the application property.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension including the formation of a new pitched roof over the existing single storey side extension. The extension would have a lean-to roof and a depth of 3m. It would be constructed using materials to match the existing property.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and 1 objection was received. The objection raised a number of concerns which have been summarised as follows:

- ☐ Overshadowing and loss of daylight
- ☐ Loss of privacy and outlook
- ☐ Proximity to boundary and risk of encroachment including during construction
- ☐ The application does not include structural and foundation details
- ☐ The application is not supported by a drainage strategy
- ☐ There is a reference made to 'Proposed Driveway Modifications' however this is not shown on the drawings
- ☐ The presence of contractors' vehicles, skips, and materials would cause a highway safety risk
- ☐ Concerns over the accuracy of the red line boundary
- ☐ There is a restrictive covenant contained within the deeds for properties on Heald Close regarding the maintenance of open plan gardens
- ☐ Noise and disturbance during construction

In the event of an approval, the objector requested the imposition of several conditions, including a Construction Management Plan (CMP), technical details including a surface water drainage strategy, structural calculations and an excavation methodology and underpinning strategy, a pre-commencement condition survey, a boundary protection and non-encroachment condition, a boundary treatment plan, a demolition integrity and condition survey, a materials schedule and a condition restricting the formation of future openings.

Officer's response:

While concerns around loss of residential amenity have been duly considered in the following report, the other matters are addressed as follows:

Drainage

At the planning stage, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers whether the proposal would result in an unacceptable increase in surface water run-off or flood risk. Detailed technical drainage design is dealt with separately under Building Regulations (Part H) and, where relevant, by the Lead Local Flood Authority. For a typical house extension, it is sufficient for the applicant to demonstrate that surface

and foul water will be managed appropriately without causing issues for neighbouring properties. The application proposes a modest rear extension in an area of very low flood risk. It should be possible for the extension to connect to the existing surface water drainage systems and there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would lead to any drainage issues or increased flood risk. Given the scale of development, the submission of a surface water drainage strategy is not considered proportionate or necessary.

Accuracy of the Boundary Line

The red edge on the submitted location plan identifies the land that the applicant owns or controls and forms part of the application site. The LPA is not responsible for verifying property boundaries or ownership through the Land Registry and does not adjudicate boundary disputes. The applicant has completed the required Certificate of Ownership, which legally confirms their interest in the land. If there is any disagreement over the exact boundary position, this is a private civil matter between the relevant landowners and falls outside the planning process.

Proximity to the Boundary and Potential Encroachment

The submitted plans show the extension entirely within the application site, and there is no evidence to suggest that it would physically extend beyond the site boundary.

Issues relating to land ownership, boundary position, or potential encroachment are civil matters between the respective landowners and do not fall within the jurisdiction of the planning system. The grant of planning permission does not authorise any works that would trespass onto or over another person's land, and it remains the applicant's responsibility to ensure the works are carried out within their legal ownership.

On planning grounds, the proximity of the extension to the boundary is considered acceptable and does not, in itself, cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity or the character of the area.

Noise and Other Disturbance During Construction

Temporary noise and other disturbance arising from construction activity are not material planning considerations in themselves, as they are short-term and subject to separate controls. However, construction work is regulated under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, which allows the Council's Environmental Health Team to investigate and impose restrictions if work causes undue nuisance (for example, limiting working hours or noise levels).

Structural Details and Foundations

Matters such as foundations, excavations, and other structural details are not assessed under the planning process. These technical elements are subject to separate approval under Building Regulations, which ensure that the development is constructed safely and to the required technical standards.

Replacement or Alteration of Boundary Treatments

The cost or maintenance of boundary features is a private matter and not a planning consideration. The planning assessment only considers whether any new or altered boundary treatment would be visually acceptable and appropriate to the character of the area. No new boundary treatments are proposed under this application.

Reference to Driveway Modifications

It is noted that one of the submitted plans refers to potential driveway modifications that are not shown on the main site plan. The LPA has sought clarification from the agent and this reference has been removed.

Restrictions on Future Window Openings

The request for a planning condition preventing the formation of additional windows or roof lights has been noted, however, given the design and relationship of the development with neighbouring properties, such a restriction is not considered necessary or reasonable.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

P3 Improving Design of New Development
DM1 General Development Requirements
T2 Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Impact on Character and Appearance

- ☐ The NPPF establishes that 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. In addition, section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.
- ☐ Overall, it is considered that the scale, massing, proportions, window detailing and materials would result in an acceptable standard of design that would be in keeping with the host property and the street scene.
- ☐ In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would be acceptable, in accordance with CS policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under CS policy DM1, which states development proposals should ensure they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.
- ☐ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *'it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.'*
- ☐ Section 5.6 of the SPD outlines the projection limit that single storey extensions should comply with.
- ☐ The extension would have a depth of 3m and would comply with the projection limit in relation to nos. 14 and 18 Heald Close. Therefore, it is not considered that the extension would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the surrounding occupiers.
- ☐ Furthermore, it is not considered that any of the proposed window openings would unduly affect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The principal habitable room windows would face rearwards into the garden of the application property, measuring some 9.7m to the rear boundary of the curtilage.
- ☐ While the extension would contain a secondary window that would measure around 5m to the shared boundary with no. 18 Heald Close, it is noted that no. 18 is sited at a higher level than the application property with a hedge along the boundary. Furthermore, the rear elevations of the two properties are skewed away from one another given their position on the outside of a 90-degree bend in the highway. Overall, it is not considered that proposed

side elevation window would result in an undue loss of privacy for the occupiers of no. 18.

- ☐ Lastly, 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.
- ☐ 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 and the NPPF.

Impact of Highways and Parking

- ☐ The application property would retain at least two off-street parking spaces, in accordance with CS Policy T2 and CS Appendix 5.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

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:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Details. Dwg no. 25.3667.1A
- Scheme 1 – Proposed Details. Dwg no. 25.3667.SC1.1B
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Dwg no. 25.3667.10B

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. 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.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	10/11/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	24/11/2025	Signed: RK

Report Author Bob Melling