

Application Number:	25/00417/HOUS
Location:	2 Grundy Street, Heywood, OL10 2BA
Proposal:	Single storey front and side extension
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Anthony And Pat O'Rourke
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 22.07.2025	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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to no. 2 Grundy Street, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of Heywood. The application property is located on a corner plot at the junction of Grundy Street and Snowden Street and is adjoined to no. 4 Grundy Street to the southwest. No. 3 Grundy Street is located across the highway to the southeast and the rear boundary of the curtilage of the application property borders the side of no/ 4 Snowden Street. The nearest property across Snowden Street to the northeast is no. 31 Siddall Street. The layout of properties in the immediate area lacks regularity, with variations in spacing, orientation and setback from the highway. The application property benefits from an existing conservatory and a single-storey front extension that does not benefit from planning permission.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey front and side extension. The extension would project approximately 0.75m forward of the principal elevation, 3m from the side elevation and would be set back 0.6m from the rear elevation. It would be characterised by a hipped roof form and constructed using materials to match the existing property. Part of the front extension is being applied for retrospectively and this section has been painted white.

Relevant History

96/D33497 Erection Of Two Dwellinghouses. Granted STC October 1996

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways – No comments received to date.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no responses were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

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

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Development

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *'of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area'* and to *'enhance the borough's identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.'*
- ❑ Although the front extension unbalances the pair of semi-detached dwellings, it is not considered to be unduly harmful given the minimal depth. The extension has the same depth of the original bay window and this limits the amount of visual harm. While the painted brickwork has created a jarring appearance, it is noted that planning permission is not required to paint brickwork where a property is not listed.
- ❑ The side extension is considered to be compatible with the character of the host property in terms of size, height, massing, layout and design, and would appear subordinate to the scale and proportions of the original dwellinghouse.
- ❑ Moreover, the extension would be finished in brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable.
- ❑ The extension would retain sufficient space to the side in order to accommodate bin storage.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.'*
- ❑ The extension would measure approximately 19m to the rear elevation of no. 31 Siddall Street, 18m to the blank side elevation of no. 3 Grundy Street and 9m to the blank side elevation of no. 4 Snowden Street. Therefore, is it not considered that the extension would result in a loss of light, outlook or privacy for any neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ All habitable rooms within the application property would receive adequate natural light and a sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be

retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupiers of the application property.

- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“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 of the NPPF advises that development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- ☐ The property currently benefits from one off-street parking space; however, this would be lost as a result of the proposed extension.
- ☐ Notwithstanding, it is not considered that the addition of one vehicle to the highway would be detrimental to highway capacity and safety given the low-trafficked nature of the highway and the availability of unrestricted kerbside parking.
- ☐ On this basis, it is not considered that the failure to provide off-street parking would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposals are therefore deemed acceptable on balance in accordance with the NPPF.

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:

Location Plan. Dated 09/05/2025

Existing Floor Plan. Issue 3. Dated 14/05/2025

Proposed Floor Plan. Issue 3. Dated 14/05/2025

Proposed Front View Elevation Plan. Issue 4. Dated 19/05/2025

Proposed Side View Elevation Plan. Issue 4. Dated 19/05/2025

Proposed Rear View Elevation Plan. Issue 4. Dated 19/05/2025

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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials and windows 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 appearance, 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	27/06/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	22/06/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling